



# Evaluation Summary



International  
Labour  
Office

Evaluation  
Office

## *Advancing Tripartite Action to Tackle Child Labour (Component of 2009/10 ILO/Norway Programme Cooperation Agreement (PCA) Joint IPEC, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP project – Final Evaluation*

### Quick Facts

<b>Countries:</b>	<i>Global</i>
<b>Final Evaluation:</b>	<i>11/2010</i>
<b>Evaluation Mode:</b>	<i>Independent</i>
<b>Administrative Office:</b>	<i>ILO/IPEC</i>
<b>Technical Office:</b>	<i>ILO/IPEC</i>
<b>Evaluation Manager:</b>	<i>ILO-IPEC/DED (Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section)</i>
<b>Project Code:</b>	<i>INT/09/50/NOR</i>
<b>Donor(s) &amp; Budget:</b>	<i>Norway (US\$ 1'750'000)</i>
<b>Keywords:</b>	<i>Decent Work Country Program; Child labour; Framework Agreement</i>

### Background & Context

#### **Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure**

The project will build on the large scale programme of technical cooperation which ILO-IPEC already has in place and reinforce and support work implemented through the DWCP process. However it would add a distinct and strategic dimension to this work through its focus on enhancing the role of the social partners and in the framework of the South-South initiative, through which co-operation for sharing good practices, experiences and lessons learned will be fostered. This strategy may play a will be based on the replication of

models (pilot-programmes) that worked well in a given country, and their adaptation to the local context of the other country. This learning and cross-fertilization experience should be done in a spirit of promoting equality, sharing of knowledge, supporting mutual assistance and building up solidarity.

The ILO-Norway Framework Agreement has supported since 2004 a collaborative action between three technical units in the ILO (ACTRAV, ACTEMP and IPEC), in the implementation of activities at the national, regional and interregional level. Many lessons have been learned from these collaborative efforts and these will serve as a basis for this new programme for 2009 and beyond. This Project has taken into account the recommendations comprised in the 2008 independent evaluation, including the need for IPEC to focus on selected thematic priorities areas under the Norway-funded programme and to strengthen its role in supporting social dialogue, global and country level advocacy and policy work.

Under this Project IPEC will focus on advancing the Global Action Plan against Child Labour by promoting the Education for All and SCREAM, expanding the outreach and impact of the WDACL, sharing of information through the 12-12 portal and the multiplying the relatively-new trend in IPEC's technical cooperation known as the "south-south initiative in combating child labour". Under this "south-south initiative, networks of social actors will be exploited that have been set up in Latin America and in Africa with aims at enhancing the exchange of experiences and good practices; material and information in related issues, including the supporting

of the implementation of technical cooperation activities among developing countries coordinated with other UN agencies under the “One UN” approach.

This Project intends to enhance trade union’s capacity to : 1) Develop policies and action plans on child labour; 2) work to include child labour in processes of collective bargaining; 3) advocate for ratification and implementation of the ILO Core Conventions; 4) participate in national bodies addressing the issue; 5) through public awareness campaigns, sensitize workers and the society at large on child labour, and the links between child labour and related issues such as gender equality, HIV/AIDS and youth employment; 6) utilize international networks to ensure that lessons learned in one part of the world benefits the struggle against child labour in another; 7) utilize international networks to shed light on child labour in the manufacturing chain; 8) with their presence at work places, monitor the child labour situation.

Likewise, Employers’ organizations have a strategic role to play in combating tackle child labour and: 1) Advocate for the strengthening of national legislative frameworks to tackle child labour; 2) Lobby for enhanced access to quality education and training for children and youth; 3) Assist members to comply with national legislation thus ensuring that child labour does not occur at the workplace; 4) Address the issue of child labour in supply chains; 5) Use their networks and experience to support programmes to combat child labour and 6) Help to raise public awareness on child labour and to change attitudes

This project, thus, aims at expanding the technical cooperation programme which ILO already has in place in the three above technical units. The project would reinforce and support work implemented through the DWCP process.

### **Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation**

This independent final Project Evaluation encompasses the component of the Tackle Project **which has been implemented through IPEC only**, i.e. outputs, activities under immediate objective 1, as outlined in the project document and in the work plan, for the period of March 2009 and 31 December 2010.

The contributions of IPEC, ACTRAV and ACTEMP to coordinated and joint activities of the framework agreement - as it relates to IPEC implemented

component - is also part of the scope (the evaluation does not focus on the mechanisms and process of establishing and managing the programme framework agreement as such).

