



IPEC Evaluation

**Public-Private partnership (PPP)
between the chocolate and cocoa
industry and the ILO in Ghana and Côte
d'Ivoire**

**P.340.10.100.001 & P.250.07.100.004
RAF/11/01/GIG & RAF/11/04/GIG**

An independent final evaluation by a team of external consultants

FPRW-ILO Project Code	RAF/11/01/GIG & RAF/11/04/GIG
Duration	42 months
Country	Cote D'Ivoire and Ghana
Starting Date	1 August 2011
Ending Date	31 December 2014
Project Language	English and French
Financing Agency	Global Issues Group in the Chocolate and Cocoa Industry
Donor contribution	USD 2,060,000

March – 2015

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO's evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited, but has undergone quality control by the Evaluation and Impact Assessment unit of ILO FUNDAMENTALS under the authority of ILO Evaluation Office. The English version of the report is the master.

NOTE ON THE EVALUATION PROCESS AND REPORT

This independent evaluation was managed by ILO-IPEC's Evaluation and Impact Assessment section (EIA) following a consultative and participatory approach. EIA has ensured that all major stakeholders were consulted and informed throughout the evaluation and that the evaluation was carried out to highest degree of credibility and independence and in line with established evaluation standards.

The evaluation was carried out by a team of external consultants¹. The field mission took place in October-November 2014. The opinions and recommendations included in this report are those of the authors and as such serve as an important contribution to learning and planning without necessarily constituting the perspective of the ILO or any other organization involved in the project.

¹ Rafael Muñoz Sevilla, International Evaluator (team leader); Kingsley Arkorful, National consultant, Ghana and Charles Kapie, National consultant, Côte d'Ivoire.

Table of contents

Acronyms	v
Executive summary	viii
<i>Findings and conclusions</i>	<i>viii</i>
<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>xi</i>
1. Project description and background	1
1.1 <i>Background</i>	1
1.2 <i>Project objectives</i>	1
1.3 <i>Project strategy</i>	1
2. Evaluation purpose and methodology	3
2.1 <i>Evaluation purpose</i>	3
2.2 <i>Methodology</i>	3
3. Findings	5
3.1 <i>Project design</i>	5
3.2 <i>Relevance</i>	8
3.3 <i>Effectiveness and efficiency</i>	10
3.4 <i>Gender issues</i>	18
3.5 <i>Major contributions towards impact</i>	18
3.6 <i>Sustainability</i>	20
4. Conclusions	23
4.1 <i>Project design</i>	23
4.2 <i>Relevance</i>	23
4.3 <i>Effectiveness and efficiency</i>	23
4.4 <i>Gender issues</i>	24
4.5 <i>Contributions towards impact</i>	24
4.6 <i>Sustainability</i>	25
5. Lessons learned and emerging good practices.....	27
5.1 <i>Lessons learned</i>	27
5.2. <i>Emerging good practices</i>	28
Annexes	32
<i>Annex A: Terms of Reference</i>	32
<i>Annex B: Field work agendas</i>	63
<i>Annex C: List of documents reviewed</i>	64
<i>Annex D: List of persons interviewed</i>	65
<i>Annex E: Inception report</i>	67

Tables

Table 1: Revised PPP Framework (Immediate Objectives and Outputs).....	6
Table 2: Identified Root Causes of Child Labour in the cocoa sector*.....	8
Table 3: Indicators and achievements for Immediate Objective 1	11
Table 4: Indicators and achievements for Immediate Objective 2	13
Table 5: Indicators and achievements for Immediate Objective 3	16

Acronyms

BECE	Basic Education Certificate Examination
CAP	Community Action Plan
CCP	Cocoa Communities Project
CCPC	Community Child Protection Committee
CEDEAO	Communauté Economique des Etat d’Afrique de l’Ouest
CGECI	Confédération Générale des Entreprises de Côte d’Ivoire
CIG	Common Initiative Group
CIM	Comité Inter-Ministériel
CL	Child Labour
CLM	Child Labour Monitoring
CLMS	Child Labour Monitoring System
CLU	Child Labour Unit
CNS	Comité National de Surveillance
COCOBOD	Cocoa Board of Ghana
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DA	District Assemblies
DCPC	District Child Protection Committee
DLTE	Direction de la Lutte Contre le Travail des Enfants
DSW	Department of Social Welfare (of MESW)
DW	Decent Work
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EIA	Evaluation and Impact Assessment Unit (of ILO-FPRW-IPEC)
FCUBE	Free Compulsory Basic Education Programme

FPRW	Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work
GAWU	General and Agricultural Workers' Union of Ghana
GCLMS	Ghana Child Labour Monitoring System
GCLS	Ghana Child Labour Survey
GES	Ghana Education Service
HQ	Headquarters
IA	Implementing Agency
IAB	Integrated Area-Based
ICI	International Cocoa Initiative
ILO	International Labour Organization
IO	Immediate Objective
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
ITUC	International Trade Union Confederation
IUF	International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations
LEAP	Livelihood Empowerment against Poverty
MELR	Ministry of Employment and Labour Relations
MESW	Ministry of Employment and Social Welfare
MoE	Ministry of Employment
NAP	National Action Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NHIS	National Health Insurance Scheme
NPECLC	National Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour in Cocoa
NSCCL	National Steering Committee on Child Labour (Ghana)
NSC	National Steering Committee
OSH	Occupational Safety and Health

PIR	Project Implementation Review
SOSTECI	Système d’Observation et de Suivi du Travail des Enfants en Côte d’Ivoire
TOR	Terms of Reference
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
USDOL	US Department of Labour
WFCL	Worst Forms Of Child Labour

Executive summary

The Project “Combatting Child Labour in Cocoa Growing Communities in Ghana and Côte d’Ivoire (PPP)” is implemented under the FPRW-IPEC strategic programme on child labour (CL) in West Africa/ECOWAS region and in the context of the Declaration of Joint Action to Support Implementation of the Harkin-Engel Protocol.

Regarding the West Africa Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (FPRW)-International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) strategy the project is particularly aligned to the projects “ECOWAS I and II”, which ended in April 2014, and ‘Towards Child Labour Free Cocoa Growing Communities in Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana through an Integrated Area Based Approach’ (CCP) and the Project “Creating a protective Environment for Children in Cocoa Growing Communities in Soubré, Côte d’Ivoire”. These projects have been/are under a common management structure, aiming at the same development objective and working in some cases with the same stakeholders. The CCP and PPP mutually reinforce and leverage from this close coordination. Among key linkages are, work to strengthen the child labour Monitoring Systems (CLMSs) in both countries, strengthen NSCs and provide direct support to communities.

The PPP seeks to support Ghana’s and Côte d’Ivoire’s plans to eliminate child labour and to contribute to workforce continuity in cocoa growing farms by younger generations. The project is a partnership between the ILO and a number of companies in the chocolate and confectionery industry that have committed to contribute to the implementation of the 2010 Framework of Action to Support Implementation of the Harkin-Engel Protocol on child labour (CL) in cocoa.

The Development Objective of the project is “To accelerate progress in the elimination of child labour, with a focus on its worst forms, in cocoa growing communities in Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana”.

The evaluation was conducted between October 15 and November 21, 2014. The evaluators reviewed project documents, developed data collection instruments, and prepared for the fieldwork during the week of October 15. Also, interviews with ILO staff in Geneva and the donor were conducted during that week. Fieldwork was conducted in Ghana from 21 to 29 October and in Côte d’Ivoire from October 27 to November 5.

The evaluators interviewed representatives from the International Labour Organization (ILO), the cocoa industry; IPEC project management team and staff in Ghana and in Côte d’Ivoire; key stakeholders, community members and project beneficiaries in both countries; and utilized secondary data that refer to documentary evidence that has direct relevance for the purposes of the evaluation and that have been produced by the ILO, other individuals, or agencies for purposes other than those of the evaluation.

Findings and conclusions

Project design

There is consensus among stakeholders on the appropriateness of the project design and, from the primary and secondary data gathered, the evaluators conclude that the overall project design has proved to be highly appropriate in addressing child labour challenges in the cocoa sector within Ghana and Côte d’Ivoire.

Relevance

The PPP Project constitutes a significant contribution of the funding companies’ commitment to reduce the worst forms of child labour in the cocoa sector in Ghana and Côte d’Ivoire and is aligned with the national

policies, efforts and commitments in preventing and combating child labour. The ILO/IPEC strategy and the PPP project itself have proved relevant and effective, holding a strong potential for scalability that should be fostered in order to better contribute to achieve the objectives and targets defined by the Framework of Action; the *Roadmap for achieving the elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour by 2016*; the *ILO Global Action Plan on Child Labour*; and, more recently, by the *Brasilia Declaration of the III Global Conference on Child Labour*. Furthermore, scaling-up the CLMSs is crucial in order to have comprehensive data on child labour at the national level, to cover other sectors that could be affected by the worst forms of child labour (WFCL) and to accelerate elimination of all forms of child labour.

Effectiveness and efficiency

The PPP was executed with high degree of effectiveness, delivering most of the expected outputs, which greatly contributed to a high degree of effectiveness in reaching the project's immediate objectives.

The PPP project has proved effective in strengthening **Child Labour Monitoring Systems (CLMS)** in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire, by providing support to national, district and community level CLMS operations in both countries. ILO/IPEC contributed significantly to **strengthening coordination and institutional capacities, especially through support to the Ministries of Labour and the National Steering Committees (NSCs)**, and to reinforcing cooperation with other relevant stakeholders at the national and decentralized levels in both countries. This contributed to significant progress in national/district/local capacities to strengthen the technical and institutional environment in order to tackle child labour. **PPP direct interventions to prevent and eliminate child labour were also very effective.** In both Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire 2577 children were withdrawn or prevented from child labour. The project promoted increased awareness on child labour and education and was able to build consensus on the need to prevent and eliminate child labour and enrol and keep children at school.

Regarding the efficiency of the project, taking into consideration that the project has been carried out in two different countries, at national, district and local levels, the scope of activities executed (policy-level, direct intervention, institutional capacity building, support to CLMS, etc.), the quality of the outputs generated, the number of beneficiaries reached, and the project's role in supporting the CCP, the evaluators conclude that the relationship between the financial resources invested and the results obtained is satisfactory.

Gender issues

In its implementation, the project took into account the positions and roles of women in target cocoa-growing communities and their relation to child labour issues, and oriented these interventions towards their empowerment and benefit. Women were motivated to become active members of their communities and decision-making bodies and processes. The PPP project also assured equal access to direct services to all child beneficiaries, both boys and girls.

Major contributions towards impact

The evaluators consider that the project's results and achievements contributed to accelerate progress in the elimination of child labour, focusing on its worst forms, in cocoa growing communities in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana. Furthermore, the project has generated and has the potential to continue generating significant impacts related to national and district capacity building, local community development and withdrawal and prevention of children at work.

Sustainability

In general, the project has successfully provided a basis for future sustainability. However, the degree of the long-term continuation of the results obtained by the PPP project will depend mainly on national and district ownership and resource allocation (financial, technical and human). Given the current available national resources, and the fact that the structural, institutional and cultural change necessary for increased ownership requires a long period of time, the evaluators believe that further external support will be needed in the short-medium term.

Lessons learned

1. Key processes and results need an extended period of time to be developed and consolidated and therefore it is important to carefully outline the project's implementation procedures in order to better align them with the administrative and funding processes and take into account possible delays (which are more likely when working in tandem with other project timelines).
2. Child labour interventions are often conducted without coordination or cooperation between agents to support each other's actions and unite efforts. But in this sense, we have learned from ILO-IPEC's interventions in this sector that the best strategy for addressing child labour is an integrated approach.
3. When selecting beneficiaries in local communities we have learned that it is important to include all of the children in the community as well as their families (as direct or indirect beneficiaries). This avoids tensions within community members and increases support to project activities and instruments such as Community Action Plans (CAPs), Community Child Protection Committees (CCPCs) and other forms of involvement in the fight against child labour.
4. Addressing child labour with an integrated approach is a possible entry point for the industry to address some of the challenges that affect the cocoa supply chain, improve the cocoa sector and the living standards of the local communities. In this sense, IPEC could be a key partner for the industry, as it is uniquely qualified and experienced in the area of child labour.

Emerging good practices

1. The integrated approach proposed by ILO-IPEC, possible through the complementary actions of different initiatives that focus specifically on given aspects and are, at the same time, coordinated by a master-plan, and which focuses not only on the root causes of child labour but also puts emphasis on working at different levels of policy and institutional capacities and community mobilization, is definitely a good practice and should be promoted in the future.
2. Support to CAPs and CCPCs has been a very good practice. Through the CAPs, the PPP project encouraged empowerment of local populations that are now able to direct themselves to district and departmental authorities to gain their support in CAP implementation and provision of basic services. The CAPs have also managed to concert efforts among the local community members showing that child labour can be withdrawn and the energies and resources of the community can be directed towards supporting children and requiring limited financial resources to do so. In addition, CAP involvement has proved to be key for local ownership of project values and goals.
3. In stand-alone communities the project has benefitted all of the children and their families by providing school kits, birth certificates, health support, etc. Thus some of the challenges and confusion usually associated with selecting beneficiaries in other projects was absent. As mentioned in lessons learned, this proved to be positive for project development in the communities because it enhanced involvement and participation of community members and resulted in stronger support of project initiatives.

Recommendations

1. **Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders and donors:** A follow-up project would help guarantee the sustainability of the project's results and ensure that target communities remain child labour free in the long term and could also contribute to a broader child labour strategy for the cocoa sector.
2. **Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC and the cocoa companies:** It is essential to continue the ILO/IPEC and cocoa industry collaboration and to reinforce the role of ILO-IPEC, at national and decentralized levels (districts/departments), in the awareness-raising and mobilization of the industry.
3. **Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC and the cocoa companies:** ILO/IPEC could and should be a privileged partner of the industry in the conception, design and implementation of the Cocoa Action Plan.
4. **Addressed to: the ILO, national stakeholders and donors:** Awareness raising about the harmful effects and risks of child labour needs to be sustained until it forms part of the cultural DNA of the communities and in order to achieve a change in attitudes and practices that ensure that children remain out of work and in schools.
5. **Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders, and donors:** CAP development and implementation also requires prolonged support until CCPCs develop full implementation, management, and sustainability capacities of CAPs.
6. **Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders and donors:** Future initiatives should continue to work to strengthen the institutional capacities and roles of the CCPCs so that they can fulfil their roles and mandates and also reach a level of autonomy at which they can foster advocacy in favour of their communities. At the national level, continuous support to NSCs is essential in order to ensure they fully achieve their mandates so they can effectively coordinate stakeholders and implement National Action Plans (NAPs) in these countries.
7. **Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders and Industry:** ILO-IPEC's work with Industry partners could help identify new areas for advocacy to improve the cocoa sector. Government coordination should be enhanced. Enterprises at all levels must be clear about their commitment to respect for all fundamental rights at work and their readiness to engage with trade unions to promote decent work, including the elimination of child labour and the ILO can support them in that regard. Similarly, ILO-FPRW/IPEC should continue to support the capacity of trade unions to integrate child labour concerns fully into their policies and activities.
8. **Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders, donors and the Governments of Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire:** CLMSs should be extended nationwide. An operational and costs analysis, a resource mobilization strategy and strategic plan could be carried out. Efforts towards simplifying the data collection and analysis and linking with public data bases, social programmes and company monitoring systems must be fast tracked. CLMS implementation should become part of the core activities of District/Departments ensuring the availability of its staff.
9. **Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders and donors:** Enhanced livelihoods of farmers, Good Agricultural practices (GAP), Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) and local economic development initiatives should be supported.
10. **Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders and donors:** More efforts should be taken in order to guarantee access to school or educational services of children in or at risk of entering child labour. Improving educational infrastructures and equipment, access to water and sanitation, teacher training and capacities and school management systems is recommended. Catch-up or

literacy programmes, school support and back-up and relevant technical and vocational education and training (TVET) alternatives for adolescents are also important.

11. **Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders and donors:** Gender empowerment is another interesting aspect to focus on at community level since it is likely to improve livelihoods, decision-making and may even generate positive spill-overs for the cocoa sector.
12. **Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders and donors:** More flexibility in the administrative and financial procedures and a higher degree of autonomy for the ILO Country Offices is needed to help future initiatives to better adjust to the scheduled time-frame or be able to foresee these delays more accurately.

1. Project description and background

1.1 Background

1. The PPP project is implemented under the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (FPRW)-International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) strategic programme on child labour in West Africa/ECOWAS region and in the context of the Declaration of Joint Action to Support Implementation of the Harkin-Engel Protocol.
2. Regarding FPRW-IPEC West Africa strategy the project is particularly aligned to the projects “ECOWAS I and II”, which ended in April 2014, and ‘Towards Child Labour Free Cocoa Growing Communities in Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana through an Integrated Area Based Approach’ (CCP) to end in March 2015 and the Project “Creating a protective Environment for Children in Cocoa Growing Communities in Soubré, Côte d’Ivoire”, ending in August 2015. The five projects have been/are under a common management structure (with clear responsibilities specified by project), aiming at the same development objective and working in some cases with the same stakeholders. The common structure and alignment allow for cross-fertilization among projects and increase efficiency and effectiveness.
3. The PPP seeks to support Ghana’s and Côte d’Ivoire’s plans to eliminate child labour and to contribute to workforce continuity in cocoa growing farms by younger generations. The project is a partnership between the International Labour Organization (ILO) and a number of companies in the chocolate and confectionery industry that have committed to contribute to the implementation of the 2010 Framework of Action to Support Implementation of the Harkin-Engel Protocol on child labour in cocoa.

1.2 Project objectives

4. **The Development Objective** of the project is “To accelerate progress in the elimination of child labour, with a focus on its worst forms, in cocoa growing communities in Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana”.
5. The project has the following immediate objectives:
 - **I.O.1:** By the end of the project, Child Labour Monitoring System (CLMS) are strengthened and expanded.
 - **I.O.2:** By the end of the project, the capacity of governments, social partners, cocoa farming families and other stakeholders to participate in and support CLMS activity is strengthened.
 - **I.O.3:** By the end of the PPP, National Steering Committees (NSCs) lead improved coordination of efforts to combat child labour in cocoa growing.

1.3 Project strategy

6. The project strategy includes interventions at the macro, meso and micro levels. It focusses on three interrelated and mutually reinforcing areas: CLMS, capacity building and coordination. Immediate Objective 2 on capacity building supports Immediate Objective 1 on CLMS. The accomplishment of Immediate Objectives 1 and 2 can be further increased through Immediate Objective 3.
7. The project strategy was designed taking in consideration the implementation of a major FWPR-IPEC project in both countries, the CCP. The CCP and PPP were to mutually reinforce and leverage from this close coordination, keeping each project’s separate and distinct character.

Among key linkages were working in strengthening the CLMSs in both countries, strengthening NSCs and providing direct support to communities.

8. Furthermore the PPP strategy contains a distinctive character and focus, as one of its main aims is to accelerate progress, notably in the deepening and expansion of CLMS, as well as in strengthening district level capacity to support CLMS activities and associated service needs in cocoa growing communities. It sought to reinforce the effectiveness of action against child labour and its worst forms in cocoa growing communities across the two target countries by improving coordination among all relevant initiatives and agencies.
9. The Ghana Child Labour Monitoring System (GCLMS) and the *Système d'Observation du Travail des Enfants* (SOSTECI) in Côte d'Ivoire are child labour monitoring mechanisms within the framework of the National Action Plans (NAPs) aimed at combatting child labour by: regular direct observation to identify child labourers and children at risk of exposure to child labour; withdrawal of children from child labour; and the referral of these children to social welfare services to ensure that they have satisfactory and sustainable alternatives to child labour. The specific interventions in each of the two countries will be discussed in the Effectiveness section of this evaluation report.

2. Evaluation purpose and methodology

2.1 Evaluation purpose

10. The overall purpose of this final independent evaluation is to examine the effectiveness of achievement and the efficiency, relevance, gender issues, potential impact and sustainability of the project. The evaluation report includes findings on whether the project produced the desired outputs, and the extent to which it realized the proposed objectives. This evaluation also identified strengths and weaknesses in the project design, strategy and implementation as well as lessons learned and conclusions with recommendations for the ILO's consideration.
11. The specific purposes of the final evaluation are:
 - a. Determine project effectiveness at the national, district and community levels: achievement of Project objectives and to understand how and why they have/have not been achieved
 - b. Identify relevant unintended/unexpected results at outcome and impact levels
 - c. Establish the relevance of the project outcomes and the level of sustainability attained
 - d. Provide recommendations regarding relevant stakeholders, building on the achievements of the Project in supporting the NAPs at the national level toward the sustainability of the project outcomes and initial impacts
 - e. Provide recommendations on the partnership between the cocoa industry and ILO (i.e. for the cocoa industry and ILO as key stakeholders)
 - f. To identify emerging potential good practices for key stakeholders

2.2 Methodology

12. The evaluation used primarily qualitative data collection methods. Quantitative data were also obtained from project documents and reports, to the extent that they were available, and incorporated into the analysis. Data collection methods and stakeholder perspectives were triangulated where possible to increase the credibility and validity of the results. The interview process incorporated flexibility to allow for additional questions, ensuring that key information was obtained. A consistent protocol was followed during each interview.
13. **Evaluation Schedule.** The evaluation was conducted between October 15 and November 21, 2014. The evaluators reviewed project documents, developed data collection instruments, and prepared for the fieldwork during the week of October 15. Also, interviews with ILO staff in Geneva and the donor were conducted during that week. Fieldwork was conducted in Ghana from 21 to 29 October and in Côte d'Ivoire from October 27 to November 5. The complete schedule of evaluation activities appears in Annex B. The final report was written in March 2015 once the evaluators received the key stakeholders' comments to the draft report.
14. **Data Collection Methods.** Evaluation methods and techniques collected primary and secondary data. Primary data consisted of information the evaluators observed or collected directly from stakeholders about their first-hand experience with the interventions. This data was collected through, direct observation, meetings, focus group discussions, and interviews that involved direct contact with the respondents. The interviews facilitated a deeper understanding of the project and the project's results and helped the evaluators observe changes and identify factors that contributed to change. Collection of data through interviews or focus groups was carried out in a confidential manner.

15. Secondary data refers to documentary evidence that has direct relevance for the purposes of the evaluation and that have been produced by the ILO, other individuals, or agencies for purposes other than those of the evaluation. Evaluation methods and techniques included the following:
16. **Document Review.** Key documents included the project document; technical reports; Mid-Term Review report; projects/countries baselines and research data and reports; etc. See Annex C for a detailed list of documents reviewed.
17. **Interviews.** The evaluators conducted interviews with the various key stakeholders. See Annex D for a detailed list of stakeholders that were interviewed.
18. The evaluators used a variety of interview formats, which are summarized below.
 - **Semi-structured interviews.** This format was used to gather information about the role played by the different actors involved in the design, implementation, and management of the programme, as well as their opinions.
 - **Focus groups.** The focus group interviews mainly served to collect qualitative data on the development of the project's cycle in its different phases, their effects, and their relevance. Focus group interviews were also useful to investigate the rest of the criteria considered in the evaluation.
 - **Focused interviews.** When necessary, the evaluators carried out additional focused interviews to deepen those aspects that required further investigation. Some of these interviews were conducted after the fieldwork phase using Skype and e-mail.
19. **Field Visits.** The PPP works in a total of 19 communities across Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire. Thirteen of these are shared with the CCP project and six are specific to the PPP (2 in Ghana and 4 in Côte d'Ivoire). The evaluation team (ET), which during the recent Final Evaluation of the CCP Project visited several "CCP communities" now focused on the 6 "stand-alone PPP Communities". The evaluation Team Leader and the Ghanaian National Consultant undertook field visits to 1 District and 2 communities in Ghana, and the Ivoirian National Consultant visited 2 districts and 4 communities in Côte d'Ivoire. Actual communities visited are included in the evaluation schedule in Annex B.
20. **National Evaluation Workshops.** The fieldwork in both countries culminated in National Evaluation Workshops with key stakeholders to gather further data, to present the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations and to obtain feedback
21. **ILO-IPEC Debriefings.** The evaluators conducted debriefing meetings with ILO project staff in Accra and Abidjan to present and discuss initial findings.

Limitations. Overall, findings have been based on information collected from background documents and in interviews with stakeholders and project staff. The accuracy of the evaluation findings are determined by the integrity of information provided to the evaluators from these sources and the ability of the evaluators to triangulate this information. The amount of information to be reviewed and analysed was vast. The considerable quantity of documentation, some of which was received after the field mission, represented a challenge to the team. The project monitoring plan was not available so the team had to rely on the (scattered) data included in the technical progress reports (TPRs) to assess the quantitative results at the outcome and output levels. Also, an extension to the project was approved (until March 2015) when the evaluators were finishing drafting this report, so more completed results could not be assessed given that the project continued its implementation.

3. Findings

22. The following findings are based on the review of key project documents and reports and interviews conducted during the fieldwork phase. The findings address the key questions listed in the Terms of Reference (TOR) and are presented according to the following evaluation categories: project design, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, gender issues, potential impact and sustainability.

3.1 *Project design*

23. In this section, the evaluation assesses the extent to which the project design was appropriate to achieve the expected outputs and objectives, addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the project identification, the validity of the project design, the internal logic and coherence, and the external logic.

3.1.1 *Project identification*

24. The PPP project is the result of a partnership between ILO/IPEC and companies in the cocoa and confectionery industry to respond to the commitments made by the companies outlined in the “Framework of Action”, which aimed towards a significant reduction in the worst forms of child labour in cocoa producing areas of Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana. Although the project has its own specific nature and value, it was also conceived to support ongoing projects in the region (ECOWAS I & II and CCP) and to strengthen the ILO-IPEC integrated response to child labour problems in these countries.
25. At the project’s inception phase, there was continuous interaction between ILO-IPEC and the representatives of the Global Issues Group in the Chocolate and Cocoa Industry (GIG) to better negotiate and define the joint action that was to be carried out by the PPP project, as well as to adjust the project strategy to the national contexts and the existing ILO-IPEC initiatives. In order to inform the development of these arrangements for the Public-Private Partnership, ILO-IPEC conducted in depth consultations in Ghana and at ILO Headquarters (HQ). Drafts of the project document were discussed with the GIG and in July 2011 a strategic planning workshop was held in Accra Ghana to validate the project design, identify key partners and relevant initiatives, and mobilize support for the project’s implementation among ILO constituents and other stakeholders. In July 2011, the project document was finalized and in August 2011 with an improved political and security situation, a strategic planning workshop was held in Côte d’Ivoire, in which ILO constituents and other stakeholders validated the strategy and contributed to operational planning.

