

# **EVALUATION REPORT**

**This is an external evaluation commissioned and managed as per donor requirements and evaluation policies and procedures, and not necessarily within ILO evaluation policy.**

**The follow-up to the follow-up (e.g. management response follow-up) is not within the remit of EVAL's responsibility.**



# External Independent Final Evaluation

---

## Global Action Program on Child Labor Issues GAP11

---



Implemented by:  
International Labour Organisation

Evaluators:

Sandra Wark  
Peter Matz

**Cooperative Agreement Number:** IL-22509-11-75-K

**Financing Agency:** U.S. Department of Labor

**Dates of Project Implementation:** September 2011 - March 2017

**Evaluation Fieldwork Dates:** 19 October - 30 November, 2015

**Total Project Funds from USDOL:** US \$15,900,000



*Sistemas, Familia y Sociedad*  
*Consultores Asociados*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

LIST OF ACRONYMS .....	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	iv
I. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	1
II. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY .....	3
2.1 Evaluation Objectives .....	3
2.2 Methodology .....	3
2.3 Evaluation Limitations.....	4
2.4 Evaluation Questions.....	5
III. EVALUATION FINDINGS .....	7
3.1 Relevance and Project Design .....	7
3.2 Effectiveness and Implementation.....	21
3.3 Sustainability .....	34
IV. LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES.....	39
4.1 Cost Effective Capacity Building Approaches .....	39
4.2 Strategic Choices of Target Beneficiaries.....	39
4.3 Innovative Methods for Conducting Child Labor Research.....	40
4.4 Promoting Greater Coordination among National Stakeholders .....	40
4.5 Sharing National Staff with Other ILO Projects.....	41
V. MAIN CONCLUSIONS .....	42
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	43

## ANNEXES

---

ANNEX 1: Overview of Project Progress by Output.....	46
ANNEX 2: Evaluation Terms of Reference .....	58
ANNEX 3: Evaluation Data Collection Matrix.....	76
ANNEX 4: List of Documents Reviewed .....	91
ANNEX 5: List of Interviews, Meetings and Site Visits .....	93
ANNEX 6: Report of GAP11 Field Visit to Cameroon.....	97
ANNEX 7: Report of GAP11 Field Visit to the Philippines .....	107
ANNEX 8: Report of GAP11 Field Visit to Haiti .....	114
ANNEX 9: Report of GAP11 Stakeholder Online Survey.....	119

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

---

CL	Child Labor
CLEAR	Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor Program
CMEP	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
CTA	Chief Technical Officer
DOLE	Department of Labor and Employment of the Philippines
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN
FL	Forced Labor
FY	Fiscal Year
GEM	Global Evaluation and Monitoring Project
GAP11	Global Action Program on Child Labor
GPRA	Government Performance Result Act
HQ	Headquarters
ILAB	Bureau of International Labor Affairs
ILO	International Labour Organization
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labor
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NAP	National Action Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NSC	National Steering Committee
OCFT	USDOL Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor and Human Trafficking
SAP-FL	Special Action Programme on Forced Labour
SIMPOC	Statistical Information and Monitoring Program on Child Labor
SFS	Sistemas, Familias y Sociedad – Consultores Asociados
TOR	Terms of Reference
TPR	Technical Progress Report
UCW	Understanding Children’s Work
UN	United Nations
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
WDACL	World Day Against Child Labor
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labor

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

### Background and Project Description

---

This report documents the main findings and conclusions of an external independent final evaluation of the Global Action Program on Child Labor 2011 (GAP11), which was carried out from October 2015 to January 2016. The project was implemented by the International Labour Organization (ILO) and aimed to build critical knowledge and capacity for accelerating progress against child labor and, where relevant, forced labor in targeted countries, with particular reference to the 2010 Hague Global Child Labor Conference Roadmap for Achieving the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor by 2016.<sup>1</sup>

The project implemented interventions across a total of 41 countries in five major world regions. Interventions were organized around three expected outcomes:

- **Outcome 1:** Improved legislation, enforcement and policy coordination on child labor and forced labor as well as national capacity to implement policy initiatives to increase access to quality education and sustainable livelihoods for vulnerable populations.
- **Outcome 2:** Innovative research and monitoring systems to guide policy development and program design.
- **Outcome 3:** Strengthened protections to children in domestic work.

### Evaluation Objectives and Methodology

---

The overall purpose of the external independent final evaluation was to:

1. Assess the benefits and challenges of the project's multi-component and multi-country structure and whether this was a successful model;
2. Determine whether the project has achieved its expected outputs and outcomes, and identify the challenges encountered in doing so;
3. Assess the sustainability of project activities;
4. Identify next steps to advance the project's objectives and outcomes; and
5. Identify good practices that should be considered for replication in the future.