Several purposes for the present evaluation are stated. The evaluation should, among others, assess the overall achievement of the programme component at different levels such as at policy, institutional and country level to the extent that data and information are available. It should analyze strategies and models of intervention used, document lessons learned and potential good practices, and provide recommendations for all stakeholders on how to integrate these into planning processes and implementation of future child labour activities within the framework agreement.

### **Methodology of evaluation**

The evaluation has included informal methods to gather quantitative data and qualitative information. The evaluation methodology triangulated several types of data. The triangulation approach was applied in order for cross-checking of the information - thereby strengthening and verifying the reliability of the conclusions to be drawn.

The evaluation has been undertaken in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy, the ILO-IPEC Guidelines and Notes, the UN System Evaluation Standards and Norms, and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard

- Desk review
- An evaluation instrument was prepared and endorsed by DED before the Evaluator’s arrival at ILO Hqs, Geneva.
- Interviews, consultations, telephone & skype interviews
- Evaluation questionnaires
- Relevance, effectiveness and (if possible) impact and sustainability are applied as evaluation criteria. The evaluator is taking note of the details regarding the evaluation standards and guidelines, mentioned in the Terms of Reference, sections 37 and 38).

### **Limitations to this Report**

The Terms of Reference for this evaluation included visits to the ILO headquarters in Geneva but no field

visit were foreseen to any of the many countries of implementation. The report would have been enriched if some field activities had been made possible and if social partners and stakeholders could have been consulted in person.

The responses from the field stakeholders (verbal and questionnaire responses) have, although they were few, added to minimize the information gap experienced at ILO headquarters. However, the imbalance in response to the evaluation questionnaires, with replies from countries in Asia and the Americas but nothing from African countries, is a clear limitation and is one that may have invited subjectivity in the drawing of conclusions.

## Main Findings & Conclusions

### *IPEC's increased actions to involve social partners*

IPEC has increasingly taken action to encourage its staff and stakeholders to involve Workers and Employers and to take own initiatives on the issue of child labour. There are clear indications that that ILO during 2009-2010, following experiences from the earlier assistance from Norway has helped to involving trade unions (in particular) as well as the employers organisations (but to a lesser extent) in *how to tackle child labour*. It has also attempted to *make linkages* between the work of IPEC and the social partners at international, regional and national level - thereby clearly contributing to ILO's own objective and to the development objective for overall Tackle Project.

The assessment has been is also that the Project activities are relevant and fully in line with IPEC's renewed efforts to broaden its work and further increase the social partners' involvement in its battle against child labour.

The Project has performed quite well in producing the planned Outputs and, in so doing, it has been effective in *reaching out* to the stakeholders. A host of activities were undertaken in many countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America during a relatively short period, involving social partners and other stakeholders.

*The World Day against Child Labour*

Regarding the WDACL, the activities of the Project directly helped develop linkages between IPEC work and those of the Government, employers, national trade unions and also NGOs, other UN agencies. An important factor in the work is the social mobilization and changing mind-sets of the social leaders and other stakeholders as well as the public and from this perspective the activities of this project made a significant contribution. In most cases, the planned activities were able to attract the target audience. Many of those activities were also covered by the press/local media, and received a lot of public appreciation.

*Is funding activities in the field resulting from a clear joint strategy?*

Tanzania and Uganda are examples of countries in which constituents have forwarded requests of "what they wished IPEC to assist with" - followed by IPEC making decisions regarding what to support, on the basis of which Project funds would be suitable (Norway, Irish or other funds), or would match a particular social dialogue activity.

The IPEC CTA and programme staff at Headquarters has appreciated this flexibility. However, from the Evaluation's perspective this approach seems not to be the result of careful strategizing and prioritizing from the part of IPEC on how to use the rather meagre resources to meet the specific IPEC objective.

*Lack of a coordinating mechanism/committee & joint monitoring "system"*

The three units have worked with similar social dialogue and child labour issues, albeit from different angles. Although discussions have been held among the three units, to some extent, the Project has lacked a defined coordination function and joint monitoring and follow-up mechanism. It is assessed that if this had been functioning *as planned* in the outset, a common understanding of Good Practices for the whole Project, not only IPEC, could have been brought forward.

The assessment is that the effectiveness in *reaching objective 1* specifically (which emphasises enhanced knowledge and linkages) would have been greater if these mechanisms had been in place and the actors had taken more time to amicably exchange ideas, experiences and information throughout.

## *Child Labour Focal Points and Networks – and sustainability*

The Project has organised and trained focal points on child labour. According to the TPR this has showed concrete results. For example, a series of organizations that participated in workshops and seminars have prepared and implemented action plans on child labour, and it has been possible to verify that an increasing number of awareness raising activities were led by those who were part in trainings – and that this proved to be “a relevant case of guaranteeing sustainability” as they have a “multiplying effect” within their member organizations.