3.1.2 *The validity of the project design*

26. The project was designed to contribute to an integrated approach to the elimination of child labour in cocoa growing communities. It was also conceived as a pilot project in the hope of future up scaling if the results and outputs were adequate.
27. The evaluation process has identified that the project document does not specifically contain a diagnostic assessment (problem-objectives-alternatives analysis) that accurately reflects the causes behind the problems it wishes to address. However, the PPP project relies on ILO-IPEC’s prior experience and the in-depth assessment carried out previously by the CCP project. The PPP project strategy, therefore, further supports the actions undertaken by the CCP and ECOWAS I & II projects.
28. All relevant stakeholders that were consulted on this matter reflected the existing consensus on the appropriateness of the project design, and confirmed its importance in addressing fundamental root causes of child labour in the cocoa sector.

29. Taking all of this into consideration, the evaluators find that the overall project design has proved to be highly relevant in addressing child labour challenges within Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire.

3.1.3 Internal logic and coherence

30. As was mentioned before, the project design leans on and profits from a thorough problem and objectives analysis and on a sound Theory of Change, which was developed by the CCP project. Overall, the evaluators found the internal logic of the PPP project to be solid, and that the project's objectives, outputs and activities are strongly linked. (The original logical framework can be found in the annexed Terms of Reference – Annex A)

31. The evaluators found that the initial project design does not fully capture the real project development as it should: to adjust to the evolving national and local context; provide optimal support to the integrated approach in which CCP, ECOWAS I & II also participate; and taking into account limited financial resources.

32. Immediate Objective 3 refers specifically to NSC support, although this was actually carried out by the ECOWAS Projects. Certain factors prevented the PPP from adequately contributing to support this objective; however efforts were concentrated on capacity building under objective 2. Furthermore, an important project component such as the prevention and withdrawal of children engaged in or at risk of entering child labour through sensitization, awareness-raising and school support, are not reflected in the original objectives and outputs. Also, outputs related to CLMSs support and developments are found in Immediate Objective 1 (which is specifically conceived for this purpose) and Immediate Objective 2 (which refers to capacity building).

33. In order to adapt the evaluation analysis to the actual project development, the evaluators propose a revised framework to better bring the logic, objectives and outputs into focus and articulate a more logical model for the evaluation.

Table 1: Revised PPP Framework (Immediate Objectives and Outputs)	
Immediate Objective 1	
By the end of the project, Child Labour Monitoring Systems are strengthened and expanded	
Outputs	
1.1.	Strengthened pilot CLMS implementation and support to CLMS operations in both countries
1.2.	Support to decentralized level CLMS operations in both countries
Immediate Objective 2	
By the end of the project, the capacity of governments, social partners, cocoa farming families and other pertinent stakeholders to combat child labour in cocoa growing communities, is strengthened	
Outputs	
2.1.	Strengthened institutional capacities and coordination of the NSC
2.2.	Strengthened institutional capacities and coordination of key stakeholders at the national and district level
2.3.	Support for the development and implementation of Community Action Plans (CAPs) in cocoa-growing communities
Immediate Objective 3	
By the end of the project, the capacities in cocoa growing communities to prevent and eliminate child labour are strengthened	

Outputs
3.1. Target communities are sensitized concerning children's work and education.
3.2. Provision of direct educational services to children engaged in child labour or at high risk of entering child labour

34. During the operational planning phase an Outcome Measurement Framework (OMF) was developed and approved by ILO-IPEC and relevant stakeholders. This framework included 4 impact indicators, 11 outcome indicators (immediate objectives), 14 outputs indicators and 19 process indicators. The project monitoring plan (PMP), however, presents a reduced number of indicators (13) which are aligned with the Immediate Objectives. This does facilitate a systematic and empirical assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives, but at the same time, and in consequence, the evaluation of output achievement and potential impact has to be based on an analysis of secondary sources and qualitative information.
35. As was mentioned before, the PPP project relies on the theory of change (ToC) and assumptions of the CCP project. The final independent evaluation of said project pointed out that “the assumptions identified (by the CCP’s ToC) are too generic (...). Assumptions are important events, conditions or decisions necessary for sustaining objectives in the long run. The probability and significance of external conditions being met should have been estimated as some could have been critical to project success.” In fact, as it is mentioned in the body of this report, and more specifically in the sustainability section, some external factors (i.e. government ownership, institutional capacities at decentralized level, financial resources available...) may prove to be key for the continuation of the project’s achievements.
36. This is even more so if we consider that the project’s implementation period was shorter than intended and that time is an essential factor in order to enhance ownership and institutional capacities and find ways to mobilize necessary resources and support.

3.1.4 External coherence

37. The project design fits within national NAPs as well as the Harkin-Engel Framework; and complements existing ILO-IPEC and other organizations’ initiatives to combat child labour and to advance towards child-labour free cocoa-growing communities.
38. At the global level, the “Framework of Action” which arose from the Harkin-Engel Protocol proposes five main objectives to combat child labour in the cocoa sector: (a) Provision of education and vocational training services to children as a means to remove children from, or prevent them from entering, the worst forms of child labour (WFCL); (b) Application of protective measures to remove workplace hazards from cocoa farming to allow children of legal working age to work under safe conditions; (c) Promotion of livelihood services for the households of children working in the cocoa sector; (d) Establishment and implementation of a sector-wide child labour monitoring system (CLMS); and (e) Conducting of nationally representative child labour surveys at least every 5 years. The PPP project, which sought to assist the GIG member companies to fulfil their commitments within this framework, specifically contributes to achieve objectives a, b and d.
39. At the national level, various actors as the cocoa industry -enterprises, cooperatives and trade unions-, International Organizations and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) promote or carry out activities to combat child labour and/or to support the cocoa sector, such as improved agriculture practices and cocoa-tree renewal, support to cooperatives, livelihood activities, and support for education. Nevertheless, often these initiatives offer partial solutions since they address only certain aspects of the child labour problem.

40. The ILO-IPEC's integrated approach to child labour addresses its root causes in an all-encompassing way and therefore offers a solid long-term strategy. This is possible because IPEC can mobilize and get support from ILO's global, regional and national technical resources, infrastructures and partnerships and because its constituents include the key economic actors.
41. In this regard, the PPP project forms part of, together with ECOWAS I & II and the CCP project, ILO-IPEC's integrated approach and contributes to further advance the achievements of these initiatives.

Table 2: Identified Root Causes of Child Labour in the cocoa sector*

Root Causes of Child Labour	ILO/IPEC Projects		
	ECOWAS I&II	CCP	PPP
Lack of community awareness on the negative effects of child labour	•	•	•
Limited access of children to education	•	•	•
Poverty	•	•	--
Reduced social surveillance of child labour issues	--	•	•
Insufficient technical, operational and institutional capacity of ILO social partners and other local institutions to address CL issues	•	•	--

* Causes of CL as defined by the CCP's Theory of Change.

3.2 **Relevance**

42. This section analyses the project's consistency with the needs of key stakeholders and beneficiaries; the appropriateness of the sectors/target groups and locations chosen to develop the project based on the findings of baseline surveys; the current PPP relevance; and the validity of the project approach and strategies as well as its potential to be scaled-up and replicated.

3.2.1 *In relation to the Industry's commitments to eradicate the worst forms of child labour in the cocoa sector*

43. The majority of working children in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire are found in agriculture, an important share of them in the cocoa sector, where they usually work on family farms and perform some tasks that include hazardous activities, such as carrying heavy loads, the use of machetes, and pesticides, and which are in contravention of international Conventions and standards².
44. Since 2001, efforts to combat the worst forms of child labour (WFCL) in cocoa production have been supported by major stakeholders, including the international cocoa industry through the Harkin-Engel Protocol. Furthermore, on September 2010, the governments of Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire, the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) and the International Cocoa Industry signed a Declaration of Joint Action to Support Implementation of the Harkin-Engel Protocol, which provides for a Framework of Action to coordinate measures to help achieve the goals of Protocol and to accelerate the reduction of the WFCL in the production of cocoa, specifically, by 70 per cent in aggregate by 2020.
45. In this sense, the PPP is fully relevant; the project was conceived to contribute to the industry's commitments to the 2010 Framework of Action and represents a significant part of the industry's commitment to reduce the worst forms of child labour in the cocoa sector.

² Global Report "Accelerating action against child labour". IPEC 2010

3.2.2 *In relation with the national policies, efforts and commitments in preventing and combating child labour*

46. At the national level, through the National Plans of Action (NPAs) to combat child labour, the governments of Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana are engaged in preventing and combating child labour in cocoa production and in establishing Child Labour Monitoring Systems in both countries. Also, the governments of Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana were represented at the Global Child Labour Conference 2010, which adopted a *Roadmap for achieving the elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour by 2016*. The Roadmap highlights the importance of addressing child labour in agriculture (including in cocoa production) and was integrated into the ILO's Global Action Plan on Child Labour.
47. The PPP project is aligned with the national efforts to deploy the NAPs and to implement the Roadmap in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana in collaboration and complementing other ILO-IPEC initiatives aimed at strengthening national and local capacities; promoting institutional coordination; effective policy development and implementation; the provision of key services to children (including access to education) and communities; and the development of a broader reach of effective child labour monitoring systems (CLMS).

3.2.3 *Project's consistency with the needs of key stakeholders and beneficiaries*

48. The project proved relevant in adequately addressing the needs of the beneficiaries, by increasing awareness of the need to eliminate child labour; increasing school enrolment and attendance; and in supporting communities in developing and implementing their own child labour committees and action plans. The vast majority of the beneficiaries (parents and children) and community representatives interviewed by the evaluators expressed their satisfaction with the PPP. In the same way, the best part of the national and district/department partners questioned during the evaluation emphasized the relevance of the PPP Project.

3.2.4 *Current PPP relevance*

49. The project remained highly relevant during its implementation and, though the situation in target communities and at the institutional level has improved, there is still room to continue improving the situation. Thus, further developments will continue to be relevant after its completion. The vast majority of national and local partners, community members and beneficiaries that were interviewed during the evaluation strongly requested further technical (and financial) support to consolidate the achievements reached so far.

3.2.5 *Validity of the project approach and strategies, and its potential to be scaled-up and replicated.*

50. The evaluators consider, and this has been confirmed by a great number of the interviewed stakeholders, that the ILO/IPEC approach to tackle child labour in the cocoa sector is highly relevant and effective. Through complementarities among the different projects and interventions, this approach addresses in an integrated way its root causes (lack of awareness, poverty, constraints on education, insufficient institutional capacities, lack of comprehensive and reliable data...)
51. The evaluators have also found that in the past years, ILO/IPEC contributed to building a more favourable enabling environment (institutional capacities and support to the project, awareness rising, community mobilization, legitimacy of the IA among communities and authorities...) in both Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire.
52. The ILO/IPEC strategy and the PPP project itself have proved relevant and effective, holding a strong potential for scalability. Almost unanimously, all the stakeholders requested further

support from the project and to upscale it in order to increase the number of beneficiaries. Additionally, the evaluators think that up scaling the project could greatly contribute to attain the objectives and targets of the Harkin-Engel Protocol and its Framework of Action; as well as to meet the aspirations of the *Roadmap for achieving the elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour by 2016*; the *ILO Global Action Plan on Child Labour*; and, more recently, by the *Brasilia Declaration of the III Global Conference on Child Labour*. Furthermore, scaling-up the CLMSs is crucial in order to have comprehensive data on child labour at the national level, to cover other sectors that could be affected by the WFCL and to accelerate elimination of all forms of child labour.

3.3 *Effectiveness and efficiency*

53. This section examines the project's overall progress to date, as well as the effectiveness of project implementation (overall achievement of Immediate Objectives and Project Outputs). Additionally, the final sub-section examines whether, in general, the results obtained justify the costs incurred.

3.3.1 *Overall project progress and challenges in implementation*

54. After preparatory work the project document was finalized by August 2011 but certain factors postponed the kick-off of the project. The recruitment of an International Programme Officer (IPO) and a National Officer (NO) for Côte d'Ivoire was delayed; they finally took up their posts at the beginning of January 2012. A main reason for joint action with the CCP was to increase the efficiency of the projects. The PPP was caught up in delays related to CCP procedures, which were unforeseen and beyond PPP's control: There was a delay in initiating and administering baseline surveys (conducted jointly with CCP) for both countries. In Ghana, it took eight months (August 2012-March 2013) for the National Steering Committee on Child Labour (NSCCL) to resolve differences with the National Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour in Cocoa (NPECLC) over the beneficiary selection method which resulted in a late start-up of the provision of services by CCP. Additionally, between March 2013 and October 2013, NPECLC was not operational due to government financial reasons. In Côte d'Ivoire, the start of the project's execution was conditioned by the socio-political and military crisis in the country. Thus, the PPP Project became operational in the beginning of 2012, and started delivering direct services to children in June 2013.

55. *Despite the short period of implementation (especially at the community level), the evaluators, based on quantitative evidence as well as qualitative information gathered among all key stakeholders found that the PPP was executed with high degree of effectiveness, delivering most of the expected outputs, which greatly contributed to a high degree of effectiveness in reaching the project's immediate objectives.*

3.3.2 *Achievement of the Specific Objectives and outputs*

56. This section examines the progress made in achieving the Specific Objectives by comparing the actual and targeted outcomes as defined by the project's indicators and also by verifying if the expected outputs were produced and if they contributed to accomplishing the specific objective.

Immediate Objective 1: By the end of the project, Child Labour Monitoring Systems are strengthened and expanded

57. At the inception of the PPP project, CLMSs faced many challenges, both in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire, that delayed its operations, slowed-down its pace and prevented its full implementation. Also, baseline data showed that none of target communities had a CLMS in place, nor a referral system or related services.

58. *The PPP project has proved effective in strengthening Child labour Monitoring Systems (CLMS) in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire, by providing support to national, district and community level CLMS operations in both countries. In Ghana the project supported piloting and roll-out of CLMS in target communities and districts, and contributed to expanding the reach of GCLMS from 5 to 12 Districts; in Côte d'Ivoire the project contributed to launching SOSTECI and to its implementation in 5 Departments and 19 communities.*
59. Overall the level of achievement of the targets defined by the indicators is satisfactory, and in some cases the results attained largely exceeded the targets set, as is shown in the following table.

Table 3: Indicators and achievements for Immediate Objective 1				
Indicators	Baseline	Target End of Project	Actuals (Sept. 2014)	% of achievement
1.1. Refined CLMS models available and implemented	0	Refined CLMS model	Support to review/pilot/adjustment of model	85%
1.2. Number of national level officials including from anti-trafficking agencies provided with enhanced knowledge of child labour issues, CLMS and its application	0	230	311	132%
1.3. Number of district level officials provided with enhanced knowledge of child labour issues, CLMS and its application	0	60	103	171%
1.4. District authorities develop and implement a resource mobilization strategy in support of CLMS	0	Resource mobilization strategy developed and implemented for the selected district	Resource mobilization strategy developed	50%

Source: ILO/IPEC

60. The IPEC team declared that indicator 1.1 will hopefully be 100% achieved after the independent review of GCLMS and SOSTECI is finalized and submitted to government. The actual number of national and district level officials trained in CLMS is higher than expected. The project supported the development of district resource mobilization strategies although, in terms of its implementation, it is not clear how active the district authorities have been.
61. The CLMSs implemented in both Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire proved to be effective mechanisms to detect and monitor and work against child labour in cocoa-growing communities. However, while the PPP supported the refinement of the model and the spread of the CLMS implementation, further advancements will depend on governments' ownership, availability of funds and willingness to scale-up the systems.

Output 1.1. Strengthened pilot CLMS implementation and support to CLMS operations in both countries

62. **In Ghana**, the project provided technical support to the implementation of the 2012 GCLMS pilot in 5 districts and 30 communities. Also the PPP Project contributed technically and financially to

the finalization of the GCLMS pilot report and the organization of a partners' forum to share the results of such pilot review.

63. The GCLMS Pilot was implemented in 5 districts. However, ILO, through the PPP and CCP projects provided technical and logistical support to strengthen and develop the GCLMS structures, processes, tools and operations that resulted in increasing the number to 12. The project's efforts and contributions had a catalytic role in rolling out the GCLMS, its contribution being key for the effective application of the 3 tools. For the first time, a full cycle of GCLMS is about to be completed in PPP/CCP project communities.
64. In **Côte d'Ivoire**, the PPP jointly with CCP and ECOWAS projects contributed to review SOSTECI's tools (manuals, data collection tools) and processes. Structures and mechanisms were established at the national level as well as in 5 Departments and 19 communities and the governance framework of the *Comité Inter-Ministériel* (CIM), *Comité National de Surveillance* (CNS), and the Central Coordinating Unit, was trained and equipped.
65. The SOSTECI Pilot was launched at a national level with local pilots (5 departments and 19 communities). After the pre-testing of the tools, SOSTECI's implementation is ongoing, with data collection starting in April 2014. All PPP beneficiary children in the target communities are taken into account by the SOSTECI. Also, the SOSTECI database was officially adopted by the Government and the First Lady's office on 25 March 2014.
66. Furthermore, in order to assess the administrative, technical, schedule and financial aspects of CLMS's implementation and to produce recommendations and to contribute to strengthen their sustainability and scalability, the PPP and CPP project initiated a review to assess these aspects in the selected project communities in both countries.
67. PPP support to CLMS in both Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire proved to be effective and contributed to the refinement of the model and the spread of the implementation of CLMS. However without full Government ownership, further external support and effective integration with existing databases and mechanisms that support child protection and rights, it is difficult to tell if the systems could be scaled-up and operational at the national level in the two countries.

Output 1.2. Support to decentralized level CLMS operations in both countries

68. Baseline data showed that the number of districts and communities registering children in child labour or undertaking any activities aimed at the welfare of children was negligible. Promoted by the project, a CLMS implementation plan was developed for the PPP target districts/departments in both countries; and a resource mobilization strategy to support the CLMS at the District level was developed also.
69. In **Ghana**, at the decentralised level, District Child Protection Committees (DCPC) and Community Child Protection Committees (CCPCs) were trained on child labour and on the GCLMS framework, tools questionnaires and database and were provided with equipment. In terms of the GCLMS roll-out, the data entry concerning the GCLMS tool 1 was completed; and all the children in PPP communities had been covered by tool 2 and data had been inputted into the system. In the first week of October 2014, NPECLC provided training to PPP community data collectors on tool no. 3. According to ILO/IPEC it is expected that by end November 2014, tool 3 will be fully applied and that the full cycle of GCLMS will be completed.
70. In **Côte d'Ivoire**, the PPP supported the establishment of department and local committees. These committees were trained in SOSTECI's implementation, data-collection, data storage and processing, and provided with equipment (computers, motorcycles). At the department and community level, data collection and data entry are underway in all the targeted communities of

the 5 Departments. However, challenges in coordination between the CIM and the CNS had some effect in delaying the SOSTECI's implementation.

71. In this sense, there is no doubt that the PPP was effective in supporting CLMS operations at the decentralized level. However, at the level of the communities, there are no indications that data collectors will continue their work once the project reaches its end. The same can be said regarding data entry clerks at the district level. Also, the local and district/department committees have not fully integrated CLMS as part of their core mandate. Furthermore, the Districts/Departments face serious budget and staff limitations and it is not clear whether they will be capable of supporting the CLMSs.

Immediate objective 2: By the end of the project, the capacity of governments, social partners, cocoa farming families and other pertinent stakeholders to combat child labour in cocoa growing communities, is strengthened

72. ILO/IPEC largely contributed to strengthen coordination and institutional capacities, especially through support to the Ministries of Labour and the NSCs, and to reinforce cooperation with other relevant Ministries such as education, agriculture and children's affairs, local governments, ILO constituents including the social partners at the national and decentralized levels in both countries. This contributed to significant progress in national/district/local capacities to strengthen the technical and institutional environment in order to tackle child labour. Additionally, Community Action Plans (CAPs) in target communities have been developed and implemented with a high degree of effectiveness.

73. Looking at the indicators, the percentage of achievement of the targets varies from 80-100%. The ILO/IPEC provided technical support to the NSCs, and the PPP trained hundreds of stakeholders on child labour related issues and developed the 6 CAPs intended, which are being developed (all child labour activities being already finished).

Indicators	Target End of Project	Actuals (Sept. 2014)	% of achievement
2.1. Coordination tools and mechanisms created and put in place to facilitate coordination by NSC	Coordination mechanism and tools in place	Technical support provided	80%
2.2. NSCs develop and implement resource mobilisation strategies to fund action against child labour	Resource mobilization strategy developed and implemented	Technical support provided.	80%
2.3. Number of national and decentralized level stakeholders provided with enhanced knowledge of child labour issues	--	At least 500*	100%
2.4. Target communities with CAPs with a focus on child labour	6	6	100%
2.5. Target communities that effectively implement their CAP with a focus on child labour	CAPs are implemented	CAPs are being implemented	85% All child labour activities have been implemented

Source: ILO/IPEC. *Estimated.

74. Despite the good results achieved, the institutional capacities of the NSC and key stakeholders are not yet fully developed and improved coordination among key stakeholders (including the industry) is still in progress and needs to be strengthened. Also, at the community and district level, the potential for building capacity for CAP implementation, resource mobilization and subsequent updating of CAPs has not yet been fully achieved.

Output 2.1. Strengthened institutional capacities and coordination of the NSC

75. The PPP funded project, jointly with the other ILO-IPEC projects in both countries, conducted an assessment review of the needs for capacity support among NSC members and institutions. However, the absorptive capacities of the Child Labour Unit (CLU) of in Ghana, the social conflict in Côte d'Ivoire and the subsequent institutional transitions, along with PPP's limited resources prevented much progress to date on this issue in either country.
76. **In Ghana** the PPP project is still in discussions with the CLU and the NSC concerning the nature of the project's further support to on-going coordination and capacity building efforts. **In Côte d'Ivoire** a workshop to strengthen the capacities of the members of the Inter-ministerial Committee (CIM) and the National Supervisory Committee (CNS) on SOSTECI was organized by the PPP project. Also a proposal for a better coordination of actions against child labour was made by IPEC and training was provided to some members of the CIM on resource mobilization, advocacy and coordination.
77. In the last years, ILO-IPEC proved effective in supporting the NSCs. However, ownership by ministry offices and agencies; financial allocations; and coordination and decision making authority are not yet fully in place to ensure that NSCs are completely functional and operative *to plan, coordinate and deliver according to their mandates*.

Output 2.2. Strengthened institutional capacities and coordination of key stakeholders at the national and district level

78. Whilst the ECOWAS I and II projects provided greater support to the NSCs, PPP efforts were geared towards capacity building among certain key stakeholders and project partners such as labour inspectors, law enforcement agencies and education services, etc.; and in strengthening dialogue and coordination with the companies.
79. **In Ghana**, ILO-IPEC and the General and Agricultural Workers' Union (GAWU) produced the occupational safety and health (OSH) manual "Eliminating hazardous child labour and occupational safety and health & environmental risks – a manual for agents of change in Ghana". Awareness raising materials, in the form of posters were developed and distributed in the communities out of the information and imagery contained in the manual. Also, the PPP and CCP projects jointly collaborated with the Ghana Education Services (GES) in the adaptation of Complementary Basic Education (CBE) materials to incorporate child labour concerns and to adapt to cocoa communities and local languages, as well as to roll out the Certificate of Basic Education (CBE) by education sector partners into cocoa areas of Ghana.
80. **In Côte d'Ivoire** the project, organized several workshops to train: labour inspectors; police and gendarmerie commanders; Regional Directors of Education (DREN); regional and local councillor and mayors; and Primary School Inspectors (IEP) on child labour issues and key concepts, including aspects regarding the normative framework regulating the fight against child labour, the consequences of child labour, the referral of children to existing relevant social protection services, etc.
81. Also, and this is a very specific feature of the PPP, in both counties ILO/IPEC started contacts and exchanges with donor representatives where they addressed coordination issues; reviewed the progress of GCLMS in the country; and, especially, provided a platform of dialogue between

private and public actors on child labour in the cocoa sector. However, despite the efforts deployed by the project staff, effective collaboration with donor companies was still not in place when the evaluation was conducted, and there is still now room to engage with them, in order to strengthen their capacity to establish a stronger rights-based approach to their development efforts in cocoa growing communities.

82. At the district/department level, the Project promoted coordination and synergies among all key stakeholders that support children and contributed to the different project components: awareness raising, capacity building, CAPs, direct services to children. The PPP project also improved the technical capacities of district and community partners.
83. Even considering the project efforts and the results achieved, the institutional capacities need to be strengthened to improve the effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of efforts towards eliminating CL. Also, the ILO/IPEC-Industry institutional coordination is still at its early stages and should be further reinforced.

Output 2.3. Support for the development and implementation of Community Action Plans (CAPs) in cocoa-growing communities

84. Baseline data showed that there was no evidence of "documented" Community Action Plans in the target communities either in Ghana or in Côte d'Ivoire. Also, there were almost no communities which had child protection committees or community rules and regulations regarding child labour. The project has shown a high degree of effectiveness regarding Community Action Plans (CAPs) development and implementation. The targets have been achieved, and in all, 6 CAPs have been developed (2 in Ghana and 4 in Côte d'Ivoire) and are being implemented in target communities.
85. **In Ghana**, District Child Protection Committees were formally inaugurated and commissioned by the District Chief Executive, and DCPC members of the PPP/CCP district (Twifo Hemang Lower Denkyra) were trained on CL and GCLMS. The project also provided training on resource mobilization to CCPCs and District Officials and advocated for the extension of social services to target communities. CAPs were presented to the District Assemblies and incorporated into their District Medium-term Development Plans (DMTDPs) 2014-2017.
86. **In Côte d'Ivoire**, the Community Child Protection Committees (CCPCs) were officially installed by decrees signed by the Prefects and Sous-Prefects. And the project advocated with communities to mobilize support from local authorities and other partners such as mayors and regional councils. Key partners have exhibited a high interest in addressing child labour issues as well as supporting Project implementation. Commitments were made by municipalities to support CAPs and to include them in their general development plans.
87. The project has proved very effective in building capacity at the community and district level and in mobilizing efforts to support CAP implementation. Nevertheless, CCPCs still demand support to consolidate so they can be able to manage effectively, update and fund their CAPs and reinforce their advocacy capabilities.

Immediate Objective 3. By the end of the project, the capacities in cocoa growing communities to prevent and eliminate child labour are strengthened

88. The project promoted increased awareness of child labour, and education and has been able to build consensus on the need to prevent and eliminate child labour and to enrol and keep children at school.
89. Baseline studies showed a lack of understanding or knowledge among community members of child labour concepts and relevant laws and Conventions on child labour. According to the indicators

defined, the project has been very effective in disseminating knowledge creating awareness on child labour. In all, the number of households reached amounts to 2,103 -almost 60% higher than planned-.