The Project also reports that the training of focal points at local and national level will in the short and long-term allow for child labour to enter at countries’ policy level. This strategy to set up focal points agreed upon between IPEC and ACTRAV has proven to not only be dynamic but also sustainable after the end of the project.

The above are good signs however this “dynamism” of the focal point training seems not to continue to maintain network to the same extent in all countries/regions. In Indonesia, for instance, the trade union focal point concept would need much more nurturing and follow-up to be effective, as reported by the IPEC Project staff member who was involved in this activity in the field.

The sustainability of the activities and the benefits of the actions may not be known at this stage as little time has passed since the closure of the Project. The evaluation has refrained from determining the level of sustainability of the activities and benefits of this particular activity, as clear evidence has not come forward at this point in time, e.g. about Focal Points and their networks, as well as the 12-12 Portal.

## **Recommendations**

### **Main recommendations and follow-up**

**Recommendation 1:** IPEC should approach the Norwegian Government for continued partnership.

**Recommendation 2:** ILO should continue the path and increase its attempts to involve social partners.

**Recommendation 3:** The ILO should ensure that lessons from technical cooperation Projects undertaking pilot work in the educational field, is shared and embraced among IPEC staff for future strategies and related to giving child labourers viable alternatives.

**Recommendation 4:** IPEC needs to place even more efforts for a stronger participation of the social partners in this important event and continue to ensure that gender is focused on (both boys and girls and youth of both sexes).

### **Recommendation 5: Inter-departmental synergy, coordination and joint initiatives with ACTRAV and ACT/EMP**

The evaluation has found that the Project has not been strong in inter-departmental synergy, coordination and joint initiatives with ACTRAV and ACT/EMP although there has been a dialogue with these units. Building stronger ties between IPEC and these units on how to jointly tackle child labour would have been desirable (see also section 5, for a more detailed discussion).

### **Recommendation 6:**

- a) ILO should seriously analyse the feasibility of having separate budgets within Framework Agreement Projects.
- b) In future framework agreements ILO (PARDEV/CODEV) should ensure that holistic approaches are applied in evaluations – as this surely would generate more fruitful lessons and directions.

**Recommendation 7:** The execution of the two Projects are the responsibility of one IPEC manager - and the above should be clarified, in particular in view of the up-coming evaluation of the Irish Project.

**Recommendation 8:** Although the SPROUT states that flexibility as regards activities is important for this type of Project (and rightfully so), an explanation is required - in order to draw lessons and be accountable to the stakeholders, including the development partner.

### **Important lessons learned:**

#### **Selecting, analysing and presenting Good Practices**

If Good Practices are part of the core outputs to be produced by a Project – a strategy is required on how to how to involve stakeholders in the process from the



start, how to collect information and what criteria to use to select cases. *Compilation, analysis, documentation and presentation* for the audience in some form should be a transparent process.

#### ***Inter-departmental coordination and synergy***

During the Project period, the three units have held discussions but the actors did not see any need to hold regular meetings, as such, for any coordination purposes or information/knowledge sharing. Each unit had earmarked funds (own budgets) under the Project, thus there was no need to reach consensus as such from the other units regarding the spending of funds. Coordination of activities and sharing of ideas between ACT/TRAV and ACT/EMP had been more intense/frequent than that between IPEC and any of the other two headquarter units, although communication has continued to exist between IPEC and the other two.

ACT/TRAV and IPEC had some joint activities in Latin America only (while ACT/EMP and ACTRAV had closer cooperation), however, most of the work under the Project was undertaken under the respective department.

More coordination among the three units ACT/TRAV, ACTEMP and IPEC involved would have benefited the outcome of the Project.

#### **Lessons shared from the Field**

##### Latin America:

1. “ILO should lower its initiatives and activities of the macro (legal / institutional / media) to the sector, i.e. to the areas we know may have this threat of child labour, thus, going from theory to practice ... or co-funding and working in programs that effectively withdraw children from work and offered the opportunity, both they and their parents, education and income respectively”.
2. “ILO should continue to support TUCA as technical and financial support and resources can help articulate and help implement *other* projects and facilitate processes of bipartite and tripartite social dialogue. We believe that the development of a clause to be included in collective bargaining processes at different levels, can be key in this framework and the promotion of Local Development actors among the tripartite actors”.
3. “ILO-IPEC should facilitate further dialogue among organizations working with the challenge of

preventing and eradicating child labour. Beyond fund projects and programs, it is suggested that through the promotion of IPEC, organizations could develop more integrated projects and share their difficulties and learning more, providing a more effective joint work in constant interaction”.