90. Regarding the number of children withdrawn and prevented from child labour, the project has so far (until September 2014) reached 2,577 children out of the 3000 targeted. According to the PPP management, the remaining 426 children will be monitored and/or provided with direct services before the end of 2014.

Table 5: Indicators and achievements for Immediate Objective 3			
Indicators	Target End of project	Actuals (Sept. 2014)	% of achievement
3.1. Number of children engaged in or at risk of entering child labour (including WFCL) withdrawn and prevented from child labour through referral by CLMS or support by the reserve fund.	3000	2577	86%
3.2. Number of households provided with enhanced knowledge on hazardous work of children	200	340	170%
3.3. Number of households benefiting from awareness raising campaigns, capacity building and other services as determined through the CAPs and CLMS process, which contribute to the withdrawal and prevention of children from child labour.	1200	1763	147%

Source: ILO/IPEC

91. The project proved very effective in sensitizing communities concerning child labour and education. However, attitude and behavioural changes take time to be fully consolidated as they are affected by cultural patterns and practices that have been present for many generations. Also, the project's success in increasing school enrolment underlines the urgent need to continue to improve and expand the existing educational infrastructures and equipment.

Output 3.1: Target communities are sensitized concerning children's work and education.

92. The project developed numerous sensitization and awareness raising activities on child labour among CCPC members, teachers, parents and children. The evaluators could, through the field visits conducted, confirm that all parties interviewed (community members, parents, children, teachers, village chiefs and authorities) are now more aware of child labour issues and hazards and are actively engaged, along with the families and children, to end child labour and keep children in school.

Output 3.2: Provision of direct educational services to children engaged in child labour or at high risk of entering child labour

93. Baseline studies could not find any evidence of children engaged in child labour or at high risk of entering child labour being provided with education. Also, according to these studies, although the majority of the communities had schools, these were old, precarious and were lacking educational materials.
94. In both Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire, 2577 working children or children at risk of entering child labour received education support and materials and where withdrawn or prevented from child labour. Schools were supported with educational materials (books, desks, etc.) and also through CAPs improved their infrastructure (construction or renovation of classrooms, teacher quarters', nurseries, school canteens, etc.)

95. Additionally, the project provided the families and children with other complementary direct services: in Ghana, 200 households were trained in occupational safety and health (OSH) practices in cocoa and palm oil; 168 community members (young and adult farmers) have been trained in soap making; and 677 children were registered into the National Health Insurance Scheme (NHIS) for coverage by basic healthcare services. In Côte d'Ivoire, support was provided to 750 children to obtain their birth certificates and 50 children received literacy support.

3.3.6 Efficiency

96. The ToR asks the evaluators to examine if, in general, the results obtained justify the costs incurred by the project. In order to assess the efficiency of the project, the evaluators focused on the amount and percentage of resources allocated to the project's direct intervention with beneficiaries. This evaluation also considered the perception of ILO/IPEC staff and other stakeholders regarding project efficiency.

97. According to the data provided by ILO/IPEC, overall, the project had a designated budget of USD 2,062,883. So far, the delivery rate amounts to an 85.99% of this initial allocation. A total of USD 100,000 was used for the preparatory costs of the project at ILO Headquarters level. Of the remaining USD 1,962,883 a 96.60% has been effectively committed to different project activities and USD 1,687,932 have been spent on these activities to date, adding up to the 85.99% mentioned above. This is consistent with the technical progress of PPP project interventions.

98. Of the total amount spent to date, USD 495,841 have been spent on direct intervention with beneficiaries. This represents 89.27% of the total amount allocated to this purpose in the initial budget, and 89.94% of the amount effectively committed so far. Based on this information, and taking into account the total number of children assisted, we can make an estimation that the cost of direct intervention of this project per child was under USD 200³.

99. The efficiency of the PPP project has largely benefitted from coordination with other IPEC projects, such as ECOWAS and CCP, as well as ILO structures and technical resources at the global, regional and national levels. This has reduced certain costs of the project allowing for a more efficient delivery of results. As was expressed by most of the project partners and stakeholders, the project's ability to create synergies with other partners made it possible to maximize project resources.

100. During the fieldwork, the evaluators collected opinions of ILO managers, national partners, and other stakeholders regarding the projects' use of resources. The responses confirmed that the project was indeed considered efficient in this regard.

101. If we take into consideration that the project has been carried out in two different countries, at national, district and local levels, the scope of activities executed (policy-level, direct intervention, institutional capacity building, support to CLMS, etc.), the quality of the outputs generated, the number of beneficiaries reached, and the project's role in supporting the CCP, the evaluators conclude that the relationship between the financial resources invested and the results obtained is satisfactory.

³ We must consider that the PPP is a pilot project to develop this approach further, and as such the cost per child is likely to fluctuate when up scaling.

3.4 Gender issues

102. As specified by the ToRs, the evaluation analysed the project's gender dimension. Although the evaluators found that no specific "gender strategy" was included in the project document, they consider that the PPP took into account the socially determined relations between women and men; promoted an active participation of women in project activities; and strengthened their role in their communities and their participation in the decision making bodies.
103. The baseline studies carried out jointly with the CCP project provided relevant information regarding the constitution of families and community organization in cocoa growing areas. Different positions and interests of men and women regarding child labour were also identified and related to socio-economic factors. This set of data was taken into consideration to assess how project activities might affect women, and to orient these interventions towards their empowerment and benefit.
104. For this purpose, women were actively involved in CAP design through participatory approaches to ensure that their needs were included. Women were also motivated to become active members of their communities through the different capacity-building activities that were carried out, as well as to increase their representation in decision-making bodies and processes (mainly CCPCs). Furthermore, PPP assured equal access to direct services to all children beneficiaries, both boys and girls.

3.5 Major contributions towards impact

105. In this section we discuss the project's contributions to significant changes at impact and outcome levels. We take into consideration a variety of aspects focusing on positive changes and negative externalities, foreseen and unforeseen changes, as well as actual and potential contributions of the project.
106. *Overall, the evaluators consider that the project's results and achievements contributed to working towards its Development Objective, which is "To accelerate progress in the elimination of child labour, focusing on its worst forms, in cocoa growing communities in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana." Furthermore, the project has generated and has the potential to continue generating significant impacts related to national and district capacity building, local community development and withdrawal and prevention of children at work.*
 1. One of the most significant achievements of the project has been its ability to contribute to build consensus among stakeholders, from national to local levels, regarding the importance of preventing and eliminating child labour in cocoa-growing communities.

Awareness about the negative effects of child labour is much higher than at the beginning of the project as a result of the actions taken in local communities and with different authorities. Children and adults in cocoa-growing communities are able to distinguish between children's participation in work that does not affect their health and personal development or interfere with their schooling; and those who renounce to education in order to work and/or perform activities that reduce their welfare.
 2. Communities and authorities are now convinced of the need to eliminate child labour, especially in its worst forms, and are sensitized towards hazardous activities in child labour as well.
 3. The project in itself has not promoted the development of new policies but, nevertheless, it has provided platform (which, without the project would have been unlikely to have been established) for national stakeholders to reinforce and further develop their policies regarding child labour and work positively towards their enforcement.

A great result in this regard is that the PPP project has managed to help extend these child labour concerns into official development plans and strategies at different levels. The CAPs in Ghana have been integrated into medium term development plans in their districts. The National Development Strategy 2014-2017 also includes child labour issues in its current draft. In Côte d'Ivoire, CCPCs are advocating for the local (Mairies) and regional authorities (Prefectures) to mainstream the CAPS in the municipal and regional plans.

4. CLMSs could be very useful tools for tracking the impact of interventions to combat child labour and to define strategies to withdraw and prevent children from engaging in child labour. By generating reliable data they can contribute to the withdrawal of children from child labour as well as the enforcement of laws and regulations aimed at protecting children. Furthermore, the child labour monitoring systems have the potential to act as the basis of an effective and comprehensive, institutional response system at the local, district and national levels. Ultimately CLMSs could contribute to consolidate and mainstream child labour issues into governance
5. Education is crucial for fighting child labour as it constitutes the main alternative activity for children who work. The PPP project has had a great impact on increasing access for children to relevant educational services. In the period of time that the project was active, and across the two target countries, 2,577 children in or at high risk of entering child labour were given improved access to educational services and were prevented or withdrawn from work.
6. In Côte d'Ivoire the project supported 735 children to obtain birth certificates. Birth registration gives the child legal existence and is fundamental to the realisation of a number of rights and practical needs including access to basic social services at the appropriate age, including school enrolment or to enforcing laws relating to minimum age for employment, contributing to efforts to prevent/eliminate child labour. But registration also ensures that the country has an up-to-date and reliable database for planning. This is as useful for national level planning as it is for local government bodies that are responsible for maintaining education, health and other social services for the community.
7. The project was able to increase the collective spirit of community members. Due to the CAP process communal spirit was strengthened so that community members joined in collective efforts and communal labour to advance towards the enforcement of rules and regulations on children's school attendance and hazardous labour.
8. Sensitization activities, CAP implementation and direct support given to children by the PPP project resulted in increased school enrolment (some schools have shown an 80% increase⁴ since the beginning of the project) and performance (in Ghana, the Basic Education Certificate Examination -BECE- results moved from 0% to 93%, and students in Côte d'Ivoire increased substantially their success rate in passing to sixth grade, "6ème année"), which have the potential to improve the standard of living and education in cocoa growing areas.
9. Empowerment of local communities, which translates into increased political participation and, consequently, the ability to bring their concerns regarding child labour and community development to local /regional authorities is another most significant impact of the PPP project. CAPs and CCPCs have proved to be greatly helpful in this regard by allowing a broader scope of analysis of intervention in community organization and empowerment.
10. By working with the industry, the project has provided a basis for broader Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) actions. The existing commitment and concern regarding child labour could be enhanced by encouraging responsible actions and policies that better integrate decent work concerns and respect for FPRW into value chain and enterprise management practices to ensure sustainable economic performance and an accelerated promotion of "child labour free cocoa communities".

⁴ According to school records and headmasters' estimations.

3.6 Sustainability

107. The evaluation process examined the likelihood of project interventions to generate continued benefits after its completion, in other words, the long-term benefits and impact of the PPP project. In this regard, the following general criteria were considered: ownership of project purposes and goals; institutional capacities; national policies; and financial resources. This section includes an assessment of the overall sustainability as well as the sustainability of the main project intervention axis.
108. In general, the project has successfully provided a basis for future sustainability, by reinforcing technical capacities among key stakeholders; developing CAPs and mainstreaming their implementation into District and Municipal plans; increasing awareness among children, families, communities and authorities of the negative consequences of child labour; mobilizing the support of all stakeholders concerned, and strengthening the national “child labour community”.
109. To the degree to which there will be long-term continuation of the results obtained by the PPP project, and further development of the fight against child labour, will depend on companies contributing to ensuring that Decent Work prevails in their value chains as well as on national and district ownership and resource allocation (financial, technical and human).
110. Given the current available national resources, and the fact that the structural, institutional and cultural change necessary for increased ownership requires a long period of time, the evaluators believe that further external technical and financial support will be needed in the short-medium term, if project results are to generate a lasting impact.

3.6.1 Ownership

111. A highly positive aspect of the PPP project was the commitment of government officials, district authorities and communities to the project’s activities and goals. Institutional capacities were enhanced by extensive training and awareness rising; advocacy proved to be effective in expanding child labour concerns to national institutions and decentralized administrations.
112. A great sign for future sustainability is the widespread agreement on the purpose of the project at all levels. This indicates that the countries’ commitment to eliminate child labour is likely to continue, at the very least from a policy perspective. However, in many cases this commitment is dependent on the financial and human resources necessary to implement actions in favour of eliminating child labour. Full national ownership still requires ongoing government, stakeholder, ILO and Industry support, including policy-making, technical assistance and resource allocation (both financial and human) and active respect for and promotion of fundamental principles and rights at work. Given the current circumstances, the lack of this support in the future may very well undo the achievements obtained by the efforts implemented in the PPP project.

3.6.2 Institutional capacities

113. The project greatly contributed to enhancing the capacity of institutions and authorities to tackle child labour through training activities and technical assistance. This being said, there is room for further development. Institutional capacities are a key element for long-term sustainability of results, and therefore it is important to continue working on supporting and developing them. Also, coordination among relevant stakeholders and local and district level was especially important for project results, but coordination among key actors at all levels is essential and continues to be something to work on.

3.6.3 *National policies*

114. Positive policy changes took place in both project countries. It is likely that the commitment to develop policies to fight child labour in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire will continue in the future. How these policy-level commitments translate into effective actions, however, is not always clear and typically depends on the human, technical and financial resources available to the government and their efficient mobilization. Commitment of authorities and effective law enforcement will largely dictate the success of this policy framework and the possibility for future developments. On the other hand, the policy-making effort can be reinforced by additional activities aimed at raising awareness of the negative implications of child labour, specifically in the cocoa sector, on the sustainability of the cocoa supply chain and on the eventual impact on the socio-economic development of both countries.

3.6.4 *Financial aspects*

115. As mentioned before, the project has successfully managed to advance national ownership of child labour concerns and institutional capacities to address them, but the financial support or specific funding commitments necessary to sustain these achievements are still uncertain. Public budgets, specifically at the local and district levels, remain scarce whereas needs continue to be high. The need for further financial support from development partners such as ILO-IPEC, the enterprises in the cocoa industry and/or other donors is manifest. The efforts, investments and results achieved by the PPP project will be all the more significant if they are sustained in the long run.

3.6.5 *Sustainability of main project axis of intervention*

- **Child labour Monitoring Systems**

The CLMSs are currently managed by the NPECLC in Ghana and the Direction de la Lutte Contre le Travail des Enfants (DLTE) in Côte d'Ivoire, which ensures a certain level of sustainability since, to some extent, the systems can be mainstreamed into state activities. But so far, it is not clear to what extent the CLMSs have been mainstreamed. At the national levels, institutional coordination and integration with different existing databases; and, at the decentralized levels, ownership and the technical and human resources available, constitute serious challenges to current operations and future sustainability. Furthermore, despite the increased involvement of Parliaments in the fight against child labour in both countries and the national efforts to earmark consistent public budget allocations to child labour monitoring systems, with unreliable funding to all state institutions, the intention to scale-up the CLMSs in both countries may not materialize or follow a consistent implementation process. It is difficult to tell if this will be sustained over the long term without a deliberate external funding mechanism and a serious attempt to ensure integration into existing state databases and mechanisms that support child protection and rights.

Regarding the referral systems, the current arrangements in place are to use both formal⁵ and informal mechanisms. At the community level, efforts are in place to set up by-laws that require monitoring of child labour. These are managed by the local committees and the traditional local authorities. Thus both the committees and the traditional authority act as a referral point for issues coming out of CLMSs. This is an informal arrangement borne out of the project's ability to galvanize support among all stakeholders to ensure the elimination of child labour. The level of awareness about child labour issues generated through the project at the community level can sustain this informal referral system for a while. However, without ongoing awareness creation, the informal system

⁵ i.e. the common beneficiary targeting mechanisms in major social protection programmes like the Free Compulsory Basic Education programme (FCUBE) or the Livelihood Empowerment against Poverty (LEAP) in Ghana.

will not hold and, depending on the intensity and frequency of the cases identified, the system may break down, especially if the local committees are not supported by a higher level body. At the district/department level, again, there is a certain level of informality and, with limited resources, the districts/departments may find it difficult to manage an influx of cases that might occur when the CLMSs are fully implemented.

- **Capacity Building**

In the last years, ILO-IPEC has made great efforts to support the NSCs. However, they face structural challenges in both countries. NSCs are inter-ministerial bodies (in the case of Ghana, members include ministries, labour unions, the Ghanaian Employers Association, NGOs, Ghana Cocoa Board, and international organizations) overseeing child labour which are housed with the Ministry of Employment, while child labour issues relate to a large number of government agencies (Education, Social Protection, Health, Gender...) and non-government agencies (NGOs, unions, Employers' Organizations...). While child labour issues are captured in the national plans and policies and the NSCs have an important role in validating project design and agreeing action programmes within projects (and who will implement them), it is unclear how the NSCs oversee actual implementation. Discussions held during the evaluation interviews and workshops indicate that representatives of the allied bodies attend meetings with no decision making authority to ensure holistic work against child labour. The NSCs (and NAPs) also suffer from limited budget allocations. Thus, continuous technical and financial support is still needed to strengthen the ownership of child labour issues in the ministry offices and agencies; insure sufficient financial allocations; and reinforce coordination and decision making authority among its members.

On the other hand, awareness about child labour and the institutional capacities of a large array of stakeholders and project partners have significantly improved as a result of the implementation of project activities. However, the capacity building is still in progress and needs to be strengthened to improve the effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of efforts towards eliminating child labour. More precisely, further support is needed in order to strengthen the roles and operating capacities of the DCPCs and CCPCs; to further promote social dialogue; reinforce the participation of workers organizations and to fully involve the employers organizations and the enterprises in the industry (at the national, district and local levels).

- **CAP implementation**

The potential of building capacity at the community and district levels for CAP implementation, resource mobilization and subsequent updating of CAPs has not yet been fully achieved. The evaluators underline the need expressed by several stakeholders and the communities themselves for prolonged external technical support to enhance CAP implementation, management, and sustainability, including efforts to advocate and attract more internal and external/local support for their implementation.

- **Prevention and elimination of child labour**

There is a strong indication of sustainability with the increased awareness of child labour issues among children, parents, community members, CCPCs, chiefs, school teachers and district/department authorities. However, with the short life span of the project, sustainability can be threatened as communities can go back to old practices if there are no strong reminders of what needs to be done. In the future, communities and district authorities will have to sustain the gains in terms of child labour elimination and school enrolment and performance. This will be challenging given the budgetary constraints expressed by key stakeholders, therefore, further external support might be necessary to consolidate these achievements.

4. Conclusions

116. The following conclusions are drawn from the analysis of the findings and are organized according to the six evaluation sections: project design, relevance; effectiveness and efficiency; gender issues; potential impact; and sustainability.

4.1 *Project design*

117. The PPP project is the result of an ILO/IPEC-Industry partnership to respond to the commitments of the cocoa and confectionery enterprises outlined in the “Framework of Action” and it was also conceived to support ongoing projects in the region (ECOWAS I & II and CCP) and to strengthen the ILO-IPEC integrated response to child labour problems in these countries. The ILO-IPEC’s integrated approach to child labour addresses its root causes in an all-encompassing way and therefore offers a solid long-term strategy. In this regard, the PPP project, together with ECOWAS I & II and the CCP project, forms part of ILO-IPEC’s integrated approach and contributes to further advance the achievements of these initiatives.
118. Also, the evaluators found the internal logic of the PPP project to be solid and there is consensus among stakeholders on the appropriateness of the project design. The evaluators conclude that the overall project design has proved to be highly appropriate in addressing child labour challenges within Ghana and Côte d’Ivoire.

4.2 *Relevance*

119. The PPP Project constitutes a significant contribution of the industry’s commitment to reduce the worst forms of child labour in the cocoa sector in Ghana and Côte d’Ivoire and is aligned with the national policies, efforts and commitments in preventing and combating child labour in all its forms.
120. The project has proved relevant to address the challenges identified regarding the fight against child labour in the cocoa sector in Ghana and Côte d’Ivoire and responded adequately to the needs of the beneficiaries and the key stakeholders. The ILO/IPEC strategy and the PPP project itself have proved relevant and effective, holding a strong potential for scalability that should be fostered in order to better contribute to achieve the objectives and targets defined by the Framework of Action, and the ILO Global Action Plan on Child Labour, which incorporates the *Roadmap for achieving the elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour by 2016, and the Brasilia Declaration*. Furthermore, scaling-up the CLMSs is crucial in order to have comprehensive data on child labour at the national level and also to cover other sectors that could be affected by the WFCL.

4.3 *Effectiveness and efficiency*

121. Despite the short period of implementation (especially at the community level), the evaluators, based on quantitative evidence as well as qualitative information gathered among all key stakeholders found that the PPP was executed with high degree of effectiveness, delivering most of the expected outputs, which greatly contributed to a high degree of effectiveness in reaching the project’s immediate objectives.
122. The PPP project has proved effective in strengthening Child labour Monitoring Systems (CLMS) in Ghana and Côte d’Ivoire, by providing support to national, district and community level CLMS operations in both countries. In Ghana the project supported piloting and roll-out of CLMS in target communities and districts, and contributed to expanding the reach of GCLMS from 5 to 12 Districts; In Côte d’Ivoire the project contributed to launching SOSTECI and to its implementation in 5 Departments and 19 communities. However, while the PPP supported the

refinement of the model and the spread of the CLMS implementation, further advancements will depend on government ownership, availability of funds and willingness to scale-up the systems.

123. ILO/IPEC largely contributed to strengthen coordination and institutional capacities of ILO constituents, especially through support to the Ministries of Labour and the NSCs, and to reinforce cooperation with other relevant Ministries such as education, agriculture and children's affairs, and with local governments, and with the employer and trade union partners at the national and decentralized levels in both countries. This contributed to significant progress in national/district/local capacities to strengthen the technical and institutional environment in order to tackle child labour. Despite the good results achieved, the institutional capacities of the NSC and key stakeholders are not yet fully developed and improved coordination among key stakeholders (including the cocoa companies) is still in progress and needs to be strengthened. Also, at the community and district level, the potential for building capacity for CAP implementation, resource mobilization and subsequent updating of CAPs has not yet been fully achieved.
124. PPP direct interventions to prevent and eliminate child labour were also very effective. In both Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire 2577 children were withdrawn or prevented from child labour. The project promoted increased awareness on child labour, and education and was able to build consensus on the need to prevent and eliminate child labour and enrol and keep children at school. Children and schools were supported with educational materials (books, desks, etc.) and also through CAPs schools improved their infrastructure (construction or renovation of classrooms, teachers' quarters, nurseries, school canteens, etc.). However, these achievements will still take further time and efforts to be fully consolidated.
125. Regarding the efficiency of the project, taking into consideration that the project has been carried out in two different countries, at national, district and local levels; the scope of activities executed (policy-level; direct intervention; institutional capacity building; support to CLMS, etc.); the quality of the outputs generated; the number of beneficiaries reached; and the project's role in supporting the CCP, the evaluators conclude that the relationship between the financial resources invested and the results obtained is satisfactory.

4.4 Gender issues

126. In its implementation, the project took into account the positions and roles of women in target cocoa-growing communities and their relation to child labour issues, and oriented these interventions towards their empowerment and benefit. Women were motivated to become active members of their communities and decision-making bodies and processes. The PPP project also assured equal access to direct services to all children beneficiaries, both boys and girls.

4.5 Contributions towards impact

127. The evaluators consider that the project's results and achievements contributed to accelerate progress in the elimination of child labour, focusing on its worst forms, in cocoa growing communities in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana. Furthermore, the project has generated and has the potential to continue generating significant impacts related to national and district capacity building, local community development and withdrawal and prevention of children from child labour.
128. The project has largely contributed to build consensus among stakeholders regarding the importance of child labour. Communities and authorities are now convinced of the need to eliminate child labour, especially in its worst forms. The PPP provided a platform for national stakeholders to reinforce and further develop their policies and work positively towards their enforcement, and has managed to help extend child labour concerns into official development plans and strategies at different levels.

129. CLMSs could be very useful tools to combat child labour and to define strategies to withdraw and prevent children from engaging in child labour. They can also contribute to the enforcement of laws and regulations aimed at protecting children. Furthermore, they have the potential to be the basis of a comprehensive, institutional response system and to contribute to consolidating and mainstreaming child labour issues into governance.
130. The PPP project has had a great impact on increasing access of children to relevant educational services. In the period of time that the project was active, and across the two target countries, 2,577 children in or at high risk of entering child labour were given improved access to educational services and were prevented or withdrawn from work.
131. By working with the industry, the project has provided a basis for broader Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) actions. The existing commitment and concern regarding child labour could be enhanced by encouraging responsible actions and policies that better integrate decent work concerns and respect for FPRW into value chain and enterprise management practices to ensure sustainable economic performance and an accelerated promotion of child labour free cocoa communities.

4.6 Sustainability

132. In general, the project has successfully provided a basis for future sustainability, by reinforcing technical capacities among key stakeholders; developing CAPs and mainstreaming their implementation into District and Municipal plans; increasing awareness among children, families, communities and authorities of the negative consequences of child labour; and mobilizing the support of all stakeholders concerned, and strengthening the national “child labour community”.
133. The degree to which there is a long-term continuation of the results obtained by the PPP project will depend mainly on national and district ownership and resource allocation (financial, technical and human). However, given the current available national resources, and the fact that the structural, institutional and cultural change necessary for increased ownership requires a long period of time, the evaluators believe that further external financial support will be needed in the short-medium term if project results are to generate a lasting impact.

Child Labour Monitoring Systems

134. At the national level, institutional coordination and integration with different existing databases, and at the decentralized level, ownership and available technical and human resources, constitute serious challenges to current operations and future sustainability. Also, there is the need for simplifying the data collection process. Furthermore, with unreliable budget allocations to all state institutions, the intention to scale-up the CLMSs in both countries may not materialize or follow a consistent implementation process without a deliberate external funding mechanism and a serious attempt to ensure its integration into existing state databases and mechanisms that support child protection and rights.

Capacity Building

135. Despite ILO-IPEC’s continuous support to the NSCs, ownership by the ministry offices and agencies, financial allocations and coordination and decision making authority are not yet fully in place to ensure that NSCs are completely functional and operational *to plan, coordinate and deliver according to their mandates*. The NSCs (and NAPs) also suffer from limited budget allocations. Thus, continuous technical and financial support is still needed to strengthen child labour ownership in Government Cabinets and agencies; ensure sufficient financial allocations; and reinforce coordination and decision making authority among its members.

136. Also, the capacity building of a large array of stakeholders and project partners have significantly improved but is still in progress and needs to be strengthened to improve the effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of efforts towards eliminating CL. More precisely, further support is needed in order to strengthen the roles and operating capacities of the DCPCs and CCPCs; to further promote social dialogue; reinforce the participation of workers organizations; to fully involve the employers' organizations and the enterprises in the industry (at the national, district and local levels).

CAP implementation

137. The potential of building capacity at the community and district levels for CAP implementation, resources mobilization and subsequent updating of CAPs has not yet been fully achieved. There is still need for continuous external support to enhance CAP implementation, management, and sustainability, including efforts to advocate and attract more internal and external/local support for their implementation.

Prevention and elimination of child labour

138. There is a strong indication of sustainability with the increased awareness of child labour issues among children, parents, community members, CPCs, chiefs, school teachers and district/department authorities. However, further external support might be necessary to consolidate these achievements.

5. Lessons learned and emerging good practices

139. Over the approximately two years that the PPP project has been active, the many activities and interventions carried out have increased the experience and enhanced the expertise of the actors, stakeholders and donors in the fight against child labour. Some challenges and positive results have been identified and constitute some of the lessons learned from the project. This section of the evaluation intends to point out the most relevant lessons learned and on-going emerging good practices, so they can be taken into account by future interventions in the region or applied to eliminate child labour wherever it may be found.

5.1 *Lessons learned*

1. Intervention in cocoa communities to work against the worst forms of child labour requires processes such as capacity building, awareness raising, referring children to social services, CAP design and roll out... These processes need an extended period of time to be developed and consolidated, and therefore it is important to carefully outline the project's implementation procedures in order to better align them with the administrative and funding processes and take into account possible delays (which are more likely when working in tandem with other project timelines).
2. Child labour is a complex issue, driven by multiple causes (including poverty, reduced access to education, traditional production patterns...) and involving many actors (children, parents, teachers, political authorities, enterprises and trade unions, etc.). Increased awareness of the negative effects of child labour at the local and international level has led to the existence of many different agents carrying out initiatives to tackle some of these root causes or their effects. In general, this is done without coordination or cooperation between these agents to support each other's actions and unite efforts. In this sense, we have learned from ILO-IPEC's interventions in this sector that the best strategy for addressing child labour is an integrated approach⁶.
3. When selecting beneficiaries in local communities we have learned that it is important to include all of the children in the community as well as their families (as direct or indirect beneficiaries). This avoids tensions within community members and increases support to project activities and instruments such as CAPs, CCPCs and other forms of involvement in the fight against child labour.
4. The cocoa supply chain faces several challenges (including low farm productivity, low level of organization among farmers/producers/farm labourers, illegal mining, migration away from rural areas of young workers, introduction of other cash-crops in cocoa producing areas such as rubber or palm oil) Addressing child labour in the sector is a possible entry point for the industry to address some of these challenges and improve the cocoa sector and the living standards of the local communities. In this sense, IPEC could be a key partner for the industry, as it is uniquely qualified and experienced in the area of child labour; possess extensive knowledge of the needs and support required by countries; and maintains excellent relations with ILO constituents (e.g. governments, trade unions, employers' organizations) as well as with relevant civil society organizations.

⁶ Integrated approach: integrated set of interventions that simultaneously addresses all the interlinked and systemic issues that perpetuate child labour in a particular area.

5.2. *Emerging good practices*

1. The integrated approach proposed by ILO-IPEC, possible through the complementary actions of different initiatives that focus specifically on given aspects and are, at the same time, coordinated by a master-plan, and which focuses not only on the root causes of child labour but also puts emphasis on working at different levels of policy and institutional capacities and community mobilization, has proved very positive because:
 - The combination and coordination of different ILO-IPEC projects in the region in general, and in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana in particular, has proved to be a key element in tackling the root causes of child labour in these countries. The support provided by ILO/IPEC national structures, regional and sub-regional offices, departments and experts; to national partners and stakeholders has proved to be an essential element in successful project implementation in both countries.
 - Despite the very little amount of funds earmarked for the provision of educational services, the project has developed effective collaborative methods with the CCP and other IPEC projects and awareness raising strategies with communities and districts which allowed to withdraw or to prevent 2577 children from child labour.
 - Partnering with government authorities, capacity building and sensitization at all levels has been crucial to strengthen the project achievements. Combining actions directed at the community level with institutional advocacy is a good approach for future initiatives.
 - Working at a decentralized level with communities and local authorities has been key for some project achievements. Community advocacy at the district level ensured mainstreaming of the project into district operations and fostered participation and synergies among the different key stakeholders concerned with child labour/child protection issues.
2. Support to CAPs and CCPCs has been a very good practice. Through the CAPs, the PPP project encouraged empowerment of local populations that are now able to direct themselves to district and departmental authorities to gain their support in CAP implementation and provision of basic services. The CAPs have also managed to concert efforts among the local community members showing that child labour can be withdrawn and the energies and resources of the community can be directed towards supporting children and requiring limited financial resources to do so. In addition, CAP involvement has proved to be key for local ownership of project values and goals.
3. In stand-alone communities⁷ the project has benefitted all of the children and their families by providing school kits, birth certificates, health support, etc. Thus some of the challenges and confusion usually associated with selecting beneficiaries in other projects was absent. As mentioned in lessons learned, this proved to be positive for project development in the communities because it enhanced involvement and participation of community members and resulted in stronger support of project initiatives.

⁷ The project's large number of targeted beneficiaries and the reduced number of "PPP stand-alone communities" resulted in all the children being selected as beneficiaries

6. Recommendations

140. Considering the different aspects of child labour in the cocoa sector that the PPP project has addressed; the need for continued support in order to achieve full local ownership of project goals and values; and the fact that child labour is a complex issue and involves many actors and stakeholders, the evaluation process has identified the following recommendations:

1. Follow-up project

Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders and donors

Priority: High. Implementation time: short-term

Consultations with key stakeholders, beneficiaries and community members have revealed the need for continued support to PPP communities. This would help guarantee the sustainability of the project's results and ensure that target communities remain child labour free in the long term. A follow-up project could also contribute to extend the interventions to other communities and, eventually, to implementing a broader child labour strategy for the cocoa sector.

2. ILO/IPEC and Industry collaboration

Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC and the cocoa companies

Priority: High. Implementation time: medium-term.

It is essential to continue the ILO/IPEC and cocoa industry collaboration and to reinforce the role of ILO-IPEC, at national and decentralized levels (districts/departments), in the awareness-raising and mobilization of the cocoa companies. This would strengthen their capacity to establish a stronger rights-based approach to their development efforts in cocoa growing communities; their engagement in child labour elimination and improve the working conditions and productivity in cocoa plantations. Also, this could be a significant achievement for sustainability and impact at a larger scale.

3. Cocoa Action Plan

Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC and the cocoa companies

Priority: Medium. Implementation time: medium-term.

ILO/IPEC could and should be a privileged partner of the enterprises in the industry in the conception, design and implementation of the Cocoa Action Plan.

4. Awareness rising in target communities concerning child labour and education

Addressed to: the ILO, national stakeholders and donors

Priority: High. Implementation time: short-term.

Awareness rising on the harmful effects and risks of child labour needs to be sustained until it forms part of the cultural DNA of the communities. Therefore, it is necessary to continue working on sensitization and knowledge about child labour issues in order to achieve a change in attitudes and practices that ensure that children remain out of work and in schools.

5. CAP Development and Implementation

Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders, and donors

Priority: High. Implementation time: short-term.

CAP development and implementation also requires prolonged technical support from ILO-IPEC and the IAs until CCPCs develop full implementation, management, and sustainability capacities of CAPs. This would improve their ability to advocate and attract more internal and external/local support for their implementation.

6. National Capacity building and Advocacy

Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders and donors

Priority: High. Implementation time: medium-term.

Future initiatives should continue to work to strengthen the institutional capacities and roles of the CCPCs so that they can fulfil their roles and mandates and also reach a level of autonomy at which they can foster advocacy in favour of their communities. DCPCs are still young institutions with a huge potential for providing a platform for joint action in child protection issues at the district level. Further technical and financial support is still necessary to strengthen these institutions and fully mature their potential. At the national level, it is crucial to continue reinforcing institutional capacities and coordination among key stakeholders. Continuous support to NSCs is essential in order to ensure they fully achieve their mandates so they can effectively coordinate stakeholders and implement NAPs in these countries.

7. Sectoral Capacity building and Advocacy

Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders and Industry

Priority: Medium. Implementation time: medium-term.

ILO-IPEC's work with industry partners could help identify new areas for advocacy and negotiation to improve the cocoa sector (i.e. law enforcement, birth certificates, etc.). Further engagement with COCOBOD (Ghana) and *Conseil Café Cacao* (Côte d'Ivoire) may be something worth working on. Government coordination should be enhanced and could incorporate cocoa marketing and export boards. Labour inspection and agricultural extension services should be strengthened as well. Enterprises at all levels must be clear about their commitment to respect all fundamental rights at work and to be willing to engage with trade unions to promote decent work, including the elimination of child labour. The ILO can prove helpful in supporting them in this regard. Similarly, ILO-FPRW/IPEC should continue to support the capacity of trade unions to integrate child labour concerns fully into their policies and activities. Strengthening the role of trade unions would enable farmers and other workers to become more organized and act through these unions and cooperatives to promote collective bargaining, acquisition of inputs and implements, and collaborative forms of labour in the farms. It would be important to build the capacity of supply chain managers and trading companies in order to involve all actors related to child labour in the cocoa sector in its eradication.

ILO-IPEC's prior experience in working with government and coordinating multiple actors should provide a good basis to carry this out.

8. Support to CLMS

Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders, donors and the Governments of Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire

Priority: High. Implementation time: short-term.

CLMS should be up-scaled and eventually extended nationwide. The current funding for CLMS implementation is uncertain, particularly at district and community levels. For this purpose an operational and costs analysis and a resource mobilization strategy could be carried out. ILO/IPEC could work with national stakeholders to develop a strategic plan that would lay out an incremental up scaling of CLMSs implementation.

Efforts towards simplifying the data collection process, entry and analysis must be fast tracked and District and community level CLMS staff must receive effective support to ensure that they can respond adequately and promptly to operational challenges. Also, CLMS implementation should become part of the core activities of District/Departments, ensuring that there is staff focused solely on that.

CLMS could be mainstreamed by linking with public data bases, social programmes and private monitoring systems and also by training and inviting trade unions and other agencies and non-government institutions and other initiatives to participate in the system in accordance with their respective mandates. This could create synergies and avoid duplication of efforts, improving the financial and technical viability of a nationwide CLMS.

9. Enhanced livelihoods and local economic development

Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders and donors

Priority: Medium. Implementation time: medium-term.

District and departmental plans to enhance livelihoods of farmers and local economic development should also be supported. Further initiatives should also work on Good Agricultural practices (GAP) and Occupational Safety and Health (OSH). This would contribute to CAP implementation and financial sustainability.

10. Education

Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders and donors

Priority: High. Implementation time: short-term.

Free, compulsory, quality full-time education is the best tool and alternative against child labour and therefore, more efforts should be taken in order to guarantee access to school and other appropriate educational services of children in or at risk of entering child labour. Improving educational infrastructures and equipment is fundamental for this purpose, as well as improving access to water and sanitation, teacher training and capacities, school management systems and involvement of parents, etc. Catch-up programmes for children that have missed out on several years of education, or literacy programmes for those who have never attended formal education can play a significant role. School support and back-up is also important to improve school results for some children. Also, preschool programmes are important to involve children in school activities from an early age. Finally, it is also important to provide relevant TVET alternatives for adolescents.

11. Gender empowerment

Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders and donors

Priority: High. Implementation time: short-term.

Gender empowerment is another interesting aspect to focus on at community level since it is likely to improve livelihoods, decision-making and may even generate positive spillovers for the cocoa sector.

12. Administrative and financial procedures

Addressed to: the ILO/IPEC, national stakeholders and donors

Priority: Medium. Implementation time: medium-term.

Delays should be minimized if project outcomes are to be completed. It is understood that in a process that requires a long period of time, and especially considering the difficulties for communication and coordination, there will inevitably be certain delays. More flexibility in the administrative and financial procedures and a higher degree of autonomy for the ILO Country Offices is needed and could help future initiatives to better adjust to the scheduled time-frame or be able to foresee these delays more accurately.

Annexes

Annex A: Terms of Reference



International Labour Organization- International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour ILO/IPEC

Final version

Terms of Reference Independent Final Evaluation “Project Combatting Child Labour in Cocoa Growing Communities in Ghana and Côte d’Ivoire”

FPRW-ILO Project Code	RAF/11/01/GIG & RAF/11/04/GIG
Duration	42 months
Country	Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana
Starting Date	1 August 2011
Ending Date	31 December 2014
Project Language	English and French
Financing Agency	Global Issues Group in the Chocolate and Cocoa Industry
Donor contribution	USD 2,060,000

Abbreviations

AP	Action Programme
CCP	‘Towards child labour free cocoa growing communities in Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana through an integrated area based approach’ Project
CdI	Côte d’Ivoire
CL	Child Labour
CLMS	Child Labour Monitoring System
CMA	the Chocolate Manufacturers’ Association
EIA	Evaluation and Impact Assessment unit of ILO-FPRW/IPEC
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programmes
ECOWAS I & II	Eliminating the worst form of child labour in West Africa and strengthening sub-regional cooperation through ECOWAS Projects I and II
FPRW	Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work branch (under ILO Governance and Tripartism Department)
GAP	Global Action Plan
GCLMS	Ghana Child Labour Monitoring System
GIG	Global Issues Group in the Chocolate and Cocoa Industry
HQ	Headquarters
ICI	International Cocoa Initiative
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
IUF	International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers’ Associations
NAP	National Action Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NSC	National Steering Committee
PPP	‘Combating child labour in cocoa growing communities in Ghana and Côte d’Ivoire’ Project
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
SOSTECI	Système d’Observation du Travail des Enfants en Côte d’Ivoire
TBP	Time Bound Programme
TORs	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
USDOL	United States Department of Labour
WCF	World Cocoa Foundation
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labour

I. Background and Justification

1. The aim of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child labour (IPEC)⁸ is the progressive elimination of child labour, especially its worst forms. The political will and commitment of individual governments to address child labour - in cooperation with employers' and workers' organizations, non-governmental organizations and other relevant parties in society - is the basis for FPRW-IPEC action. FPRW-IPEC support at the country level is based on a phased, multi-sector strategy. This strategy includes strengthening national capacities to deal with this issue, legislation harmonization, improvement of the knowledge base, raising awareness on the negative consequences of child labour, promoting social mobilization against it, and implementing demonstrative direct action programmes (AP) to prevent children from child labour and remove child workers from hazardous work and provide them and their families with appropriate alternatives.
2. The operational strategy of FPRW-IPEC has over the years focus on providing support to national and local constituents and partners through their project and activities. Such support has to the extent possible been provided in context of national frameworks, institutions and process that have facilitated the building of capacities and mobilisation for further action. It has emphasized various degrees of a comprehensive approach, providing linkages between action and partners in sectors and areas of work relevant for child labour. Whenever possible specific national framework or programmes have provided such focus.
3. Starting in 2001, FPRW-IPEC has promoted the implementation of such national frameworks through the national Time Bound Programme (TBP) approach which has evolved into the current NAPs. The NAP is the framework to operationalize the national Child Labour (CL) labour policy as a statement of a country's course or approach to dealing with the problem of CL. It is intended to be a set of coherent and complementary policies, strategies and interventions with the long-term purpose of reducing and eventually eliminating CL.
4. The Global Action Plan (GAP), proposed in the 2006 Global Report on Child Labour and endorsed by the Governing Body at its November 2006 sitting, reinforced this emphasis by calling on all ILO member States to put appropriate time-bound measures using National Action Plans (NAP), in place by 2008 with a view to eliminating the WFCL by 2016.
5. The NAPs incorporate lessons learned from the earlier TBPs, especially in terms of process, the importance of institutions, and the role FPRW-IPEC and other ILO units can play to ensure broad mobilization and sustainability. The recent experience has emphasized the facilitation and enhancement of national ownership, using a participatory approach involving government departments, the social partners and other key stakeholders at national, sub-national and sectorial levels.
6. NAPs are designed to be based on existing and planned interventions in all relevant social and economic sectors, with linkages to UNDAF and other UN programmes. They represent a programme framework, not a standalone project. The NAP formulation and implementation is a national responsibility, requiring national leadership and ownership, as well as national resource mobilization.
7. FPRW-IPEC strategy, settled under the Decent Work Country Programmes, in Africa, states that FPRW-IPEC will work with all countries; and sub-regional and regional bodies, towards the elimination of child labour, depending on our comparative advantage and the availability of resources. Towards this end, efforts will be made to beef up capacity for upstream support in

⁸ IPEC is an ILO Program operating under the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work branch (FPRW) at the Governance and Tripartism Department.

the region. The orientation is to rebalancing FPRW-IPEC support in favour of upstream activities (especially policy advice, advocacy, knowledge development and sharing, and capacity building), with direct actions emphasizing the development of mechanisms that ensure mainstreaming into the work of mandated institutions

8. From the perspective of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the elimination of child labour is part of its work on standards and fundamental principles and rights at work. The fulfilment of these standards should guarantee decent work for all adults. In this sense, the ILO provides technical assistance to its three constituents: government, workers and employers. This tripartite structure is the key characteristic of ILO cooperation and it is within this framework that the activities developed by the Programme should be analysed.
9. ILO Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) have subsequently been developed and are being introduced in the ILO to provide a mechanism to outline agreed upon priorities between the ILO and the national constituent partners within a broader UN and International development context.
10. The DWCP defines a corporate focus on priorities, operational strategies, as well as a resource and implementation plan that complements and supports partner plans for national decent work priorities. As such, DWCP are broader frameworks to which the individual ILO project is linked and contributes to. DWCP are beginning to be gradually introduced into various countries' planning and implementing frameworks. The four countries have DCWP, at different stages of evolution that will be considered in this evaluation. For further information please see : <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/decent.htm>
11. Since 2001, efforts to combat the worst forms of child labour in cocoa production have also been supported by the international cocoa industry. In September 2001, the Chocolate Manufacturers' Association (CMA), the World Cocoa Foundation (WCF) and other bodies, including the International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations (IUF), signed the "Protocol for the Growing and Processing of Cocoa Beans and their Derivative Products in a Manner that Complies with ILO Convention 182 concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour", which is known as the Harkin-Engel Protocol.
12. An outcome of the Harkin-Engel Protocol has been the creation of the International Cocoa Initiative (ICI) Foundation in 2002. The industry-funded ICI is a coalition of the global chocolate industry, the IUF, and NGOs whose mission is "to oversee and sustain efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labour and forced labour in the growing and processing of cocoa beans and their derivative products." The ILO helped with the setting up of the Foundation and is a member of its Advisory Council.

In 13 September 2010, the governments of Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire, the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) and the International Cocoa Industry signed a Declaration of Joint Action to Support Implementation of the Harkin-Engel Protocol, which provides for a Framework of Action to coordinate measures to help achieve the goals of the Harkin-Engel Protocol and to accelerate the reduction of the worst forms of child labour in the production of cocoa. The cocoa industry and ILO-FPRW/IPEC are carrying on together several initiatives within this framework.

Project background

13. This project is implemented under the FPRW-IPEC strategic programme on child labour in West Africa/ECOWAS region and under the Declaration of Joint Action to Support Implementation of the Harkin-Engel Protocol.

14. Regarding West Africa FPRW-IPEC strategy the project is particularly aligned to the projects “ECOWAS I and II”, that ended in April 2014, and ‘Towards Child Labour Free Cocoa Growing Communities in Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana through an Integrated Area Based Approach’ (CCP) to end in December 2014 and the Project “Creating a protective Environment for Children in Cocoa Growing Communities in Soubré, Côte d’Ivoire”, ending in August 2015. The five projects have been/are under a common management structure (with clear responsibilities specified by project), aiming at the same development objective and working in some cases with the same stakeholders. The common structure and alignment allow for cross-fertilization among projects and increase efficiency and effectiveness.
15. The ECOWAS I and II ended in April 2014. The CCP and the PPP projects are still being implemented. The CCP has had an Expanded Independent Final Evaluation in July-August current year. The project in Soubré will run a mid-term self-evaluation in October 2014.
16. The project is a partnership between the ILO and a number of companies in the chocolate and confectionery industry seeks to eliminate CL and to ensure workforce continuity in cocoa growing farms by younger generations, as a contribution to the implementation of the 2010 Framework of Action to Support Implementation of the Harkin-Engel Protocol on CL in cocoa (described in the previous section).
17. The project development objective is:
 - To accelerate progress in the elimination of child labour, with a focus on its worst forms, in cocoa growing communities in Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana.
18. The project immediate objectives are:
 - Immediate Objective 1: By the end of the project, child labour monitoring system (CLMS) are strengthened and expanded;
 - Immediate Objective 2: By the end of the project, the capacity of governments, social partners cocoa farming families and other stakeholders to participate in and support CLMS activity is strengthened; and
 - Immediate Objective 3: By the end of the PPP, National Steering Committees (NSCs) lead improved coordination of efforts to combat child labour in cocoa growing.
19. The project strategy includes interventions at the macro, meso and micro levels. It focusses on three interrelated and mutually reinforcing areas: CLMS, capacity building and coordination. Immediate Objective 2 on capacity building supports Immediate Objective 1 on CLMS. The accomplishment of Immediate Objectives 1 and 2 can be further increased through Immediate Objective 3.
20. The project strategy has been designed taking in consideration the implementation of a major FWPR-IPEC project in both countries, CCP. The CCP and PPP will mutually reinforce and leverage from this close coordination, keeping each project separate and distinct character. Among key linkages are working in strengthening the CLMSs in both countries, strengthening NSCs, and provide direct support to communities
21. The project major results, as reported by the project, as of August 2014, are the following:
 - NAP NSCs in Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana have received training and technical support (in coordination with CCP and ECOWAS I and II projects)
 - Development and validation of policy documents
 - Mainstreaming of CL in national development strategy/ education policy in Ghana
 - Complementary Basic Education (CBE) materials incorporating child labour considerations in cocoa communities in Ghana

- GCLMS: review of 2012 pilot and revision of tools with data being entered into the system
- SOSTECI: revision of framework and tools and pilot being implemented at the district level and community level
- CAP implementation in communities: infrastructure developed in communities, teachers have been recruited; and CAP has been submitted to area MP and district authorities and mainstreaming in district medium term plans
- 1,633 children (658 in Ghana and 975 in CdI) received direct support
- 1,568 (593 in Ghana and 975 in CdI) prevented or withdrawn from CL
- 300+ community leaders, local authorities trained, teachers and labour inspectors, 200 households, and other key stakeholders sensitized and trained on CL themes (including CLMS)

Evaluation background

22. The project has gone through a Project Implementation Review in July 2013. A summary of the recommendations are available in Annex III.
23. The project has been implemented taking in consideration its articulation with the ECOWAS I and II Projects and the CCP project. The mid-term and final evaluations of these projects discuss in more details the articulation of these projects within them and with the PPP project.
24. Comprehensive baseline studies carried on at households and community levels for each country target communities are expected to be considered as key resources for the final evaluation.
25. The evaluation team should make all efforts to use information from the baseline studies to reflect on achieved changes, even though the findings would not necessarily have statistical validity.

II. Purpose and Scope

Purpose

26. The main purposes of the independent final evaluation are:
 - a. Determine project effectiveness at the national, district and community levels: achievement of Project objectives and understanding how and why have/have not been achieved
 - b. Identify relevant unintended/unexpected results at outcome and impact levels
 - c. Establish the relevance of the project outcomes and the level of sustainability attained
 - d. Provide recommendations regarding relevant stakeholders, building on the achievements of the Project in supporting the NAPs at the national level toward the sustainability of the project outcomes and initial impacts
 - e. Provide recommendations on the partnership of the cocoa industry and ILO (i.e. for the cocoa industry and ILO as key stakeholders)
 - f. To identify emerging potential good practices for key stakeholders
27. The final evaluation should provide all stakeholders (i.e. the national and sub national/local stakeholders, the project management team, the donor and ILO/FPRW-IPEC) with information to assess strategies, objectives, partnership arrangements and resources. It should identify the potential impact on mainstreaming policy and strategies and suggest a possible way forward for the future.

Scope

28. The evaluation will focus on the ILO/FPRW-IPEC project mentioned above, its achievements and its contribution to the overall national and sub-regional efforts to achieve the elimination of WFCL. The evaluation should focus on all the activities that have been implemented since the start of the projects to the moment of the field visits.
29. The evaluation should look at the project as a whole and in relation to CCP and ECOWAS I and II projects, including issues of initial project design, implementation, sustainability of outcomes and impact, lessons learnt replicability and recommendations for current and future programmes.
30. The evaluation should cover expected (i.e. planned) and unexpected results in terms of non-planned outputs and outcomes (i.e. side effects or externalities). Some of these unexpected changes could be as relevant as the ones planned. Therefore, the evaluation team should reflect on them for learning purposes.
31. The analytical scope should include identifying levels of achievement of objectives and explaining how and why have been attained in such ways (and not in other alternative expected ways, if this would be the case).

III. Suggested Aspects to be Addressed

32. The evaluation should be carried out in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy, the ILO evaluation Guidelines, the specific ILO/FPRW-IPEC Guidelines and Notes, the UN System Evaluation Standards and Norms⁹, and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard.
33. The evaluation will address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability (and potential impact) to the extent possible as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-Based Evaluation: Principles, Rationale, Planning and Managing for Evaluations (i-eval resource kit)⁹ available at http://www.ilo.org/eval/WCMS_168289/lang--en/index.htm
34. Gender concerns should be addressed in accordance with ILO Guidance note 4: “Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of projects”: http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm

All data should be sex-disaggregated and different needs of women and men and of marginalized groups targeted by the programme should be considered throughout the evaluation process.
35. In line with results-based framework approach used by ILO/FPRW-IPEC for identifying results at global, strategic and project level, the evaluation will focus on identifying and analysing results through addressing key questions related to the evaluation concerns and the achievement of the Immediate Objectives of the project using data from the logical framework indicators.
36. Annex I contains specific suggested aspects for the evaluation to address. Other aspects can be added as identified by the evaluation team in accordance with the given purpose and in consultation with ILO/FPRW-IPEC Geneva's Evaluation and Impact Assessment unit (EIA) and the project coordinator. It is not expected that the evaluation address all of the questions detailed in the Annex; however the evaluation must address the general areas of focus.

⁹Please see www.unevaluation.org/document/guidance-documents. In particular consider the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for evaluation, March 2008.

37. The evaluation instrument (summarised in the Inception report) should identify the general areas of focus listed here as well as other priority aspects to be addressed in the evaluation.

Below are the main categories that need to be addressed:

- Design
- Effectiveness and efficiency of the project (Implementation of the process and achievement of objectives)
- Potential impacts
- Relevance
- Sustainability
- Special Aspects to be Addressed

IV. Expected Outputs of the Evaluation

38. The expected outputs to be delivered by the evaluation team are:

- Inception report: this report based on the desk review should describe the evaluation instruments, reflecting the combination of tools and detailed instruments needed to address the range of selected aspects. The instrument needs to make provision for the triangulation of data where possible. The report will include the points defined in the EIA Inception Report outline. It will include also the outline of the stakeholders' workshop, the evaluation report, the distribution of responsibilities within the whole assignment; and all details to assure a consistency field work, stakeholders' workshops and reporting for both countries.
- Stakeholders' workshops: at the end of fieldwork in each country, presenting the initial findings regarding the validation and complete data collection (in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana).
- Draft evaluation report for the project: the evaluation report should include and reflect on findings from the field work, and the stakeholders' workshops.
- Final evaluation report after comments from stakeholders consolidated by EIA and provided to the evaluation team.