4. “A greater balance would be obtained if more funds were directed to unions instead of NGOs for the purpose of sustainability. It is necessary to strengthen trade union action on the child labour issue, and organise meetings, workshops and joint activities in the sub regional levels and regional levels. We believe that participation in the process is key and should include targets and indicators in projects related to the participation of constituents in all phases of the projects could help a lot”.
5. “The relationship and cooperation with partners and stakeholders is very good, as the business sector recognizes that the ILO can provide specific tools for business organizations and companies in the eradication of child labour. Also, there is a better understanding by the business sector of the Southern Cone of Latin America, on the importance of the subject and the negative impact child labour has in the functioning of the economy and business dynamics”.
6. “The quality of outputs/products are very good. Results have been reached as high impact to society stakeholders (eg, human resource managers or corporate social responsibility, academics). Also the products / results have favoured partnerships between public and private sector. The products are very high visibility which indirectly also generated a general awareness level of society”.
7. “The activities of the Project are highly relevant and successful, as it has encouraged workers organisations to come together to monitor the process started”.
8. “The theme (child labour) is installed and each time companies are more interested in the subject. It is very probable that in Latin America the benefits of IPEC activities continue beyond 2011”.
9. “In June 2009, with the support of the project, the seminar Chile without child labour: the contribution of business, was organised by ILO, the Ministry of Labour and Social Council and the Confederation of Industry and Commerce (CPC). *As a direct effect of this activity, an Agreement was made between the CPC and the ministry of Labour for the eradication of child labour in Chile*”.

### India:

10. “Trade Unions being a part of ILO core constituency, have a pivotal role to play in combating child labour, and therefore it would be good to provide more opportunities for the Trade unions in India to work under the IPEC programmes.”

11. “Regarding IPEC strategies, linkages need to be consistent to achieve sustainable results. Since IPEC has massive programmes and large funds reaching out to larger areas covering large populations, it would be very useful as the Trade unions have a large out reach”.

12. “Assistance to Trade Unions for release, rehabilitation activities need to increase is important. Although rehabilitation of working children is not the role of the trade unions, however, trade unions in Tamil Nadu would like to adopt a holistic approach to child labour eradication, moving from awareness to identification, release and sustainable rehabilitation and all this linked to workers rights and they have the capacity to address these issues:

- Campaigns on promotion of universal ratification of ILO Child Labour Conventions 138 & 182 need to be extended to all the states in India, based on the experience of some good practices;
- Child labour needs to be looked at in the context of overall workers rights like right to organize and collective bargaining and not as child labour issue alone.
- Social pressure created by the partners was the main vehicle to achieve IPEC objectives. As ILO is a UN Agency, its mandate/protocol does not allow it to put direct pressure on any Government and thus one of the alternatives is to create social/political pressure on the Government through the trade unions and social society. And this strategy worked well in this context”.

13. “The involvement of the Trade Unions has contributed to building up social pressure on the Employers’ organisations, as well as on the government to take concrete actions in their own domain. Involvement of the employers contributed to the change of their attitude towards child labour. Involvement of the Parliament Members (MP) contributed to pass on a direct message to the highest authority of the Government about their roles and responsibilities in combating child labour.”

### Indonesia:

14. “The establishment of focal points at Asia Pacific regional level was made based on recommendations from ITUC only; as a result, TU members who were already trained at national level were not selected.”

### ***General – on how to carry the work forward***

15. “Social partners should continue to support these (combating child labour) activities by accepting them as their organizational mandate. Elimination of child labour should not be seen as a mandate of the ILO, rather the social partners (trade unions, employers, NGOs, Governments and others) should consider child labour elimination also as their mandate. ILO’s role is to provide them with the socio-technology (i.e. the social knowledge/strategy/process) about the said elimination”.

### **Good Practices**

Two out of the four Project Outputs relate to Good Practices:

Under Output 1.1: Pilot Trade Union Manual; Inter-Regional Exchange of Good Practices; 2010 IPEC Staff Training and Strategy Workshop; South-South Cooperation; and Training for Employers Child Labour Focal Points.

Under Output 1.2: Continue Trade Union Focal Points; Strategies on the use of the Guide for Employers; Strategy for re-energizing 12 to 12 Portal with sustainable Focal Point data.

However, despite the significance that IPEC places on Good Practices in general, analysis and documentation of good practices at the end of the Project are curiously lacking. The evaluation has assessed that not enough analysis has been made (or been made transparent) how the Project has defined Good Practices and what criteria specifically were used to determine these particular practices (apart from the fact that these were activities to be undertaken).