39. Draft and Final evaluation reports include the following sections:

- Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions, recommendations, lessons and good practices
- Clearly identified findings
- A table presenting the key results (i.e. figures and qualitative results) achieved per objective (expected and unexpected)
- Clearly identified conclusions and recommendations (i.e. specifying to which actor(s) apply)
- Lessons learned
- Potential good practices and effective models of intervention
- Appropriate Annexes including present TORs
- Standard evaluation instrument matrix (adjusted version of the one included in the Inception report)

40. The total length of each report should be a maximum of 30 pages. This is excluding annexes; additional annexes can provide background and details on specific components of the project evaluated.

41. The report should be sent as one complete document and the file size should not exceed 3 megabytes. Photos, if appropriate to be included, should be inserted using lower resolution to keep overall file size low.

42. The entire draft and final reports (including key annexes) have to be submitted by the evaluation team in English and French (making explicit which language is there master one).
43. All drafts and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible for Word for Windows. Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with ILO/FPRW-IPEC and the consultants. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of ILO/FPRW-IPEC. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.
44. The draft reports will be circulated to key stakeholders (project management, ILO/FPRW-IPEC, ILO Regional, all participants present at the stakeholders' evaluation workshop, donor and others as identified by EIA) for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated by EIA and provided to the evaluation leader. In preparing the final report, the evaluation leader should consider these comments, incorporating as appropriate and providing a brief note explaining the reasons for not doing it when this last case applies.

V. Evaluation Methodology

45. The following is the proposed evaluation methodology. While the evaluation team can propose changes in the methodology, any such changes should be discussed with and approved by EIA and the project, provided that the research and analysis suggest changes and provided that the indicated range of questions is addressed, the purpose maintained and the expected outputs produced at the required quality.
46. The evaluation will be carried out, as a first step, through desk review. This activity includes review by the evaluation team of appropriate materials, including the project documents, progress reports, outputs of the programme and the projects (action programmes), results of any internal planning process and relevant materials from secondary sources. At the end of the desk review period, it is expected that the evaluation leader will prepare an inception report indicating the methodological approach to the evaluation in the form of the evaluation instrument, to be discussed and approved by EIA and provided to the Project for input prior to the commencement of the field mission.
47. The evaluation team leader will interview the donor representatives and ILO/FPRW-IPEC HQ and regional backstopping officials through conference calls interviews from home.
48. The evaluation team will undertake field visits to selected districts and communities and interview national stakeholders in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire. The evaluators will conduct interviews with project partners and implementing agencies, direct beneficiaries (i.e. children) parents and teacher, do observations on the field and facilitate a workshop toward the end of the field visits in each country.
49. For in-country work, in Ghana the evaluation team will include the team leader and the national consultant, and in Côte d'Ivoire only the national consultant
50. The selection of the field visits locations should be based on criteria to be defined by the evaluation team. Some criteria to consider include:
 - Locations with successful and unsuccessful results from the perception of key stakeholders. The rationale is that extreme cases, at some extent, are more helpful than average cases for understanding how process worked and which results have been obtained

- Locations that have been identified as providing particular good practices or bringing out particular key issues as identified by the desk review and initial discussions.
 - Areas known to have high prevalence of child labour.
 - Locations next to and locations not so close to main roads
51. The national workshops will be attended by ILO/FPRW-IPEC staff and key stakeholders (i.e. partners), including the donor as appropriate. These events will be an opportunity for the evaluation team to gather further data, to present the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations and to obtain feedback. These meetings will take place toward the end of the fieldwork in Accra (October 29th) and Abidjan (November 5th).
 52. The evaluation team will be responsible for organizing the methodology of the workshops. The identification of the participants of the workshop and logistics will be the responsibility of the project team in consultation with the evaluation team leader
 53. The team leader has the ultimate responsibility of the whole process. He/she will be responsible for drafting and finalizing the evaluation reports. Upon feedback from stakeholders to the draft report, the team leader will further be responsible for finalizing the report incorporating any comments deemed appropriate.
 54. The evaluation will be carried out with the technical support of the ILO/FPRW-IPEC EIA unit and with the logistical support of the programme offices in the two countries, in particular the main project office in Accra.
 55. EIA will be responsible for consolidating the comments of stakeholders and submitting them to the team leader.
 56. It is expected that the evaluation team will work to the highest evaluation standards and codes of conduct and follow the UN evaluation standards and norms.

The team leader responsibilities and profile

57. 1 Evaluation leader (International consultant):

Responsibilities	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review of project documents • Development of the evaluation instrument • Briefing with ILO/FPRW-IPEC EIA unit • Interviews with FPRW-IPEC HQ officers, donor • Technical guidance to evaluation team members • Undertake country visits in Ghana • Facilitate stakeholders' workshop in Ghana • Draft evaluation reports • Final evaluation reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Have not been involved in the project.</u> • Relevant background in social and/or economic development. • Experience in the design, management and evaluation of complex multinational development projects, in particular with policy level work, institutional building and local development projects as evaluation leader and at the UN system or other international context as evaluation leader • Relevant sub-regional experience • Experience in the area of children's and child labour issues and rights-based approaches in a normative framework and operational dimension are highly appreciated. • Experience at policy level and in the area of education and legal issues would also be appreciated. • Experience in the UN system or similar international development experience including preferably international and national development frameworks in particular UNDAF. • Fluency in English and French is essential • Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings.

58. National consultant in Ghana

Responsibilities	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review of documents • Contribute to the development of the evaluation instrument • Organize and participate in interviews of stakeholders and field visits in the country • Co-facilitate stakeholders' workshop (under the international team member leadership) • Contribute to the evaluation report through systematizing data collected and providing analytical inputs • Others as required by the team leader 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No prior involvement with the project if possible • Relevant background in country social and/or economic development. • Experience in the design, management and evaluation of development projects, in particular with policy level work, institutional building and local development projects. • Relevant country experience, preferably prior working experience in child labour. • Experience in the area of children's and child labour issues and rights-based approaches in a normative framework are highly appreciated. • Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings. • Fluency in English or French (with English reading capacity) essential • Knowledge of local languages an asset • Experience in the UN system or similar international development experience desirable.

59. National consultant in Côte d'Ivoire

Responsibilities	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review of documents • Contribute to the development of the evaluation instrument • Undertake country visits and interview national stakeholder in Côte d'Ivoire • Facilitate stakeholders' workshop • Contribute to the evaluation report through an internal country report based on requirements from the team leader • Others as required by the team leader 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Have not been involved in the project.</u> • Relevant background in country social and/or economic development. • Experience in the design, management and evaluation of development projects, in particular with policy level work, institutional building and local development projects. • Relevant country experience, preferably prior working experience in child labour. • Experience in the area of children's and child labour issues and rights-based approaches in a normative framework are highly appreciated. • Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings. • Fluency in English or French (with English reading capacity) essential • Knowledge of local languages an asset • Experience in the UN system or similar international development experience desirable.

Evaluation Timetable and Schedule

60. The total duration of the evaluation process is mid-October to mid-December 2014.

The tentative timetable is as follows:

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks	TL*	NC Cdl	NC Ghana
1	Evaluation leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Briefing with ILO/FPRW-IPEC-EIA o Desk Review of programme related documents o Telephone briefing with the donor, ILO regional office and FPRW-IPEC HQ 	3	1	1
2	Evaluation leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Field visit, interviews and workshops with key stakeholders in the 2 countries (team leader and NC in Ghana and NC only in Cdl): sharing of preliminary findings and feedback from participants 	7	8	7
3	Evaluation leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Integrate draft report (based on consultations from field visits, desk review and workshops) 	8	2	1
4	EIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Circulate draft report to key stakeholders o Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to evaluation leader 	-	-	
5	Evaluation leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Finalize the report including explanations for comments that were not included 	1	1	0
TOTAL			19	12	9

* **TL: Team Leader**

** **NC: National Consultant**

61. Summary schedule of consultants assignment

Phase	Duration (days)	Dates
1	3 days	15-17 Oct
2	8 days	21-29 Oct Ghana & 27 Oct-5 Nov Cdl
3	8 days	6-14 Nov
4	14 days	18-28 Nov
5	1 day	1 December

62. Sources of Information and Consultations/Meetings

Available at HQ and to be supplied by EIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project document • EIA Guidelines and ILO guidelines
Available in project office and to be supplied by project management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports/Status reports • Other studies and research undertaken • Action Programmes • Project files • National Action Plans

Consultations with:

- Project management and staff
- ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials
- Partner agencies
- Child labour programs in the country
- Social partners Employers' and Workers' groups
- Government stakeholders (e.g. representatives from Department Labour, Social Development etc.)
- Policy makers

- Direct beneficiaries, i.e. boys and girls (taking ethical consideration into account.)
- Parents of boys and girls
- Community members as identified by the project management and evaluation leader
- Donor at global level (GIG) and in the two countries (i.e. local companies representatives)
- Private sector stakeholders

Final Report Submission Procedure

63. The process for both reports is as follows:

- The team leader will submit the draft report to FPRW-IPEC EIA in Geneva.
- FPRW-IPEC EIA will forward a copy to key stakeholders for comments on factual issues and for clarifications.
- FPRW-IPEC EIA will consolidate the comments and send these to the team leader by date agreed between EIA and the evaluator or as soon as the comments are received from stakeholders.
- The final report is submitted to FPRW-IPEC EIA who will then officially forward it to stakeholders, including the donor.

VI. Resources and Management

Resources

64. The resources required for this evaluation are:

For the evaluation team leader:

- Fees for 19 work days.
- Fees for DSA in project locations.
- Travel from consultant's home residence to Ghana in line with ILO regulations and rules.

For national consultant in Ghana

- Fees for 9 work days.
- Fees for DSA in project locations.

For national consultant in Ghana

- Fees for 12 work days.
- Fees for DSA in project locations.

In addition, the ILO office in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire will provide the necessary logistical support to the evaluation team.

Management

65. The evaluation team will report to FPRW-IPEC EIA in headquarters and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with EIA, should issues arise.
66. FPRW-IPEC project officials and the ILO Office in Accra and Abidjan will provide administrative and logistical support during the evaluation mission.

Annex I: Suggested aspects to address

Design

- Determine the validity of the project design, the effectiveness of the methodologies and strategies employed and whether it assisted or hindered the achievement of the project's goals as set out in the Project Document.
- Assess whether the project design was logical and coherent:
 - Were the objectives and targets of the project clear, realistic and likely to be achieved within the established time schedule and with the allocated resources (including financial and human resources)?
 - Were the linkages between inputs, activities, outputs and objectives clear and logical?
 - Were the different components of the project clearly and realistically complementing each other?
 - Have been the time frame for project implementation and the sequencing of project activities logical and realistic?
- Assess whether the project design was logical and coherent and took into account the institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders.
- Assess the external logic of the project: degree to which the project fits into existing mainstreaming activities that would impact on child labour.
- How well did the project design take into account local, national and sub-regional efforts already underway to address child labour and promote educational opportunities for targeted children and existing capacity to address these issues?
- Analyze whether available information on the socio-economic, cultural and political situation was taken into consideration at the time of the design and whether these were reflected in the design of the project.
- Has the project included a gender dimension?
- To what extent were external factors identified and assumptions identified at the time of design? Have these underlying assumptions on which the project has been based proven to be true?
- Assess whether the problems and needs were adequately analyzed.
- Is the strategy for transferring models of intervention, promising practices, and lessons learned clearly defined in the Project Document (i.e. within APs and for non-project countries)?
- Was the strategy for sustainability of project results defined clearly at the design stage of the project?
- How relevant and useful are project indicators and means of verification for measuring project impacts and outcomes?
- What lessons were learned, if any, in the process of conducting baseline survey for the identification of target children?
- Does the project design fit within and complement existing initiatives by other organizations to combat child labour?

Effectiveness and efficiency of the project (Implementation of the process and achievement of objectives)

General

- Assess whether the project has achieved its immediate objectives. If not, what were the factors that contributed to the project delay and were they justifiable (i.e. shortened length of service)?
- Examine delivery of project outputs in terms of quality and quantity
- Assess the effectiveness of the project. In general, did the results obtained justify the costs incurred?
- Have unplanned outputs and results been identified and if so, why were they necessary and to what extent are significant to achieve project objectives?
- Assess the project's gender mainstreaming activities (including framework applied)

- How was the capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners to develop effective action against child labour enhanced as a result of project activities?
- How has the project responded to obstacles (both foreseen and unforeseen) that arose throughout the implementation process? Has the project team been able to adapt the implementation process in order to overcome these obstacles without hindering the effectiveness of the project?
- Have there been any changes to external factors and the related assumptions in design?
- Assess the process for documenting and disseminating models: scale-up, lessons, etc.

Enabling environment (Capacity Building)

- Analyze the level and nature of the project's contribution and support to the enabling environment at national and local levels regarding child labour and the cocoa sector.
- Examine any network that has been built between organizations and government agencies working to address child labour and national and local levels, with special consideration to the cocoa sector.
- How effective has the project been at stimulating interest and participation in the project at the local and national levels?
- How effectively has the project leveraged resources (e.g., by collaborating with non-IPEC initiatives and other projects launched in support of the NAP process and of the cocoa sector thus far)?
- How well has the project coordinated and collaborated with other child-focused interventions supported by other organizations?
- How relevant and effective were the studies commissioned by the project in terms of affecting the national debates on child labour, in particular regarding the cocoa sector?
- Examine how the ILO/IPEC project interacted and possibly influenced national and regional level policies, debates and institutions working on child labour in the cocoa sector.
- Assess the extent to which the ILO/IPEC project has been able to mobilize resources, policies, projects, partners and activities to be part of the NAP and other related initiatives under the cocoa sector.

Direct Targeted Action

- Assess the effectiveness of the different action projects implemented and their contribution to the immediate objectives of the project.
- Has the capacity of community local and national levels agencies and organizations been strengthened to plan, initiate, implement and evaluate actions to prevent and eliminate child labour?
- Has the entire target population been reached?
- What kinds of benefits have the target beneficiaries gained?
- How effective were the strategies implemented for child labour monitoring? Are the initiatives on child labour monitoring likely to be sustainable?
- In cases where the action programs link beneficiaries with existing programs, assess the value-added of the project's interventions.

Potential impact

- Assess the major high level changes that the project has contributed towards the project development objective at national and local levels
- Has the project generated unintended impacts on child labour prevention and elimination?

Relevance of the Project

- Examine whether the project responded to the real needs of the beneficiaries and stakeholders.
- Assess validity of the project approach and strategies and its potential to be replicated and scaled up.
- Assess whether the problems and needs that gave rise to the project still exists or have changed.
- How is this project supporting and contributing towards the formulation and implementation of a NAP? How did the strategy used in this project fit in with the national education, agriculture and anti-poverty efforts, and interventions carried out by other organizations (including national and international organizations)?
- How is this project supporting and contributing towards the formulation and implementation of a sustainable cacao industry strategy (involving private sector and government) in the two countries?

Sustainability

- Assess to what extent a phase out strategy has been defined and planned and what steps have been taken to ensure sustainability (e.g. government involvement).
- Assess whether these strategies had been articulated/explained to stakeholders.
- Examine if outcomes would last after project, based on the phase out strategy implemented.
- Assess whether the program's interventions to withdraw and prevent children from child labour are making lasting impacts on the beneficiaries. Will the result of children being withdrawn or prevented be sustained or are additional interventions needed?
- Assess what contributions the project has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national and local stakeholders (government and implementing agencies) and to encourage ownership of the project results to partners.
- Assess project success in leveraging resources for on-going and continuing efforts to prevent and eliminate child labour towards the formulation of a NAP.
- Analyze the level of private sector / employers' organizations support towards a NAP, paying specific attention to how these groups participated in project activities.
- Assess the degree to which the project has worked with a gender perspective, reflected in project design and implementation, with focus on sustainability of project outcomes.

Specific Aspects to be addressed:

- How has the project addressed the recommendations of the project implementation review?
- Assess knowledge sharing effectiveness between the project teams and with other IPEC project in the two countries (i.e. CCP)?
- Assess the validity and effectiveness of CCP and PPP strategy of working in some target common communities
- Assess with particular emphasis project contribution to strengthen joint work in the coca sector between the private sector and the government regarding CL (i.e. CLMS use by multiple actors such as government and private sector).
- How has the project contributed to the cocoa industry sustainability strategy (i.e. sector importance of elimination of CL)?
- Assess how far the project contributed to integrate the CLMSs to other social development government initiatives (i.e. Education sector and the Social Protection system) towards its institutionalization
- Assess the potential to expand the CLMS, taking in consideration in particular whether the CLMS in its current form is sustainable (i.e. the economics and in-country capacity for operating the CLMS)

Annex II: Log frame

Immediate objective No. 1 By the end of the project, Child Labour Monitoring Systems are strengthened and expanded
Output 1.1: Support to national and district level CLMS operations in both countries
Activity 1.1.1: Refine model CLMS in consultations with key stakeholders including ILO constituents and civil society and in coordination with the ECOWAS I and II and CCP projects across the two countries
Activity 1.1.2: <i>Identify opportunities to strengthen CLMS operations at Ministerial level through capacity assessments and skills training</i>
Activity 1.1.3: <i>Strengthen CLMS components at district level through ongoing training</i>
Activity 1.1.4: Development and sharing of knowledge and good practices on CLMS capacity building
Output 1.2: Strengthened pilot CLMS implementation
Activity 1.2.1: Provide technical assistance to support implementation of strategic plans to roll out CLMS in target communities
Activity 1.2.2: Support target communities to implement or strengthen CLMS
Output 1.3: Support for the development and implementation of Community Action Plans (CAPs) in cocoa-growing with a specific view to mobilizing support for CLMS
Activity 1.3.1: Support local communities and partners in developing CAPs that focus on the elimination of child labour in cocoa growing communities
Activity 1.3.2: Support target communities to implement and monitor CAPs in conjunction with CLMS work through ongoing training, including on the identification of hazardous child labour
Activity 1.3.3: Support communities in their resource mobilization for the implementation of their CAPs
Activity 1.3.4: <i>Support for child labour remediation efforts, targeted as needed in project communities</i>
Immediate objective No. 2: By the end of the project, the capacity of governments, social partners, cocoa farming families and other pertinent stakeholders to combat child labour, in particular through supporting and participating in CLMS in cocoa growing communities, is strengthened
Output 2.1: Strengthened capacity of Governments of Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire and social partners to contribute to effective CLMS
Activity 2.1.1: Conduct technical meetings and trainings with key national agencies and institutions to promote more effective contribution to CLMS
Activity 2.1.2: Create or adapt training materials on child labour, in particular on the identification of hazardous child labour
Activity 2.1.3: Design and carry out joint trainings, including for the social partners, on the identification of hazardous child labour and anti-trafficking measures.
Activity 2.1.4: Create and adapt training materials on child labour in cocoa growing communities for teachers on the basis of a gap analysis.

Activity 2.1.5: Using these materials, integrate of child labour training into pre-service and in-service teacher training programmes
Output 2.2: Strengthened capacity of district level authorities and social partners in target communities to enforce child labour-related policies and regulations, including CLMS
Activity 2.2.1: Organize workshops to assess and support the budgeting and planning capacity needs of the stakeholders in the intervention areas, including strategies to mobilize resources to fund CLMS
Activity 2.2.2: Provide ongoing training and technical assistance with a focus on CLMS to district level authorities and social partners
Output 2.3: Strengthened capacity in cocoa growing communities to eliminate child labour, including through participating in CLMS
Activity 2.3.1: In cooperation with ILO constituents and other relevant stakeholders, design and implement awareness raising campaigns in target communities, including on the identification of hazardous child labour in target communities
Immediate objective No. 3: By the end of the project, National Steering Committees (NSCs) lead improved coordination of efforts to combat child labour in cocoa growing communities
Output 3.1: Strengthened operational capacity of each country's NSC
Activity 3.1.1: Identify opportunities to strengthen the NSCs, including by promoting greater coordination between other national level organisations charged with the elimination of child labour in cocoa growing communities
Output 3.2: Support capacity building of NSCs to plan, coordinate and deliver according to their mandates
Activity 3.2.1: Review capacity needs among NSC members
Activity 3.2.2: Provide training and other technical assistance to NSCs, including on resource mobilization strategies and coordination of CLMS

Annex III: PIR Recommendations

The recommendations are presented by country under the various thematic headings and addressed to specific group of stakeholders. Nine recommendations are identified, with specific measures about how they might be implemented.

GHANA – GHANA CHILD LABOUR MONITORING SYSTEM (GCLMS)

Recommendation 1 addressed to NPECLC and the NSC (PPP and other IPEC initiatives are recommended to offer appropriate support): ***Improve effectiveness and sustainability of the GCLMS through the following measures:***

- Investigate re-establishing annual budgetary support from the Ministry of finance
- Investigate possibilities for public-private partnership funding
- Consider the merits of raising public awareness of child labour issues to create pressure to provide funding
- Develop advocacy within government to raise awareness of child labour monitoring issues so that all relevant ministries make child labour part of their sector plans (particularly the Ministry of Local Government)
- Circulate and follow up on the Memorandum Of Understanding signed with Ministries and Departments, to encourage its implementation
- Carry out a current cost analysis to inform the streamlining of the GCLMS
- Send correspondence between NPECLC and District Assemblies via the District Chief Executives and District Coordinating Directors and copied to the focal persons (Social Welfare Officer and NGOs)

Recommendation 2 addressed to district level stakeholders and the PPP project team: ***Improve effectiveness and sustainability of the GCLMS through the following measures:***

- Support and encourage coordinated advocacy by CCPCs, DCPCs, NGOs, local authority staff and other actors to encourage the mainstreaming of GCLMS and related issues (CAPs) into departmental and District Medium Term Development plans, Annual Action Plans and the composite budget. Make decentralisation work!
- Support and promote capacity building for District Chief Executives and District Finance Officers, especially in new districts, to ensure that they are aware of child labour issues
- Advocate for a revision of the Functional Organisation Assessment Tool (FOAT) used to assess DAs, in relation to child labour issues (Should the FOAT look at how CAPs and Area Council Plans feed into the development of Medium Term Development Plans? Should child labour have a higher profile in the evaluation tool?)
- Work to empower communities to demand child labour related services from their DAs
- Encourage alternative livelihoods programmes (skill development and microfinance) to enable families to supplement their income from cocoa
- Investigate sustainable markets for food crops through Ministry of Agriculture and others and consider a local trade show to market produce.

GHANA - CAPS

Recommendation 3 addressed to implementing agencies, other district level stakeholders and the PPP project team: **Improve effectiveness and sustainability of CAPs implementation and results with the following measures:**

- Explore all possible sources of public and private funding at both local and national levels;
- Build the capacity of communities to explore funding sources, develop proposals and advocate for the right to quality education and decent work. Develop local understanding of a rights-based approach and how to access local government services;
- Consider showcasing the CAPs at district level to market them to potential local funders;
- Advocate appropriately for the extension of state social interventions to cover PPP communities;
- Explore options for livelihood support that the PPP can realistically offer in the remaining time;

GHANA - DIRECT BENEFICIARIES

Recommendation 4 addressed to implementing agencies and the PPP project team: **to ensure that direct beneficiary targets are met and successfully reported, implement the following measures:**

- Finish the needs assessment as soon as possible and decide what to do about any short fall.
- Start reporting on direct beneficiaries as soon as possible to iron out any problems using the DMBR and ensure a minimum of three months monitoring before the end of the project.

CÔTE D'IVOIRE - SYSTÈME D'OBSERVATION DU TRAVAIL DES ENFANTS EN CÔTE D'IVOIRE SOSTECI

Recommendation 5 addressed to local level SOSTECI implementation partners and the PPP project team: **Improve effectiveness and sustainability of the SOSTECI through the following measures:**

- Strengthen the capacity of state agencies responsible for meeting the needs of children withdrawn or at risk of child labour by
 - i. *Advocacy towards decentralised authorities (Regional and town councils) for material and financial support and to devolved authorities (Prefectures, Sub-prefecture, ministerial bodies, ...) to request their support ;*
 - ii. *Involving decentralised and devolved agencies in SOSTECI training ;*
 - iii. *Asking PPP implementing agencies to contribute to strengthening local platforms for coordinated action.*
- Resolve the issue of coordination of child protection issues at local level by
 - i. *Establishing if the SOSTECI framework clarifies this*
 - ii. *If necessary, mapping existing agencies in each area*
 - iii. *Where necessary, advocating for locally appropriate solutions*
- Find effective and creative solutions to the issue of covering costs and recognising the efforts of different actors involved in rolling out the SOSTECI (e.g.: *by delivering certificates, bicycles, T-shirts etc. ;*)

- Investigate the feasibility of developing systems and support for using local foster families
 - i. *Identify and raise awareness of the need at community level*
 - ii. *Identify voluntary foster families*
 - iii. *Build the capacity of these families*
 - iv. *Identify a strategy for reintegration of children cared for by such families*
 - v. *Ensure regular monitoring of children placed in foster families*

CÔTE D'IVOIRE - CAPS

Recommendation 6 addressed to implementing agencies, other local level stakeholders and the PPP project team: **Establish effective local platforms** to encourage collaboration between all the agencies concerned as a means of improving coordination, collaboration, training and resource mobilisation and supporting the effective roll out of the SOSTECI. (NB: this was also a recommendation emerging from the CCP PIR in February 2013).

CÔTE D'IVOIRE - DIRECT BENEFICIARIES

Recommendation 7 addressed to implementing agencies and the PPP project team: **to ensure that direct beneficiary targets are met and successfully reported, implement the following measures:**

- Start reporting on direct beneficiaries as soon as possible to iron out any problems using the DMBR and ensure a minimum of three months monitoring before the end of the project
- Follow up on the suggestions related to supporting schoolchildren to obtain birth certificates

CÔTE D'IVOIRE - TRAINING FOR WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS:

Recommendation 8 addressed to the PPP project team and implementing agencies: **Ensure that relevant organisations** are invited to national and local training events and encourage them to get actively involved in replicating training themselves so that awareness continues to grow concerning occupational health and safety and workers and employer' rights and responsibilities.

GHANA AND CÔTE D'IVOIRE – PROMOTING PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY AND IMPACT

Recommendation 9 addressed to the PPP project team and implementing agencies: **to promote the sustainability and impact of the project results, consider the following measures:**

- Review PPP capacity building activities at community levels to ensure that the project is doing everything possible with the resources available. Operational, organisational and economic aspects should be reviewed.
- Where possible, strengthen systems for circulating information between actors at community, local government and national levels.
- Project finances permitting, request a no-cost extension for several months to complete and consolidate activities
- Identify PPP good practices and try to develop a forum for sharing these and the overall PPP achievements with the donor consortium and the individual companies concerned

Annex B: Field work agendas

GHANA

Oct 21 Tuesday	09.00-13.00h	ILO
	14.30-16.00h	Cargill, Mondelez, Hershey
Oct 22 Wednesday	08.30h	Travel from Accra to field visits 12h-14h- Meeting with Oasis Found (IA) 14h-16h- Meeting with SW officer and GCLMS focal point with a possibility to meet briefly with the DCE 16h-17h- Meeting with key DCPC members
Oct 23 Thursday	09.00-17.00h	AM Visit to Tweapease (plus sub-communities if/as possible) Meeting with CCPCs including data collectors, teachers and traditional leaders (plus those that have been recipient of support, training etc. as possible) PM Visit to Ankaako (plus sub-communities if/as possible) Meeting with CCPCs including data collectors, teachers and traditional leaders (plus those that have been recipient of support, training etc. as possible)
Oct 24 Friday	09.00-17.00h	AM Open space for meetings (with those we did not manage to see days before) 12h-14h – ICT Centre commissioning 14h - Return to Accra
Oct 27 Monday	09.00-17.00h	NPECLC – 10:00 am @ NPECLC Office
Oct 28 Tuesday	09.00-13.00h	ICI – 10:00 am / GAWU – 11:15 am / CLU 12:30pm
	14.30-16.00h	Debriefing with ILO
Oct 29 Wednesday	09.00-16.00h	National Workshop

CÔTE D'IVOIRE

Oct 27 Monday	09.00-13.00h	ILO
	14.30-16.00h	Interviews with project partners in Abidjan (CIM, DLTE, CNS...)
Oct 28 Tuesday	09.00-17.00h	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with project partners in Abidjan (CTLTE, ICI, PATRONAT) • Donor representatives (Nestle, Mars, Adm, Barry...)
Oct 29 Wednesday	09.00-17.00h	Travel from Abidjan to M'BATTO + Meeting with SOSTECI coordination and IA (Social centre) at district level
Oct 30 Thursday	09.00-17.00h	Field visit to community 1 (ASSOUMOUKRO) and community 2 (TCHECOU)
Oct 31 Friday	09.00-17.00h	Travel to BOUAFLE+ Meeting with SOSTECI coordination and IA at district level
Nov 01 Saturday	09.00-17.00h	Field visit to community 3 (IRIBAFLA) + Field community 4 (BANTIFLA)
Nov 02 Sunday	09.00-17.00h	Travel from field visits to Abidjan
Nov 4 Tuesday	09.00-17.00h	Interviews with project partners in Abidjan (rest)
Nov 5 Wednesday	09.00-13.00h	Interviews with project partners in Abidjan (rest)
	14.30-16.00h	Debriefing with ILO
Nov 6 Thursday	09.00-16.00h	National Workshop

Annex C: List of documents reviewed

1. PPP Prodoc. 2011.
2. PPP technical Progress reports and status updates. 2011-2014.
3. Etude de base sur le travail des enfants dans la culture du cacao dans les Départements de Bouaflé, MbattoDaoukro, Issia et Soubré. 2013.
4. Rapid census (listing) and baseline survey in four (4) cocoa-growing districts in Ghana. Community and School Report. 2012.
5. Rapid census (listing) and baseline survey in four (4) cocoa-growing districts in Ghana. Survey Report. 2012.
6. Institutional and Social Intervention Mapping and Capacity Needs Assessment of District and Community Level Partners for Child Labour Elimination. 2012.
7. *Public Private Partnership to combat child labour in cocoa growing communities in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire*. Project Implementation Review (PIR). 2013.
8. Draft Final Evaluation of ECOWAS I & II PROJECTS (Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour in West Africa And Strengthening Sub-Regional Cooperation in West Africa). 2014.
9. Pilot report on Ghana Child labour Monitoring System (GCLMS). MERL. 2013.
10. Framework of Action to Support Implementation of the Harkin-Engel Protocol. 2010.
11. CLCCG Annual Report 2013.

Annex D: List of persons interviewed

INCEPTION PHASE		
Person	Organisation	Position/Department
Benjamin Smith	ILO-Geneva	Corporate Social Responsibility Senior officer, FPRW-IPEC
Alexandre Soho	ILO-Geneva	Senior Programme and Operations Officer(FPRW/IPEC)
Ricardo Furman	ILO-Geneva	IPEC Evaluation and Impact Assessment unit , FPRW-IPEC
Susan Smith	Global Issues Group in the Chocolate and Cocoa Industry-USA	Donor

FIELD PHASE – NATIONAL STAKEHOLDERS - GHANA		
Person	Organisation	Position/Department
Maria Joao Vasquez	ILO/IPEC	Project coordinator
Stephen McClelland	ILO/IPEC	Project CTA
Sarah Adjei	Mondelez	Project Officer
Sam Quaye	Cargill Ghana Ltd	Sustainability Manager
Ken Mamudu	NPECLC	Programme Manager
Justice Safo	NPECLC	Project Officer
Gabriel Tetteh	NPECLC	Project Officer
Elizabeth Akanbenbire	Child labour Unit	Head
Christian Anang	Child labour Unit	Officer
Cyprian Laryea	Child labour Unit	Officer
Joshua Asamoah	Child labour Unit	Officer
Frank Osei Kofi	ICI	Livelihood Associate
Prince Gyamfi	ICI	Programme Coordinator
Avril kudzi	ICI	National Coordinator
Isadore Armah	ICI	Programme Coordinator
Daniel Adjei Sarpong	Oasis Foundation	Project Coordinator
Samuel Kwakye	Oasis Foundation	Project Assistant
Samuel Antwi	Oasis Foundation	Staff
Mathew Hayford	Oasis Foundation	Staff
Andrews Tagoe	General Agricultural Workers Union (GAWU)	Head of Training and Education

NATIONAL EVALUATION WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS- GHANA		
Person	Organisation	Position/Department
Ken Mamudu	NPECLC	Programme Manager
Justice Safo	NPECLC	Project Officer
Issah Mushin	NPECLC	Project Officer
Daniel Adjei Sarpong	Oasis Foundation	Project Coordinator
Kobina Atta	CCPC	Member
John Boahene	CCPC	Secretary
Hannah Agyapong	CCPC	Member
Abu Irahimb	Development Fortress	Project coordinator
Charles Asante Bempong	Ghana Employers Association	Research &Project Manager
Pascal Kaba	GAWU	Senior Programme Officer
Isadore Armah	ICI	Programme Coordinator
Yvonne Owusu Sekyere	ADM Cocoa Ghana Ltd	HR Supervisor
Tawia Agyarko Kwarteng	The Hershey Company	Cocoa Sustainability Manager
Sylvester Ntiamao	DCPC	District Social Welfare officer
Charles Senyo	DCPC	Social Welfare officer
Ellis Owusu	DCPC	Chairman, Social Services Committee
Nana Aidoo	DCPC	District Director of Education
Nana Afesah	DCPC	Traditional Ruler
Elizabeth Akanbenbire	Child labour Unit	Head
Maria Joao Vasquez	ILO	Project Coordinator
Akpene Amenumey	ILO	IPEC Assistant
Joseph Nabir	ILO	Field Coordinator
Daniel Chachu	ILO	NPO (M&E)
Barbara Welstein	Nestle	Public Affairs Manager

FIELD PHASE – NATIONAL STAKEHOLDERS - CÔTE D'IVOIRE		
Person	Organisation	Position
BOUA BI Sémien Honoré	BIT-IPEC	International Program Manager
OUATTARA P. Gervais	IPEC-PPP	NOP
Laurent GUITTEY	IPEC-CCP	NOP
Christophe KOUAME	ICRAF	Director
Moctar SANGARE	Mars Inc.	Représentant
David LOUE	ADM	Director Développement Durable
DJI Florent	ADM	Forecast Sp
N'DAN AOUSSI Marie Laure	Saco-Barry-Callebaut	Responsable CSR
HOBAN Christian	DLTE	S/Director
OUFFOUET Raïssa	DLTE	S/Directrice
TANOASSOH Agnès	DLTE	S/Directrice
BAGOUE DIEI Alice Irma	DLTE	Assistante de Direction
KOUASSI Koffi Armand	DLTE	Agent technique
SILUE T. Benjamin	DLTE	Agent technique
RABET Jean	CTLTE	Coordonnateur
LADOUYOU Edouard	CGECI	Responsable questions Sociale
Donatien AWOKOU	ICI	Assistant Programme
KWAMIN YA Flora	Centre Social M'BATTO	Directrice
N'GORAN KOUAKOU Alexis	Direction Régionale Ministère de la famille Bouaflé	Director Régional

NATIONAL EVALUATION WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS- CÔTE D'IVOIRE		
Person	Person	Person
BOUA BI Sémien Honoré	BIT-IPEC	International Program Manager
OUATTARA P. Gervais	IPEC-PPP	NOP
Laurent GUITTEY	IPEC-CCP	NOP
BREDOU Atta Georges	ICRAF	Manager Développement Communautaire
N'DA AOUSSI Marie Laure	Saco-Barry-Callebaut	Responsable CSR
Youssef KONE	GEPEX	Assistant du Secrétaire Général
LADOUYOU Edouard	CGECI	Responsable questions Sociale
TANO ASSOH Agnès	DLTE	S/Directrice
KOFFI Monique	BIT/IPEC	Field officer
SMITH Benjamin	BIT/IPEC	Back Stopper
BULL Pee John	ONG AWECO	Director
GNALY Alexis	SOSTECI	Coordinator
Mathilde Socoty KOUÉI	NESTLE	Field
Maria Joao VASQUEZ	BIT/PPP	International Coordinator
ADOU Kouamé Joachin	CLV Assoumoukro	President
AKA Kande Narcisse	CLV Tchekou	President
N'ZI Brou Yacinthe	Centre social M'Batto	Assistant Social
KWAMIN YA Flora		Directrice
N'GORAN KOUAKOU Alexis	Direction Régionale Ministère de la famille Bouaflé	Director Régional
DIGBEUTI Jean Gabin		Assistant Technique
BOLOU Didier	CLV Irribafla	Membre
KOUAME BI Za	CLV Bantifla	President
AKEGNAN Martial	BIT/IPEC	AAF Soubre
NAOUNOU Désiré Ange	BIT/IPEC	AAF Abidjan
Donatien AWOKOU	ICI	Assistant Programme
Stephen McClelland	ILO/IPEC	Project CTA
KONE Niamien		Chargé de Programme/Projet
Dr N'GUESSAN Joseph	ONG FSL	President
Charles KAPIE	BIT/IPC/PPP	Evaluator (National Consultant)

The evaluators also interviewed/met with numerous District level, CCPCs and DCPCs, CLMSs representatives; community members, children, parents and schools teachers and principals in both countries.

ILO-FPRW/IPEC

Independent Final Evaluation

**“Project Combatting Child Labour in Cocoa Growing Communities in
Ghana and Côte d’Ivoire”**

Inception Report

Table of contents

1. Introduction	69
2. Background on project and context	69
3. The PPP Project	71
3.1 <i>Introduction</i>	71
3.2 <i>Project objectives</i>	71
3.3 <i>Project strategy</i>	71
4. Independent final evaluation	72
4.1 <i>Purpose</i>	72
4.2 <i>Scope</i>	73
5. Aspects to be addressed	73
5.1 <i>Evaluation criteria</i>	73
5.2 <i>Evaluation questions</i>	74
6. Methodology	76
6.1 <i>Evaluation framework</i>	76
6.2 <i>Evaluation principles</i>	76
6.3 <i>Methods and techniques</i>	76
7. Evaluation phases	79
7.1 <i>Preparatory phase (activities to date)</i>	79
7.2 <i>Field phase</i>	80
7.3 <i>Reporting phase</i>	81
7.4 <i>Evaluation organization</i>	82
7.5 <i>Language needs in Ghana and Côte d’Ivoire</i>	82
8. Workplan	83
Annexes	84
<i>Annex 1. Methodology matrix</i>	84
<i>Annex 2. Field work agendas</i>	94
<i>Annex 3. Interview guides</i>	95
<i>Annex 4. In country workshop (methodology and tools)</i>	109
<i>Annex 5. National consultants’ country reports format and contents</i>	112

1. Introduction

The Inception Report is based on all prior discussions with ILO-IPEC, the ToR, the Document Review and the Team Leader (TL) preliminary interviews with ILO/IPEC HQ and backstopping officials through conference calls interviews from home. The TL with inputs from the Local Consultants (LC) has developed the inception report with common evaluation instruments (in-countries sample agendas, interview guides; national workshops...). The Expanded Independent Evaluation is conducted by the independent evaluation team, coordinated by the Evaluation TL under **the overall supervision of the IPEC EIA at ILO Headquarters.**

2. Background on project and context

The Evaluation Team have a full understanding of the background to the project and its context.

The aim of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child labour (IPEC)¹⁰ is the progressive elimination of child labour, especially its worst forms. The political will and commitment of individual governments to address child labour - in cooperation with employers' and workers' organizations, non-governmental organizations and other relevant parties in society- is the basis for FPRW-IPEC action. FPRW-IPEC support at the country level is based on a phased, multi-sector strategy. This strategy includes strengthening national capacities to deal with this issue, legislation harmonization, improvement of the knowledge base, raising awareness on the negative consequences of child labour, promoting social mobilization against it, and implementing demonstrative direct action programmes (AP) to prevent children from child labour and remove child workers from hazardous work and provide them and their families with appropriate alternatives.

The operational strategy of FPRW-IPEC has over the years focus on providing support to national and local constituents and partners through their project and activities. Such support has to the extent possible been provided in context of national frameworks, institutions and process that have facilitated the building of capacities and mobilisation for further action. It has emphasized various degrees of a comprehensive approach, providing linkages between action and partners in sectors and areas of work relevant for child labour. Whenever possible specific national framework or programmes have provided such focus.

Starting in 2001, FPRW-IPEC has promoted the implementation of such national frameworks through the national Time Bound Programme (TBP) approach which has evolved into the current NAPs. The NAP is the framework to operationalize the national Child Labour (CL) labour policy as a statement of a country's course or approach to dealing with the problem of CL. It is intended to be a set of coherent and complementary policies, strategies and interventions with the long-term purpose of reducing and eventually eliminating CL.

The Global Action Plan (GAP), proposed in the 2006 Global Report on Child Labour and endorsed by the Governing Body at its November 2006 sitting, reinforced this emphasis by calling on all ILO member States to put appropriate time-bound measures using National Action Plans (NAP), in place by 2008 with a view to eliminating the WFCL by 2016.

The NAPs incorporate lessons learned from the earlier TBPs, especially in terms of process, the importance of institutions, and the role FPRW-IPEC and other ILO units can play to ensure broad mobilization and sustainability. The recent experience has emphasized the facilitation and enhancement of national ownership, using a participatory approach involving government departments, the social partners and other key stakeholders at national, sub-national and sectorial levels.

¹⁰ IPEC is an ILO Program operating under the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work branch (FPRW) at the Governance and Tripartism Department.

NAPs are designed to be based on existing and planned interventions in all relevant social and economic sectors, with linkages to UNDAF and other UN programmes. They represent a programme framework, not a standalone project. The NAP formulation and implementation is a national responsibility, requiring national leadership and ownership, as well as national resource mobilization.

FPRW-IPEC strategy, settled under the Decent Work Country Programmes, in Africa, states that FPRW-IPEC will work with all countries; and sub-regional and regional bodies, towards the elimination of child labour, depending on our comparative advantage and the availability of resources. Towards this end, efforts will be made to beef up capacity for upstream support in the region. The orientation is to rebalancing FPRW-IPEC support in favour of upstream activities (especially policy advice, advocacy, knowledge development and sharing, and capacity building), with direct actions emphasizing the development of mechanisms that ensure mainstreaming into the work of mandated institutions

From the perspective of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the elimination of child labour is part of its work on standards and fundamental principles and rights at work. The fulfilment of these standards should guarantee decent work for all adults. In this sense, the ILO provides technical assistance to its three constituents: government, workers and employers. This tripartite structure is the key characteristic of ILO cooperation and it is within this framework that the activities developed by the Programme will be analyzed.

ILO Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) have subsequently been developed and are being introduced in the ILO to provide a mechanism to outline agreed upon priorities between the ILO and the national constituent partners within a broader UN and International development context.

The DWCP defines a corporate focus on priorities, operational strategies, as well as a resource and implementation plan that complements and supports partner plans for national decent work priorities. As such, DWCP are broader frameworks to which the individual ILO project is linked and contributes to. DWCP are beginning to be gradually introduced into various countries' planning and implementing frameworks. The two countries have DCWP, at different stages of evolution that will be considered in this evaluation.

Since 2001, efforts to combat the worst forms of child labour in cocoa production have also been supported by the international cocoa industry. In September 2001, the Chocolate Manufacturers' Association (CMA), the World Cocoa Foundation (WCF) and other bodies, including the International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations (IUF), signed the "Protocol for the Growing and Processing of Cocoa Beans and their Derivative Products in a Manner that Complies with ILO Convention 182 concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour", which is known as the Harkin-Engel Protocol.

An outcome of the Harkin-Engel Protocol has been the creation of the International Cocoa Initiative (ICI) Foundation in 2002. The industry-funded ICI is a coalition of the global chocolate industry, the IUF, and NGOs whose mission is "to oversee and sustain efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labour and forced labour in the growing and processing of cocoa beans and their derivative products." The ILO helped with the setting up of the Foundation and is a member of its Advisory Council.

In 13 September 2010, the governments of Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire, the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) and the International Cocoa Industry signed a Declaration of Joint Action to Support Implementation of the Harkin-Engel Protocol, which provides for a Framework of Action to coordinate measures to help achieve the goals of the Harkin-Engel Protocol and to accelerate the reduction of the worst forms of child labour in the production of cocoa. The cocoa industry and ILO-FPRW/IPEC are carrying on together several initiatives within this framework.

3. The PPP Project

3.1 Introduction

The PPP project is implemented under the FPRW-IPEC strategic programme on child labour in West Africa/ECOWAS region and under the Declaration of Joint Action to Support Implementation of the Harkin-Engel Protocol.

Regarding West Africa FPRW-IPEC strategy the project is particularly aligned to the projects “ECOWAS I and II”, that ended in April 2014, and ‘Towards Child Labour Free Cocoa Growing Communities in Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana through an Integrated Area Based Approach’ (CCP) to end in December 2014 and the Project “Creating a protective Environment for Children in Cocoa Growing Communities in Soubré, Côte d’Ivoire”, ending in August 2015. The five projects have been/are under a common management structure (with clear responsibilities specified by project), aiming at the same development objective and working in some cases with the same stakeholders. The common structure and alignment allow for cross-fertilization among projects and increase efficiency and effectiveness.

The ECOWAS I and II ended in April 2014. The CCP and the PPP projects are still being implemented. The CCP has had an Expanded Independent Final Evaluation in July-August current year. The project in Soubré will run a mid-term self-evaluation in October 2014.

The project is a partnership between the ILO and a number of companies in the chocolate and confectionery industry seeks to eliminate CL and to ensure workforce continuity in cocoa growing farms by younger generations, as a contribution to the implementation of the 2010 Framework of Action to Support Implementation of the Harkin-Engel Protocol on CL in cocoa (described in the previous section).

3.2 Project objectives

The Development Objective of the project is “To accelerate progress in the elimination of child labour, with a focus on its worst forms, in cocoa growing communities in Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana”.

The project has the following immediate objectives:

- **I.O.1:** By the end of the project, child labour monitoring system (CLMS) are strengthened and expanded.
- **I.O.2:** By the end of the project, the capacity of governments, social partners’ cocoa farming families and other stakeholders to participate in and support CLMS activity is strengthened.
- **I.O.3:** By the end of the PPP, National Steering Committees (NSCs) lead improved coordination of efforts to combat child labour in cocoa growing.

3.3 Project strategy

The project strategy includes interventions at the macro, meso and micro levels. It focusses on three interrelated and mutually reinforcing areas: CLMS, capacity building and coordination. Immediate Objective 2 on capacity building supports Immediate Objective 1 on CLMS. The accomplishment of Immediate Objectives 1 and 2 can be further increased through Immediate Objective 3.

The project strategy has been designed taking in consideration the implementation of a major FWPR-IPEC project in both countries, CCP. The CCP and PPP will mutually reinforce and leverage from this close coordination, keeping each project separate and distinct character. Among key linkages are working in strengthening the CLMSs in both countries, strengthening NSCs and provide direct support to communities

4. Independent final evaluation

A final independent evaluation will be conducted to examine the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, potential impact and sustainability of the project. The evaluation report will include findings on whether the project has achieved its stated objectives, produced the desired outputs, and the extent to which it realized the proposed objectives. This evaluation will also identify strengths and weaknesses in the project design, strategy, and implementation as well as lessons learned and conclusions with recommendations for ILO's consideration. *The evaluation will comply with the ILO evaluation policy, which is based on the United Nations Evaluation Norms and Standards; and the UNEG ethical guidelines will be followed.*

4.1 Purpose

Globally, as specified in the Terms of reference, the main purposes of the independent final evaluation are:

- a. Determine project effectiveness at the national, district and community levels: achievement of Project objectives and understanding how and why have/have not been achieved.
- b. Identify relevant unintended/unexpected results at outcome and impact levels.
- c. Establish the relevance of the project outcomes and the level of sustainability attained.
- d. Provide recommendations regarding relevant stakeholders, building on the achievements of the Project in supporting the NAPs at the national level toward the sustainability of the project outcomes and initial impacts.
- e. Provide recommendations on the partnership of the cocoa industry and ILO (i.e. for the cocoa industry and ILO as key stakeholders).
- f. To identify emerging potential good practices for key stakeholders.

More specifically, the evaluation will pay special attention to the following key issues:

- **The PPP approach and strategy:** Coordination and complementarities with other IPEC projects, notably the CCP, and the validity and effectiveness of PPP strategy of working in some target common communities (with CCP) and some “stand alone communities”.
- **The CLMS support effectiveness; its sustainability and its potential to expand the CLMS,** taking in consideration:
 - Pilot CLMS implementation.
 - Degree of integration and coordination among actors.
 - Human and financial capacities in place.
 - Existence of referral systems and related services available.
 - CLMS institutionalization and ownership.
 - Key parties' commitment (e.g. through policy and budgetary support) in contributing towards CLMS sustainability and replication.
- **Capacity Building:** To what extent National/Local capacities on NAP/CAP design and implementation have been enhanced; to what extent institutional coordination has been improved with all stakeholders involved.
- **Industry support to Child Labour combat efforts:**

- Project contribution towards Joint work between the private sector and the government.
- Project contribution to the cocoa industry sustainability strategy.
- Possibilities of enhanced joint work against child labour between the industry and the ILO and its partners.

Also, as requested by the TORs, the final evaluation will seek to provide all stakeholders (i.e. the national and sub national/local stakeholders, the project management team, the donor and ILO/FPRW-IPEC) with information to assess strategies, objectives, partnership arrangements and resources. It should identify the potential impact on mainstreaming policy and strategies and suggest a possible way forward for the future.

4.2 Scope

As specified in the TORs, the evaluation will focus on the ILO/FPRW-IPEC project mentioned above, its achievements and its contribution to the overall national and sub-regional efforts to achieve the elimination of WFCL. The evaluation will focus on all the activities that have been implemented since the start of the projects to the moment of the field visits.

The evaluation will look at the project as a whole and in relation to CCP and ECOWAS I and II projects, including issues of initial project design, implementation, sustainability of outcomes and impact, lessons learnt replicability and recommendations for current and future programmes.

The evaluation will cover expected (i.e. planned) and unexpected results in terms of non-planned outputs and outcomes (i.e. side effects or externalities). Some of these unexpected changes could be as relevant as the ones planned. Therefore, the evaluation team will reflect on them for learning purposes.

The analytical scope will include identifying levels of achievement of objectives and explaining how and why have been attained in such ways (and not in other alternative expected ways, if this would be the case).

5. Aspects to be addressed

As requested by the TORs, the evaluation will address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability (and potential impact) to the extent possible as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-Based Evaluation: Principles, Rationale, Planning and Managing for Evaluations (i-eval resource kit)', January 2012.

Gender concerns will be addressed in accordance with ILO Guidance note 4: "Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of projects". To the extent possible, all data (when available) will be sex-disaggregated and different needs of women and men and of marginalized groups targeted by the programme will be considered throughout the evaluation process.

In line with results-based framework approach used by ILO-IPEC for identifying results at global, strategic and project level, the evaluation will focus on identifying and analysing results through addressing key questions related to the evaluation concerns and the achievement of the Immediate Objectives of the project using data from the project indicators.

5.1 Evaluation criteria

The evaluation will address the **general areas of focus** (evaluation criteria):

- **Design**
The evaluation will assess to what extent the project design was appropriate to achieve the expected outputs and objectives.
- **Relevance**
The evaluation will analyse the relevance of the project in supporting development challenges identified in the project document and the national development priorities of the countries in which it was implemented.
- **Effectiveness and efficiency of the project (Implementation of the process and achievement of objectives)**
The estimation of the effectiveness will be made through the data from the project indicators. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the projects' outputs and objectives have been achieved to date. For this purpose, it will be verified if the expected inputs were achieved, determining to what extent it has been possible to attain what was intended and if these inputs were sufficient to accomplish the specific objective.
- **Potential impact**
The potential, foreseen and unforeseen, project impacts will be assessed, whether they are positive or negative.
- **Sustainability**
The evaluation will examine the likelihood of the continuation of benefits from the project after it has been completed, in other words the probability of continued PPP long-term benefits.

5.2 Evaluation questions

To the extent possible the evaluation will address all the **questions/aspects**, detailed in the ToR; and will pay special attention to the following:

- **Strengths and weaknesses** of the project.
- **Results (planned or unplanned)** obtained so far by the project (CLMS, NSC CAPs, Direct intervention).
- **Coordination and complementarities with other IPEC projects** in the two countries (i.e. CCP)?
- The validity and effectiveness of CCP and PPP strategy of working in some target **common communities**.
- Major changes that the project has contributed at **national, district and local levels**.
- Impacts in the **Children/Families/Communities**.
- **Unintended impacts** on child labour prevention and elimination.
- Were **country needs and priorities** regarding CL identified and addressed by the project?
- Were **project strategies, methodologies** and overall **approach** relevant to address country needs and priorities?
- To what extent did the project **collaborate with the government**? Were collaborations appropriate, effective, and did they **fit under the national action plan**?
- Does the PPP respond to the real **needs** of the beneficiaries? And the communities?

- Which were **criteria for selecting the beneficiaries** of these activities? Who defined these criteria?

CLMS

- Relevance, effectiveness and quality of the **PPP support to the CLMS**.
- **Pilot CLMS implementation:** strengths & weaknesses/challenges.
- Does the CLMS produce **reports, statistics...** reflecting their findings? If so, are they **used for community, district and/or national -level actions**?
- What's the degree of **integration and coordination among actors** at the various levels of action (community, district, national)?
- Are the **human and financial capacities** in place sufficient for CLMS implementation?
- **CLMS institutionalization:** integration to other social development government initiatives (i.e. Education sector and the Social Protection system).
- Is there a **referral system** in place? If so, what are the related **services available**?
- **CLMS Sustainability.**
- **Replication/Scaling up potential.**
- What are the **remaining gaps and bottlenecks** to address regarding CLMS?

Capacity Building

- To what extent **National/Local capacities on NAP/CAP design and implementation** have been enhanced?
- Capacity of the **National Steering Committees** to lead improved coordination of efforts to combat child labour in cocoa growing communities.
- To what extent **institutional coordination** has been improved with all stakeholders involved?
- To what extent the CL, activities and processes have been taken up and **integrated into national strategies and policies** (such as education and poverty reduction)?
- Capacities in cocoa growing communities to eliminate child labour, **including through participating in CLMS**.
- Capacity of district level authorities and social partners to enforce child labour-related policies and regulations, **including CLMS in target communities**.
- To what extent **key parties** involved such as, national governments, other institutions and potential donors are **committed** (e.g. through policy and budgetary support) in **contributing** towards the CCP outputs (NAPs, CAPs, CLMS...) **sustainability**.

Industry/Private sector

- **Private sector/employers' organizations support to Child Labour** combat efforts and NAP implementation.
- **Project contribution to strengthen joint work** in the cocoa sector between the private sector and the government regarding CL (i.e. CLMS use by multiple actors such as government and private sector)
- **Project contribution to the cocoa industry sustainability strategy** (i.e. sector importance of elimination of CL)?

- **How joint work** against child labour between the industry and the ILO and its partners **could be enhanced?**

6. Methodology

6.1 Evaluation framework

The methodology for the evaluation will take into account: i) the need for identifying country specific issues, needs and constraints; ii) the need to evaluate country, programme and project (action programmes) levels of achievement, lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations – and taking into account the different stages of progress in Ghana and Côte d’Ivoire; iii) the need to formulate conclusions and recommendations as an input into future strategy and follow-up; iv) the project’s logical framework and indicators to be used as a basis for addressing key questions.

The evaluation will be carried out in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy, the ILO Guideline, the specific ILO-IPEC Guidelines and Notes, the UN System Evaluation Standards and Norms, and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard.

6.2 Evaluation principles

- **Usefulness:** The evaluation aims to be useful, particularly to support decision-making.
- **Impartiality:** Evaluators will avoid bias and protect impartiality at all stages of the evaluation, thereby supporting the credibility of the evaluation process and results. The reports will present the evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations in a complete and balanced way.
- **Independence:** The evaluators have been selected with due regard to their independence and professionalism to avoid potential conflicts of interest.
- **Quality:** The evaluation will employ design, planning and implementation processes that are inherently quality oriented, covering appropriate methodologies for data collection, analysis and interpretation.
- **Competence:** Those engaged in conducting the evaluation have all necessary skills to conduct high-quality and ethical work.
- **Transparency and consultation:** Transparency and consultation with the major stakeholders are essential features in all stages of the evaluation process. This improves the credibility and quality of the evaluation. It can facilitate consensus building and ownership of the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

6.3 Methods and techniques

The selection of methods and techniques has been established in order to assure relevant data collection regarding, the evidence needed to best answer the evaluation questions and the analyses that are most appropriate to generate useful findings and address the evaluation criteria.

To strengthen the credibility and usefulness of evaluation results, to ensure data accuracy and facilitate its interpretation the evaluation will use a mix of data sources collected through multiple methods and techniques. This use of mixed methods and data from mixed sources or “triangulation” will facilitate the evaluators to overcome the bias that comes from single information sources, the use of single methods or single observations.

Evaluation methods and techniques will collect primary and secondary data. Primary data will consist on information the evaluators observe or collect directly from stakeholders about their first-hand

experience with the intervention. This data will be collected through, meetings, focus group discussions, and interviews that involve direct contact with the respondents. It can facilitate deeper understanding of the project, the project's results and the observed changes and the factors that contributed to change. Collection of data through interviews or focus groups will be carried out in a confidential manner.

Secondary data is documentary evidence that has direct relevance for the purposes of the evaluation and that has been produced by the ILO, other individuals or agencies for purposes other than those of the evaluation.

Annex I: Methodology Matrix, contains the indicators and key questions for the evaluation criteria; links them with the different evaluation methods and techniques proposed; and with the different stakeholders involved.

Evaluation methods and techniques will include:

1. **Comprehensive document review**

Including the project document; action programmes; technical plans and reports; CMES framework and datasets; Mid-Term Review report; projects/countries baselines and research data and reports; Decent Work Country Programmes; etc.

2. **Interviews**

The evaluation will conduct interviews with key stakeholder's representing:

- IPEC-EIA staff.
- Project management and staff.
- ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials.
- Partner agencies.
- Child labour programs in the country.
- Social partners Employers' and Workers' groups.
- Government stakeholders (e.g. representatives from Department Labour, Social Development etc.).
- Policy makers.
- Direct beneficiaries, i.e. boys and girls (taking ethical consideration into account.).
- Parents of boys and girls.
- Community members as identified by the project management and evaluation leader.
- Donor at global level (GIG) and in the two countries (i.e. local companies' representatives).
- Private sector stakeholder.

These interviews will adopt several formats:

2.a **One-to-one semi-structured interviews**

They will be useful, on the one hand, to gather information and opinions about the role played by the different actors involved in the design, implementation and management of the program.

2.b **Group Interviews with project's technical and managing staff (and related ILO departments)**

These interviews will mainly serve to collect qualitative data on the development of the project's cycle in its different phases, their effects and their relevance. It will also be useful to investigate the rest of the criteria considered in the evaluation.

2.c Group Interviews with project’s stakeholders

In some cases arranging individual meetings with key stakeholders (private sector, worker’s and Employer’s representatives, NGOs, beneficiaries...) might present difficulties. In these cases, group interviews with their representatives instead of individual interviews will be carried out in order to ensure the collection of qualitative information necessary for the evaluation.

Focus groups with key stakeholders will be useful to obtain qualitative information about their opinions of the project and its effects, according to their subjective perceptions.

2.d Focused interviews

When necessary, the evaluation TL and/or the NC will carry out additional focused interviews, to deepen those aspects that may require further investigation (these interviews will most likely be conducted electronically –Skype, e-mail- after the field visit phase).

2.e Phone and Skype interviews, emails

Interviews with ILO/IPEC HQ and backstopping officials were conducted by the TL through conference calls (Skype, phone) interviews from home.

The different types of interviews will pay special attention to how/if the actions undertaken and the services provided by the project adjust to the needs and expectations of the different actors.

The information obtained in the interviews will be cross checked with that obtained by other research methods used in the evaluation, in order to obtain general and valid judgments about the project development, its effects, their relevance and sustainability.

In particular, the intersection of qualitative data – from interviews- and quantitative data - basically obtained through documentary analysis- will allow an external validation of the different subjective perceptions.

Techniques by stakeholders	
Type of stakeholder	Technique
Project management and staff	One-to-one interviews Group Interviews Focused interviews
ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials	One-to-one interviews Focused interviews
Implementing government and non-governmental agencies	One-to-one interviews Group Interviews
Child labour programs in the country	One-to-one interviews Group Interviews
Social partners Employers' and Workers' groups	One-to-one interviews Group Interviews
Government stakeholders at country and district levels	One-to-one interviews Group Interviews
Policy makers	One-to-one interviews Group Interviews
CLMS officers and volunteers	One-to-one interviews Group Interviews

Techniques by stakeholders	
Type of stakeholder	Technique
Direct beneficiaries	One-to-one interviews Group Interviews
Parents of boys and girls	One-to-one interviews Group Interviews
Community members	One-to-one interviews Group Interviews
Donors	One-to-one interviews Group Interviews

Interview Formats (Questionnaires) have been developed the in-country visits and the electronic interviews. These are presented at Annex 3. Interviews will be guided by the UNEG Norms and Standards.

3. **Direct On-Site Observation**

Will be used to gather qualitative information on-site, about how the project operates; ongoing activities; behaviours; processes; discussions; social interactions and observable results and outcomes in the target communities and with the selected beneficiaries. This technique does not include pre-set questions or responses as it will collect open-ended narrative data that will be written on the field notes.

4. **National Evaluation workshops**

The national workshops will be attended by ILO-IPEC staff and key stakeholders (i.e. partners), including the donor as appropriate. These events will be an opportunity for the evaluation team to gather further data, to present the preliminary findings, and conclusions and to obtain feedback. Also, the workshops will serve to jointly examine and contrast the main aspects of the evaluation, and at the same time, to the extent possible, validate conclusions and recommendations in a consensual manner.

These meetings will take place toward the end of the fieldwork in Accra and Abidjan.

The evaluation team (TL & NC) will be responsible for organizing the methodology of the workshops. The identification of the participants of the workshop and logistics will be the responsibility of the project team in consultation with the evaluation team leader. The evaluation workshop in Ghana will be animated by the Team leader and the Ghanaian National Consultant. The evaluation workshop in Côte d'Ivoire will be animated by the Ivorian national Consultant.

7. Evaluation phases

7.1 Preparatory phase (activities to date)

A preparatory phase was conducted prior the elaboration of the present inception report and before the field work. This phase included the following activities:

- a. **Desk Review of project information.** The TL and the NC identified and reviewed the documents and relevant materials from secondary sources needed for the successful implementation of the evaluation and identified the key stakeholders to be interviewed.
- b. **Preliminary contacts and interviews.** The TL hold contacts and interviews with donor representatives and ILO/IPEC HQ officials and staff through e-mail and conference calls interviews from home.

Person	Organization
Benjamin Smith Corporate Social Responsibility Senior officer	ILO-Geneva
Alexandre Soho Senior Programme and Operations Officer(GOVERNANCE - FPRW/IPEC)	ILO-Geneva
Vera Perdigao- Paquete Regional Child Labour Specialist	ILO-Dakar
Peter Wichmand IPEC-EIA	ILO-Geneva
Ricardo Furman IPEC-EIA	ILO-Geneva
Maria Joao Vasquez Project coordinator	ILO-Ghana
Stephen Mcclelland Project CTA	ILO Ghana
Susan Smith	Global Issues Group in the Chocolate and Cocoa Industry-USA

The discussions and interviews involved aspects of the evaluation including the project's implementation, results, evaluation questions, timelines, methodology, and reporting requirements.

- c. **Preparation of the Inception report.** Containing the methodological approach to the evaluation including the main aspects of operational planning of the evaluation.

7.2 Field phase

During the field phase, the evaluators (TL & NC) will conduct interviews with project partners and implementing agencies, direct beneficiaries (i.e. children) parents and teachers, do observations on the field and facilitate a workshop toward the end of the field visits in each country. For in-country work, in Ghana the evaluation team will include the team leader and the national consultant, and in Côte d'Ivoire only the national consultant

The PPP works in a total of 19 communities across Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire. Thirteen of these are shared with the CCP project and six are specific to the PPP (2 in Ghana and 4 in Côte d'Ivoire). During the CCP evaluation, the evaluation team undertook field visits to 2 selected districts and 8 communities in Ghana, and 3 districts and 6 communities in Côte d'Ivoire.

Field visits to districts/communities conducted during the CCP Evaluation		
Country	District	Community
Ghana	Amenfi West	Yirase
		Nwansema Camp
		Aboi Nkwanta
	Birim South	Oforikrom/Aboabo
		Nyankomase
		Akosombo/Anyinabirem
Côte d'Ivoire	Daoukro	Kodiakro
		Ebinikouadiokro
	Issia	Ouandia
		Borotapia
	Soubre	Kangagui
		Oupagui

As proposed by the PPP project coordinator, for the current evaluation the ET will visit now the 6 “stand-alone PPP Communities”:

Field visits to PPP districts/communities		
Country	District	Community
Ghana	Hemang Denkyra	Tweapease
	Twifo AttiMokwa	Ankaako
Côte d’Ivoire	M’Batto	Tchekou
		Assoumoukro
	Bouaflé	Iribafla
		Bantifla

The two projects share some common intervention strategies but also have some differences in their approach, which may enable some comparison between them.

7.3 Reporting phase

a. Draft report

The team leader with the contributions from the NC will analyse and process the information and data collected and analysed in prior Phases to produce a **Draft Report**.

The Draft Report will provide an objective assessment of the evaluation criteria and clear answers to the evaluation questions. The report will identify strengths, weaknesses and challenges framed within the Project context, and enabling environment. In the course of the evaluation it is anticipated that a number of key issues and constraints will emerge. Possibilities for remedial actions will be explored. Examples of best practice will be highlighted. The lessons learned/ recommendations will propose the measures needed for rectifying identified weaknesses and gaps. The draft report will be circulated to key stakeholders for comment and factual correction.

b. Final report

The TL will finalize a final independent evaluation report, synthesizing all findings and taking into account feedback from the ILO and other relevant stakeholders. The final evaluation report will follow the format below and the main body will be no more than 30 pages in length, but excluding annexes:

1. Title page.
2. Table of contents.
3. Executive summary.
4. Acronyms.
5. Background and project description (project logic and rationale).
6. Purpose of evaluation.
7. Evaluation methodology.
8. Findings. This section’s content will be organised based on the ToR, focusing on five areas: effectiveness/efficiency, relevance, impact, sustainability and specific aspects; and will contain a table presenting the key results achieved per objective.
9. Lessons Learned, Potential Good practices and Conclusions.
10. Recommendations.
The findings, conclusions and recommendations shall be provided for each of these areas evaluated.
11. Annexes: Evaluation instrument matrix, ToRs, list of people met and interviewed with dates by country, and any other relevant documents.

7.4 Evaluation organization

The Team Leader will be responsible for day-to-day management of the Final Evaluation and implementation of the work plan and will conduct in-country visits in Ghana along with the NC. He will supervise the outputs of NC and ensure quality assurance of all deliverables and key elements of the evaluation. He will also be responsible for ILO-IPEC liaison and the organisation, preparation and presentation of the Evaluation Draft and Final report, including all methodological aspects.

The TL will verify the overall consistency and coherence between findings, conclusions and recommendations proposed, and ensure the professional quality of written outputs produced under this assignment. All deliverables will be carefully examined as regards content, structure, consistency, layout, etc. in order to ensure that they meet ILO requirements. A key focus of the quality assurance process is to ensure that all stakeholder comments are considered.

The Evaluation Team Members (NC) will be involved in all major tasks, utilising their particular expertise to add value to the preparation of all deliverables; including desk phase research; in-country stakeholders interviews; field visits; national evaluation workshops, etc. and provide support to the TL in finalising the draft and final report. Team work is an important aspect of the work with full utilisation of the skills and experience of the local team members. Both National Consultants' will systematize their inputs and contributions to the evaluation report through a *country report* (see Annex 5) that they will submit to the TL at the end of the field phase. **These are internal ET tools, not evaluation deliverables.**

The Ivorian National Consultant will be responsible for the whole in-country activities in Côte d'Ivoire: he will conduct interviews with project partners and implementing agencies, direct beneficiaries and community members; do observations on the field; and will facilitate the National Evaluation Workshop in Abidjan.

The evaluation will be carried out with the technical support of the IPEC-EIA section and with the logistical support of the programme offices in the two countries, in particular the main project office in Accra.

EIA will be responsible for consolidating the comments of stakeholders and submitting them to the team leader.

7.5 Language needs in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire

The ET Members are fluent in the following languages:

Team Members	Language Proficiency			Countries
	English	French	Native languages of local communities	
Rafael Muñoz (TL)	•	•		Ghana, Côte d'Ivoire
Kingsley Arkorful (NC Ghana)	•		•	Ghana
Charles Kapié (NC Côte d'Ivoire)		•	•	Côte d'Ivoire

The Ghanaian National Consultant will facilitate the TL communication with local stakeholders that might not be fluent in English.

8. Workplan

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks	Dates
Preparatory Phase	TL & NC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Briefing with ILO/IPEC-EIA ○ Briefing with ILO HQ staff ○ Desk Review of programme related documents ○ Preparation of Inception report 	15-17 October
Field Phase	TL & NC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews with programme staff and partners ▪ Field visits ▪ Coordination with sub studies consultants ▪ Workshops with key stakeholders in the 2 countries: sharing of preliminary findings and feedback from participants 	21-29 October (Ghana) 27 Oct- 5 Nov (Cdl)
Reporting Phase Draft Report	TL & NC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Draft (based on consultations from field visits, desk review and workshops, feedback to sub-studies consultants and integration of sub studies' findings) 	6-14 November
Comments to Draft Report	EIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Circulate draft report to key stakeholders ▪ Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to team leader 	18-28 November
Final Report	TL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Finalize the report including explanations for comments that were not included 	1 December

Annexes

Annex 1. Methodology matrix

DESIGN				
To what extent has the project design been appropriate to achieve the expected results and objectives?				
Evaluation aspects	Key indicators/questions	Data collection techniques	Who is in charge?	Stakeholders involved
Appropriateness of project identification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders. ▪ Consideration of available information on the socio-economic, cultural and political situation ▪ Quality of problems and needs analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document review ▪ Interviews 	TL + NC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IPEC-EIA staff ▪ Project management and staff ▪ ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials ▪ National Partners/Constituents ▪ Implementing government and non-governmental agencies ▪ Donors
Validity of project design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarity of conceptualisation ▪ Appropriateness of methodology ▪ Clear and effective organisation and complementarities ▪ Inclusion of gender concerns ▪ Inclusion of transferring models of intervention, promising practices, and lessons learned ▪ Inclusion of a strategy for sustainability ▪ Project adjustments to changes (context, priorities...) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document review ▪ Interviews 	TL + NC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IPEC-EIA staff ▪ Project management and staff ▪ ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials ▪ National Partners/Constituents ▪ Implementing government and non-governmental agencies ▪ Donors

DESIGN				
To what extent has the project design been appropriate to achieve the expected results and objectives?				
Evaluation aspects	Key indicators/questions	Data collection techniques	Who is in charge?	Stakeholders involved
To what extent is the intervention logic appropriate and coherent?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of description and alignment of Activities, Outcomes/Outputs, indicators, Objectives in the Action Plan and the Log frame ▪ Usefulness of project indicators and means of verification ▪ Realism of Assumptions and risks ▪ Complementarities with CL activities and initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document review ▪ Interviews 	TL + NC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IPEC-EIA staff ▪ Project management and staff ▪ ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials ▪ National Partners/Constituents ▪ Implementing government and non-governmental agencies ▪ Donor

EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY				
To what extent has the project achieved the expected results and specific objectives? To what extent has the project implementation been efficient?				
Evaluation aspects	Key indicators/questions	Data collection techniques	Who is in charge?	Stakeholders involved
What are the results obtained so far by the project activities (compare actual vs. planned)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Timely delivery of activities ▪ Delivery of project outputs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document review ▪ Interviews ▪ Direct observation ▪ Evaluation Workshops 	TL + NC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IPEC-EIA staff ▪ Project management and staff ▪ ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials ▪ National Partners/Constituents ▪ Implementing government and non-governmental agencies ▪ CLMS officers and volunteers ▪ Community members ▪ Beneficiaries

EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

To what extent has the project achieved the expected results and specific objectives? To what extent has the project implementation been efficient?

Evaluation aspects	Key indicators/questions	Data collection techniques	Who is in charge?	Stakeholders involved
To what extent have the specific objectives been achieved, or can be expected to be achieved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality and quantity of outputs delivered. ▪ Effectiveness of the APs and project activities in contributing to the project meeting its outputs and immediate objectives. ▪ Project's contribution to strengthen project partners capacities ▪ Project's contribution and support to the enabling environment at national and local levels ▪ Project's gender mainstreaming activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document review ▪ Interviews ▪ Direct observation ▪ Evaluation Workshops 	TL + NC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IPEC-EIA staff ▪ Project management and staff ▪ ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials ▪ National Partners/Constituents ▪ Implementing government and non-governmental agencies ▪ CLMS officers and volunteers ▪ Community members ▪ Beneficiaries
Have there been unforeseen or unintended outputs/results/consequences?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have the assumptions required to translate project results into the project purpose been realised? If not, why and how did this affect the project? ▪ If there were unforeseen results, why, the extent, impact and implications for all stakeholders? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document review ▪ Interviews ▪ Direct observation ▪ Evaluation Workshops 	NC + TL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IPEC-EIA staff ▪ Project management and staff ▪ ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials ▪ National Partners/Constituents ▪ Implementing government and non-governmental agencies ▪ CLMS officers and volunteers ▪ Community members ▪ Beneficiaries
Have the project resources (Technical Assistance and personnel, equipment, training, research etc.) been directly related to project results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How efficient was the organisation, management, implementation of the project? ▪ How effectively has the project leveraged relevant resources ▪ How well has the project coordinated and collaborated with other child-focused interventions supported by other organizations? ▪ Has the project mainstreamed CL issues and possibly influenced national and regional level policies, debates and institutions working on child labour. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document review ▪ Interviews ▪ Direct observation ▪ Evaluation Workshops 	NC + TL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IPEC-EIA staff ▪ Project management and staff ▪ ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials ▪ National Partners/Constituents ▪ Implementing government and non-governmental agencies ▪ Policy makers ▪ CLMS officers and volunteers ▪ Community members ▪ Beneficiaries

POTENTIAL IMPACT				
What are the potential, foreseen and unforeseen, project impacts, whether they are positive or negative?				
Evaluation aspects	Key indicators/questions	Data collection techniques	Who is in charge?	Stakeholders involved
Major high level changes that the project has contributed towards the project development objective at national and local levels.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of awareness regarding child labour and education Development of CAPs CAP Implementation Child Labourers/at risk with access to improved relevant education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review Interviews Direct observation Evaluation Workshops 	NC + TL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IPEC-EIA staff Project management and staff ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials National Partners/Constituents Implementing government and non-governmental agencies CLMS officers and volunteers Community members Beneficiaries
Project eventual unintended impacts on child labour prevention and elimination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvement of local and national capacities to deploy CLMS and measure progress towards the elimination of CL Improvement of technical and institutional capacities to implement NPAs and combat CL 			

RELEVANCE				
Relevance of the project in supporting development challenges identified in the project document and the national development priorities of the countries in which it was implemented				
Evaluation aspects	Key indicators/questions	Data collection techniques	Who is in charge?	Stakeholders involved
Response to the real needs of the beneficiaries and stakeholders/ Do the problems and needs that gave rise to the project still exists or have changed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validity of the project approach and strategies and its potential to be replicated and scaled up. Appropriateness of the sectors/target groups and locations chosen to develop the projects based on the findings of baseline surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review Interviews Direct observation Evaluation Workshops 	NC + TL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IPEC-EIA staff Project management and staff ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials National Partners/Constituents Implementing government and non-governmental agencies CLMS officers and volunteers Community members Beneficiaries Donors

Does the project support national policies of the partner countries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is this project supporting and contributing towards the formulation of a NAP? How did the strategy used in this project fit in with the national education, agriculture and anti-poverty efforts, and interventions carried out by other organizations (including national and international organizations)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review Interviews Evaluation Workshops 	NC + TL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IPEC-EIA staff Project management and staff ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials National Partners/Constituents Implementing government and non-governmental agencies Donors
Is the project coherent with ILO DW policies in the countries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is this project contributing to the DWCP? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review Interviews Evaluation Workshops 	NC + TL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IPEC-EIA staff Project management and staff ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials National Partners/Constituents Policy makers

SUSTAINABILITY				
Likelihood of the continuation of benefits from the project after it has been completed, probability of continued CCP long-term benefits.				
Evaluation aspects	Key indicators/questions	Data collection techniques	Who is in charge?	Stakeholders involved
Would outcomes last after project, based on the phase out strategy implemented?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participatory approach and inclusion of national/local stakeholders in project planning, monitoring and implementation To what extent a phase out strategy has been defined and planned and what steps have been taken to ensure sustainability (e.g. government involvement). Whether these strategies had been articulated/explained to stakeholders. Degree to which the project has worked with a gender perspective, reflected in project design and implementation, with focus on sustainability of project outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review Interviews Evaluation Workshops 	TL + NC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IPEC-EIA staff Project management and staff ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials National Partners/Constituents Implementing government and non-governmental agencies Policy makers CLMS officers and volunteers Community members Beneficiaries
To what extent have the national and local stakeholders improved their	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining and improving the organisational structure and interrelationships between institutions involved with CL Improvements to processes and procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review Interviews 	NC + TL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IPEC-EIA staff Project management and staff ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials

SUSTAINABILITY				
Likelihood of the continuation of benefits from the project after it has been completed, probability of continued CCP long-term benefits.				
Evaluation aspects	Key indicators/questions	Data collection techniques	Who is in charge?	Stakeholders involved
Institutional and organizational capacities to meet their CL challenges?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements to capacity in all respects (organisational, staff skills etc.) of national/local partners (i.e. tripartite constituents) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation Workshops 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Partners/Constituents Implementing government and non-governmental agencies Policy makers CLMS officers and volunteers Community members Beneficiaries
To what extent do national/local stakeholders will continue to ensure the financial sustainability of CL related measures?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial commitments at country level Inclusion of CL in national development plans to improve economic development Design and implementation of improved legislation Success in leveraging resources for on-going and continuing efforts to prevent and eliminate child labour towards the formulation of a NAP. The level of private sector / employers' organizations support towards a NAP, paying specific attention to how these groups participated in project activities. Financial Commitments of development partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review Interviews Evaluation Workshops 	NC + TL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IPEC-EIA staff Project management and staff ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials National Partners/Constituents Implementing government and non-governmental agencies Policy makers CLMS officers and volunteers Community members Beneficiaries
What are the lessons learned in terms of sustainability?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional Policy Financial Local Ownership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review Interviews Evaluation Workshops 	TL +NC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IPEC-EIA staff Project management and staff ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials National Partners/Constituents Implementing government and non-governmental agencies Policy makers CLMS officers and volunteers Community members Beneficiaries

SPECIFIC ASPECTS				
Evaluation aspects	Key indicators/questions	Data collection techniques	Who is in charge?	Stakeholders involved
What has been the answer to and progress in applying the Mid-term PIR recommendations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of recommendations followed ▪ Relevance, quality and effectiveness of the actions undertaken. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document review ▪ Interviews ▪ Evaluation Workshops 	TL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IPEC-EIA staff ▪ Project management and staff ▪ ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials
What was the extent of knowledge sharing effectiveness between the project teams and with other IPEC project in the two countries (i.e. CCP)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organisational structure ▪ interrelationships between project staff and stakeholders among projects and countries ▪ Processes and procedures ▪ Relevance, quality and effectiveness of the knowledge sharing actions undertaken. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document review ▪ Interviews ▪ Evaluation Workshops 	TL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IPEC-EIA staff ▪ Project management and staff ▪ ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials ▪ National Partners/Constituents ▪ Implementing government and non-governmental agencies
What was validity and effectiveness of CCP and PPP strategy of working in some target common communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How did the project integrate with the CCP Project? ▪ How did this contribute to the overall effectiveness of both projects? ▪ Degree of coherence, synergies and avoidance of overlap 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document review ▪ Interviews ▪ Direct observation ▪ Evaluation Workshops 	TL + NC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ILO/IPEC Staff ▪ IPEC-EIA staff ▪ Project management and staff ▪ ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials ▪ National Partners/Constituents ▪ Implementing government and non-governmental agencies ▪ CLMS officers and volunteers ▪ Community members

SPECIFIC ASPECTS				
Evaluation aspects	Key indicators/questions	Data collection techniques	Who is in charge?	Stakeholders involved
Private sector involvement/participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Private sector / employers' organizations support to Child Labour combat efforts. ▪ Project contribution to strengthen joint work in the coca sector between the private sector and the <u>government</u> regarding CL (i.e. CLMS use by multiple actors such as government and private sector) ▪ Project contribution to the cocoa industry sustainability strategy (i.e. sector importance of elimination of CL)? ▪ Joint work against child labour between the industry and the ILO and its partners. ▪ Contribution to a coherent approach to significantly reducing the worst forms of child labour in cocoa growing areas, ▪ Degree of coherence, synergies and avoidance of overlap ▪ How did this contribute to promote a coordinated sector wide approach by industry, grounded in ILO principles and in support of the NPAs of Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document review ▪ Interviews ▪ Evaluation Workshops 	NC + TL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IPEC-EIA staff ▪ Project management and staff ▪ ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials ▪ National Partners/Constituents ▪ Implementing government and non-governmental agencies ▪ Donors

SPECIFIC ASPECTS				
Evaluation aspects	Key indicators/questions	Data collection techniques	Who is in charge?	Stakeholders involved
Effectiveness of Support to CLMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relevance, quality and quantity of activities conducted and outputs delivered to strengthen the CLMS at community, local and national level ▪ # of communities with an effective CLMS, including a referral system and related services, in place. ▪ # of reliable national CLMS reports produced and their findings used for national, district and community-level actions ▪ # of children withdrawn from labour by the project ▪ # of children prevented from labour by the project ▪ # of children referred to educational/employment services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document review ▪ Interviews ▪ Direct observation ▪ Evaluation Workshops 	TL + NC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IPEC-EIA staff ▪ Project management and staff ▪ ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials ▪ National Partners/Constituents ▪ Implementing government and non-governmental agencies ▪ CLMS officers and volunteers ▪ Community members ▪ Beneficiaries
Sustainability of Support to CLMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Degree of integration among actors at the various levels of action (community, district, national) ▪ Human and financial capacities in place for CLMS implementation in each country ▪ Remaining gaps and bottlenecks to address 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document review ▪ Interviews ▪ Evaluation Workshops 	TL + NC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IPEC-EIA staff ▪ Project management and staff ▪ ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials ▪ National Partners/Constituents ▪ Implementing government and non-governmental agencies ▪ CLMS officers and volunteers ▪ Community members ▪ Beneficiaries

SPECIFIC ASPECTS				
Evaluation aspects	Key indicators/questions	Data collection techniques	Who is in charge?	Stakeholders involved
CLMS Replication/Scaling up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Further issues that are worth documenting from project experience in CLMS as a basis for replication and/or scaling-up ▪ Key lessons learned from project experience in innovative manners of supporting the CLMS under an IABA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document review ▪ Interviews ▪ Evaluation Workshops 	TL + NC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IPEC-EIA staff ▪ Project management and staff ▪ ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials ▪ National Partners/Constituents ▪ Implementing government and non-governmental agencies ▪ CLMS officers and volunteers ▪ Community members ▪ Beneficiaries

Annex 2. Field work agendas

Ghana - Draft agenda

Oct 21 Tuesday	09.00-13.00h	ILO
	14.30-16.00h	Donor representatives
Oct 22 Wednesday		Travel from Accra to field visits, field visit to community 1
Oct 23 Thursday	09.00-17.00h	District + Field visit to community 2
Oct 24 Friday	09.00-17.00h	Return to Accra + possible meeting with remaining donor representatives
Oct 27 Monday	09.00-17.00h	Interviews with project partners in Accra
Oct 28 Tuesday	09.00-13.00h	Interviews with project partners in Accra
	14.30-16.00h	Debriefing with ILO
Oct 29 Wednesday	09.00-16.00h	National Workshop

Côte d'Ivoire - Draft agenda

Oct 27 Monday	09.00-13.00h	ILO
	14.30-16.00h	Interviews with project partners in Abidjan (CIM, DLTE, CNS...)
Oct 28 Tuesday	09.00-17.00h	- Interviews with project partners in Abidjan (CTLTE, ICI, PATRONAT) - Donor representatives (Nestle, Mars, Adm, Barry...)
Oct 29 Wednesday	09.00-17.00h	Travel from Abidjan to M'BATTO+ Meeting with SOSTECI coordination and IA(Social centre) at district level
Oct 30 Thursday	09.00-17.00h	Field visit to community 1 (ASSOUMOUKRO) and community 2 (TCHECOU)
Oct 31 Friday	09.00-17.00h	Travel to BOUAFLE+ Meeting with SOSTECI coordination and IA at district level
Nov 01 Saturday	09.00-17.00h	Field visit to community 3 (IRIBAFLA) + Field community 4 (BANTIFLA)
Nov 02 Sunday		Travel from field visits to Abidjan
Nov 3 Monday		
Nov 4 Tuesday	09.00-17.00h	Interviews with project partners in Abidjan (rest)
Nov 5 Wednesday	09.00-13.00h	Interviews with project partners in Abidjan(rest)
	14.30-16.00h	Debriefing with ILO
Nov 6 Thursday	09.00-16.00h	National Workshop

Annex 3. Interview guides

Introduction to the Interview Guides

Interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders will be based on qualitative questions that will be open-ended, that is, the respondents will provide their responses in his/her own words, in order to get in-depth information about their perceptions, insights, attitudes, experiences, or beliefs regarding the project.

Interviews/focus groups will also be useful to follow-up with questions the evaluators may have after analysing data from other evaluation methods such as document review.

Evaluators may ask the same question to different individuals or informant categories to compare their responses and analyse how these individual differences may reflect on the project.

The items included on the different interview guides are exhaustive, but generic. As the interview guides are intended to help the evaluators develop semi-structured interviews/focus groups, they **will be adapted depending on each country context** and project implementation degree; **the profile and attitudes of the respondent; and the results of previous interviews** with other stakeholders; in order to help focus each interview.

ILO/IPEC Project staff

1. Introduction to the interview

Thank you for participating in this interview. My name is **<insert name>**. I am one of the consultants conducting the PPP Project Evaluation on behalf of the ILO/IPEC.

The purpose of this interview is to help us better understand the project, its results and effects in **<specify name of the country>**. In order to do so, I would like you to respond to some questions, **based on your experience and perspective** as a stakeholder on the PPP Project.

Your answers will be treated with the strictest **confidentiality**.

The evaluator will ask the respondent to introduce him/herself and his/her role/participation in the project

Do you have any questions before we begin?

2. Evaluation questions

General

- General assessment on the project: Strengths and weaknesses
- Results (planned or unplanned) obtained so far by the project (CLMS, NSC CAPs, Direct intervention)
- Inclusion of gender dimension.

Project design and relevance

- Were **country needs and priorities** regarding CL identified and addressed by the project?
- Were **project strategies, methodologies** and overall **approach** relevant to address country needs and priorities?
- Does the PPP respond to the real **needs** of the beneficiaries? And the communities?
- Which were **criteria for selecting the beneficiaries** of these activities? Who defined these criteria

Coherence/complementarities

- To what extent did the project **collaborate with the government**? Were collaborations appropriate, effective, and did they **fit under the national action plan**?
- Did the project design took into account the institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders?
- To what extent the project is part of a **global and integrated strategy**: degree of **coherence** with the different **ILO initiatives, synergies and avoidance of overlap** with other CL interventions.
- What has been the answer to and progress in applying the **Mid-term PIR recommendations**?

CLMS

- Relevance, effectiveness and quality of the **PPP support to the CLMS**
- **Pilot CLMS implementation:** strengths & weaknesses/challenges
- Does the CLMS produce reports, statistics... reflecting their findings? If so, are they used for community, district and/or national -level actions?
- What's the degree of integration and coordination among actors at the various levels of action (community, district, national)
- Are the human and financial capacities in place sufficient for CLMS implementation
- **CLMS institutionalization:** integration to other social development government initiatives (i.e. Education sector and the Social Protection system)
- Is there a **referral system** in place? If so, what are the related **services available**?
- **CLMS Sustainability.**
- **Replication/Scaling up potential**
- What are the **remaining gaps and bottlenecks** to address regarding CLMS

Capacity Building

- How was the **capacity of the implementing agencies** and other relevant partners to develop effective action against child labour **enhanced as a result of project activities**?
- Project's contribution and support to the **enabling environment** at national and local levels
- To what extent **National/Local capacities on NAP/CAP design and implementation** have been enhanced?
- Capacity of the **National Steering Committees** to lead improved coordination of efforts to combat child labour in cocoa growing communities
- To what extent **institutional coordination** has been improved with all stakeholders involved?
- To what extent the CL, activities and processes have been taken up and **integrated into national strategies and policies** (such as education and poverty reduction)?
 - Capacities in cocoa growing communities to eliminate child labour, including through participating in CLMS.
 - Capacity of district level authorities and social partners to enforce child labour-related policies and regulations, including CLMS in target communities.
- To what extent **key parties** involved such as, national governments, other institutions and potential donors are **committed** (e.g. through policy and budgetary support) in **contributing** towards the CCP outputs (NAPs, CAPs, CLMS...) **sustainability**.
- What would national partners **need** to better integrate CL into national planning/programming and even budgeting?

Industry/Private sector

- Private sector / employers' organizations support to Child Labour combat efforts and NAP implementation.

- Project contribution to strengthen joint work in the cocoa sector between the private sector and the government regarding CL (i.e. CLMS use by multiple actors such as government and private sector).
- Project contribution to the cocoa industry sustainability strategy (i.e. sector importance of elimination of CL)?

Impact

- Major changes that the project has contributed at **national, district and local levels**.
- Impacts in the **Children/Families/Communities**?
- Has the project generated **unintended impacts** on child labour prevention and elimination?

Sustainability

- To what extent **key parties** involved such as, national governments, other institutions and potential donors are **committed** (e.g. through policy and budgetary support) in **contributing** towards the PPP outputs (NAPs, CAPs, CLMS...) **sustainability**.
- Do you think it's likable that the **services/activities provided by the PPP will continue** after the project is finished?

Lessons learned

- Main lessons learned

Good practices

- Emerging good practices

What's next/Recommendations

- What are the remaining challenges/deficits on CL?
- Does the country need further external support to strengthen its capacity to combat CL in the cocoa sector?
- In that case, what could be ILO's Contribution?
- And the government's and National/Project partners
- Are there any other issues you would like to address/discuss?

Project partners/Implementing agencies

1. Introduction to the interview

Thank you for participating in this interview. My name is **<insert name>**. I am one of the consultants conducting the CCP Project Evaluation on behalf of the ILO/IPEC.

The purpose of this interview is to help us better understand the project, its results and effects in **<specify name of the country>**. In order to do so, I would like you to respond to some questions, **based on your experience and perspective** as a stakeholder on the CCP Project.

Your answers will be treated with the strictest **confidentiality**.

The evaluator will ask the respondent to introduce him/herself and his/her role/participation in the project.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

2. Evaluation questions

General

- **General assessment** on the project: **Strengths** and **weaknesses**
- **Results (planned or unplanned)** obtained so far by the project (CLMS, NSC CAPs, Direct intervention)

Project design and relevance

- Were **country needs and priorities** regarding CL identified and addressed by the project?
- Were **project strategies, methodologies** and overall **approach** relevant to address country needs and priorities?
- To what extent did the project **collaborate with the government**? Were collaborations appropriate, effective, and did they **fit under the national action plan**?
- Does the PPP respond to the real **needs** of the beneficiaries? And the communities?
- Which were **criteria for selecting the beneficiaries** of these activities? Who defined these criteria

CLMS

- Relevance, effectiveness and quality of the **PPP support to the CLMS**
- **Pilot CLMS implementation**: strengths & weaknesses/challenges
- Does the CLMS produce reports, statistics... reflecting their findings? If so, are they used for community, district and/or national -level actions?
- What's the degree of integration and coordination among actors at the various levels of action (community, district, national)
- Are the human and financial capacities in place sufficient for CLMS implementation
- **CLMS institutionalization**: integration to other social development government initiatives (i.e. Education sector and the Social Protection system)

- Is there a **referral system** in place? If so, what are the related **services available**?
- **CLMS Sustainability.**
- **Replication/Scaling up potential.**
- What are the **remaining gaps and bottlenecks** to address regarding CLMS

Capacity building

- To what extent **National/Local capacities on NAP/CAP design and implementation** have been enhanced?
- Capacity of the **National Steering Committees** to lead improved coordination of efforts to combat child labour in cocoa growing communities
- To what extent **institutional coordination** has been improved with all stakeholders involved?
- To what extent the CL, activities and processes have been taken up and **integrated into national strategies and policies** (such as education and poverty reduction)?
 - Capacities in cocoa growing communities to eliminate child labour, including through participating in CLMS.
 - Capacity of district level authorities and social partners to enforce child labour-related policies and regulations, including CLMS in target communities.
- To what extent **key parties** involved such as, national governments, other institutions and potential donors are **committed** (e.g. through policy and budgetary support) in **contributing** towards the CCP outputs (NAPs, CAPs, CLMS...) **sustainability**.
- What would national partners **need** to better integrate CL into national planning/programming and even budgeting?

Industry/Private sector

- Private sector / employers' organizations support to Child Labour combat efforts and NAP implementation.
- Project contribution to strengthen joint work in the cocoa sector between the private sector and the government regarding CL (i.e. CLMS use by multiple actors such as government and private sector).
- Project contribution to the cocoa industry sustainability strategy (i.e. sector importance of elimination of CL)?

Impact

- Major changes that the project has contributed at **national, district and local levels**
- Impacts in the **Children/Families/Communities**?
- Has the project generated **unintended impacts** on child labour prevention and elimination?

Sustainability

- Do you think it's likable that the **services/activities provided by the PPP will continue** after the project is finished?

Lessons learned

- Main lessons learned

Good practices

- Emerging good practices

What's next/Recommendations

- What are the **remaining challenges/deficits** on CL?
- Does the country need **further external support** to strengthen its capacity to combat CL in the cocoa sector?
- In that case, what could be **ILO's Contribution**?
- And the **government's and National/Project partners**.
- Are there any other issues you would like to address/discuss?

Donors/Private sector

1. Introduction to the interview

Thank you for participating in this interview. My name is <insert name>. I am one of the consultants conducting the PPP Project Evaluation on behalf of the ILO/IPEC.

The purpose of this interview is to help us better understand the project, its results and effects in <specify name of the country>. In order to do so, I would like you to respond to some questions, **based on your experience and perspective** as a stakeholder on the PPP Project.

Your answers will be treated with the strictest **confidentiality**.

The evaluator will ask the respondent to introduce him/herself and his/her role/participation in the project

Do you have any questions before we begin?

2. Evaluation questions

- To what extent do you think **child labour** is a problem for the cocoa sector?
- How's the **Private sector supporting Child Labour combat efforts** and NAP implementation in the country?
- Does your organization have any **policy/plan/program regarding child labour** in the country?
- Could you please briefly describe **your organization's interventions on CL** in the country?
- How is your organization **related to the PPP Project**?
- Is the PPP Project and other ILO related activities relevant to the **sector and country's context, needs and priorities**?
- **General assessment** on the PPP project: **Strengths and weaknesses**.
- Do you think your organization's and ILO's interventions **complement each other**?
- Did the PPP Project/other ILO initiatives influence **your policies** regarding CL?
- What would your organization **need** to better integrate CL into planning/programming and even budgeting?
- Has the Project contributed to strengthen **joint work in the coca sector between the private sector and the government** regarding CL (i.e. CLMS use by multiple actors such as government and private sector)?
- Project contribution to the cocoa **industry sustainability strategy** (i.e. sector importance of elimination of CL)?
- What's your opinion regarding **CAPs/NAP**?
- What's your opinion regarding **CLMS**?
- What are the **remaining challenges/deficits** on CL?
- Does the country need **further external support** to strengthen its capacity to combat CL in the cocoa sector?
- In that case, what could be **ILO's Contribution**? And the **industry's/donor**?

- Do you think there's room for **further strengthened ILO-private sector collaboration**?
- Are there any other issues you would like to address/discuss?

Community members

1. Introduction to the interview

Thank you for participating in this interview. My name is **<insert name>**. I am one of the consultants conducting the PPP Project Evaluation on behalf of the ILO/IPEC.

The purpose of this interview is to help us better understand the project, its results and effects in **<specify name of the country>**. In order to do so, I would like you to respond to some questions, **based on your experience and perspective** as a stakeholder on the PPP Project.

Your answers will be treated with the strictest **confidentiality**.

The evaluator will ask the respondents/participants to introduce him/herself and his/her role/participation in the project

Do you have any questions before we begin?

2. Evaluation questions

- Could you please describe the activities implemented in this community to prevent and/or eliminate child labour?
- Do you think these activities respond to the real needs of the beneficiaries? And the community?
- Do you know the criteria for selecting the beneficiaries of these activities?
- What is your opinion on the implementing agency?
- What is your opinion on the activities developed/services provided by the implementing agency?
- How do you value your participation in the project's activities?
- Where these activities effective in terms of:
 - Increasing the capacity of community/local organizations to plan, initiate, implement and evaluate actions to prevent and eliminate child labour?
 - reducing the number of child labourers;
 - Increasing school attendance;
 - Increasing education quality.
- Does this community have a system to register and monitor child labourers?
- Does this community have a Community Action Plan (CAP)?
- Does this community have a Child Protection Committee (CPC)?
- Has the CPC or CAP conducted any activities regarding child labour?
- Has the CPC or CAP conducted any activities regarding children's education/health/nutrition/protection?
- Are there any community rules or/and regulations concerning child labour?
- What are the major changes (impacts) that the activities on child labour have introduced in your community?
- Do you think it's likable that the services/activities provided by the project (education, livelihoods...) will continue after the project is finished?

- Do you think it's likable that the CAP-CPC-CLMS will continue after the project is finished?
- Are there any other issues you would like to address/discuss?

CLMS officers and volunteers: District and community levels

1. Introduction to the interview

Thank you for participating in this interview. My name is **<insert name>**. I am one of the consultants conducting the PPP Project Evaluation on behalf of the ILO/IPEC.

The purpose of this interview is to help us better understand the project, its results and effects in **<specify name of the country>**. In order to do so, I would like you to respond to some questions, **based on your experience and perspective** as a stakeholder on the PPP Project.

Your answers will be treated with the strictest **confidentiality**.

The evaluator will ask the respondents/participants to introduce him/herself and his/her role/participation in the project

Do you have any questions before we begin?

2. Evaluation questions

- Could you please describe the activities implemented in this community/district to prevent and/or eliminate child labour?
- Do you think these activities respond to the real needs of the beneficiaries? And the communities?
- How do you value your participation in the project's activities?
- Where these activities effective in terms of:
 - Increasing the capacity of community/local organizations to plan, initiate, implement and evaluate actions to prevent and eliminate child labour?
 - reducing the number of child labourers;
 - Increasing school attendance;
 - Increasing education quality.
- Were any of the activities to eliminate child labour initiated by the national/local government?
 - Does this community/district have a CLMS?
 - Could you please explain how it works?
 - Relevance and quality of the PPP **support to initiate/strengthen the CLMS**.
 - Is there a **referral system** in place? If so, what are the related **services available**?
 - Does the CLMS produce reports, statistics... reflecting their findings? If so, are they used for community, district and/or national -level actions?
 - Do you have an estimation of:
 - # of children withdrawn from labour by the project in your community/district;
 - # of children prevented from labour by the project in your community/district;
 - # of children referred to educational/employment services in your community/district.
 - What's the degree of integration and coordination among actors at the various levels of action (community, district, national).
 - Are the human and financial capacities in place sufficient for CLMS implementation
 - Capacities in cocoa growing communities to eliminate child labour, including through participating in CLMS.

- Capacity of district level authorities and social partners to enforce child labour-related policies and regulations, including CLMS in target communities.
- What are the remaining gaps and bottlenecks to address regarding CLMS.
- Does this community have a Community Action Plan (CAP)?
- Has the CPC or CAP conducted any activities regarding child labour?
- Has the CPC or CAP conducted any activities regarding children's education/health/nutrition/protection?
- Are there any community rules or/and regulations concerning child labour?
- What are the major changes (impacts) that the activities on child labour have introduced in your community/district?
- Do you think Child labour is NOW a problem in this community/district?
- Do you think school attendance is NOW a problem in this community/district?
- Do you think it's likable that the direct services/activities provided by the project (education...) will continue after the project is finished?
- Do you think it's likable that the CAP-CPC-CLMS will continue after the project is finished?
- Are there any other issues you would like to address/discuss?

Beneficiaries/Parents of boys and girls

1. Introduction to the interview

Thank you for participating in this interview. My name is **<insert name>**. I am one of the consultants conducting the PPP Project Evaluation on behalf of the ILO/IPEC.

The purpose of this interview is to help us better understand the project, its results and effects in **<specify name of the country>**. In order to do so, I would like you to respond to some questions, **based on your experience and perspective** as a stakeholder on the PPP Project.

Your answers will be treated with the strictest **confidentiality**.

The evaluator will ask the respondent to introduce him/herself and his/her role/participation in the project

Do you have any questions before we begin?

2. Evaluation questions

- Do you think Child labour was a problem in this community before the project started?
- Do you think school attendance was a problem in this community before the project started?
- Could you please describe the activities implemented in this community to prevent and/or eliminate child labour?
- Do you think these activities respond to your real needs? And the community's needs?
- Do you know the criteria for selecting the beneficiaries of these activities?
- What is your opinion on the activities developed/services provided?
- What is your opinion on the implementing agency?
- Did you receive any direct services from the project? What's your opinion them?
- Have your children benefited from direct services from the project? What's your opinion about them?
- Has the project contributed to Increase the education services quality
- Has the project contributed to Increase the school attendance
- Did any of your children (under 15 years old) work before the project started?
- Did any of your children help you or anyone in the community in the farm work (or any other economic activity)?
- Did all your children (6-15 years old) attend school before the project started?
- Does any of your children work now or help anyone in the farm work (or any other economic activity)?
- Do all your children (6-15 years old) attend school now? Why?
- Do you think your children enrolled in school this/last year will continue to attend next year? Why?
- What are the major changes (impacts) that the activities on child labour have introduced in your family/community?
- Are there any other issues you would like to address/discuss?

Annex 4. In country workshop (methodology and tools)

PPP evaluation national workshop

Objective: to jointly examine and contrast the main aspects of the evaluation and at the same time, validate conclusions and recommendations in a consensual manner.

After a first round of individual/group interviews with all relevant stakeholders in each country, the workshops will, with a **participatory focus**, will promote discussions about the project's strengths and weaknesses around three main topics: CLMS; Capacities to combat child labour; and private sector involvement; in order to seek consensus on the main findings, conclusions and recommendations. Depending on each country context, project achievement and interview's results, **these topics might be adapted**.

Duration: 1 day

Participants: Representatives of major stakeholders (ILO-IPEC, Ministry of Labour, workers' and Employers' organizations, National/Local Partners, Government and Non-Government Implementing Agencies, industry/donors).

Group work methodology

The group discussions (based on brain-storming exercises) will use the below "simple but effective" charts. These charts can be worked with the aid of a laptop, and later presented in plenary with a data-show, so every participant can visualize the results of the discussions, debate and ask questions.

Group 1: CLMS

Child Labour Monitoring Systems			
	Strengths	Weaknesses	Recommendations
Capacities at national level to implement CLMS			
Capacities at district level to implement CLMS			
Capacities in target communities to implement CLMS			
Capacities of social partners to contribute to CLMS			
CLMS institutionalization: integration to other social development government initiatives (i.e. Education sector and the Social Protection system)			
Pilot CLMS implementation			
Potential to expand the CLMS			
CLMS Sustainability			

Group 2: Capacities to combat child labour

Capacities to combat child labour			
	Strengths	Weaknesses	Recommendations
CAP implementation and monitoring in target communities			
Resource mobilization for CAP implementation			
Capacities in cocoa growing communities to eliminate child labour, including through participating in CLMS			
Capacity of district level authorities and social partners to enforce child labour-related policies and regulations, including CLMS in target communities			
Capacity of the National Steering Committees to lead improved coordination of efforts to combat child labour in cocoa growing communities			

Group 3: Private sector

Private sector/Industry			
	Strengths	Weaknesses	Recommendations
Private sector / employers' organizations support to Child Labour combat efforts in the cocoa sector.			
Project contribution to strengthen <u>joint work in the coca sector between the private sector and the government</u> regarding CL (i.e. CLMS use by multiple actors such as government and private sector)			
Project contribution to the cocoa industry sustainability strategy (i.e. sector importance of elimination of CL)?			
Joint work against child labour between the cocoa industry and the ILO and its partners.			

Annex 5. National consultants' country reports format and contents

1. Findings

1.1. General

- *Strengths and weaknesses*
- *Main results (planned and unplanned outcomes and outputs)*

1.2. Relevance

1.3. Project design

1.4. Effectiveness and efficiency

- *CLMS*
- *Capacity Building*
- *Direct intervention*
- *CCP & PPP Coherence/complementarities*
- *Industry/Private sector coordination*

1.5. Potential Impact

1.6. Sustainability

2. Lessons learned

3. Good practices

4. Conclusions

5. Recommendations

Annex: Key stakeholders interviewed

Organisation	Persons Interviewed	Title

National evaluation workshop participants

Organisation	Persons Interviewed	Title