The evaluation was carried out by a team of two international consultants from October 2015 to January 2016. In particular, the evaluation looked into (a) the relevance and project design, (b) the effectiveness and implementation, and (c) the sustainability of project interventions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Roadmap outcomes are summarized in the following document:  
<http://www.ilo.org/ipecinfor/product/viewProduct.do?productId=13453>

The evaluators' main data collection methods included a review of project documents, key informant interviews, extensive discussions with in-country project staff and key stakeholders, project performance analysis, review of the relevance and quality of project research and other products, an online questionnaire of national stakeholders from countries not visited by the evaluation team, and budget analysis.

## Evaluation Findings

---

Thirteen main findings emerged from the evaluation.

***Finding 1: Capacity-building strategies were varied and appreciated by stakeholders but more follow-up was needed***

GAP11 implemented a wide variety of strategies to increase the capacity of target countries to address child labor issues, which have contributed to increased knowledge and awareness on child labor, among other positive results. Successful approaches included tailored approaches, experience sharing between countries, learning by doing, and using a former labor inspector to train labor inspectors. The project involved various partners, including ILO constituents, nongovernmental organization (NGOs), other UN agencies and others. Stakeholders' satisfaction with the ILO's efforts was almost uniformly high, based on in-country interviews and stakeholder responses to the GAP11 evaluation questionnaire. However, many stakeholders thought that the longer term effectiveness of project capacity building interventions would be diminished by insufficient follow-up support from the ILO and the government, coupled with insufficient national ownership.

***Finding 2: Many factors in the enabling environment affected implementation both positively and negatively***

Prior interventions to combat child labor and/or forced labor in GAP11 countries were a positive factor enabling project interventions. Past or ongoing activities, and in particular an ongoing ILO presence in the country, often meant that the project's relatively limited interventions and budget could build on existing foundations or leverage complementary resources. Project managers seized on opportunities to mobilize existing ILO human resources, collaborate with other international organizations and institutional partners, and capitalize on complementary resources from other projects. However, this required time investment and contributed to implementation delays. Additionally, there were numerous external factors beyond the project's control that hindered progress, including conflict, natural disaster, economic upheaval and civil unrest, as well as frequent turnover in project counterpart personnel.

***Finding 3: Characteristics of the project design contributed to implementation challenges in various ways***

The design of GAP11 significantly contributed to implementation challenges. The sheer number of interventions spread across the globe in combination with relatively small activity budgets and the frequent lack of obvious, built-in synergies between components were not conducive to efficient



implementation, leading to complicated project management arrangements and high transaction costs in some settings.

The large number of geographically dispersed countries targeted by GAP11 favored centralized management, while its legal, regulatory and policy oriented activities would have been served better by having a longer term in-country GAP staff presence. More national staff would have facilitated a more sustained national dialogue.

***Finding 4: Limited synergies between Child Labor and Forced Labor interventions***

Within GAP11, project activities on child labor and forced labor overlapped in fairly limited ways, mainly in the context of legal and regulatory framework assessments. Project follow-on capacity building interventions at the country level tended to address the issues separately. An exception is Timor Leste, where the project is implementing a joint data collection exercise and may develop a joint NAP. Even so, GAP11 fostered frequent contact and collaboration between child labor and force labor specialists, which contributed positively to knowledge sharing among some team members.

***Finding 5: Many GAP11 outcome targets were missed for a variety of reasons***

GAP11 project managers anticipated attaining a large number of achievements under USDOL's Government Performance Result Act (GPRA) capacity outcome goals. However, many of these are unlikely to be reached before the end of the project. Reasons for this include unforeseen project implementation delays or cancellations, difficulty obtaining the required level of official validation/adoption from counterpart governments, and in some cases, poor target-setting. GPRA indicator targets should have been more tightly managed and thoughtful in the early stages of the project (adjustments were made in the latter part). In addition, future legal, regulatory and capacity building projects should use a broader set of indicators set by the project team, rather than having GPRA as the only monitoring tool by which project achievements will be judged and evaluated.

***Finding 6: Thanks to multiple extensions in the project implementing period, most planned project outputs will likely be achieved before project end***

Based on progress to date and project management projections, GAP11 will achieve most of its planned outputs before the end of the project. The project has taken significantly longer to implement and has been accorded multiple extensions, totaling 30 months. According to various key informants, varying degrees of cooperation from national counterparts, administrative delays, the absence of long term project management personnel in the field, and inadequate funding as well as other unfavorable circumstances affected project implementation and caused delays. However, the project cancelled planned interventions in only a few countries and in nearly all these cases, for reasons beyond its control.

***Finding 7: There were many positive outcomes of project intervention, but not all of them were measured by the GPRA indicator***

There were many positive results produced by GAP11 that are not measured by the GPRA capacity indicator. For example, most respondents thought that capacity building for strengthening



enforcement and monitoring was very useful and expect that the tools and skills contributed by the project will be applied in law enforcement activities.

Moreover, it should be noted that the achievement of some GPRA outcomes may be realized later, given that policy and regulatory changes often lag behind other kinds of changes and that some of the capacity building outputs may be built upon by other ILO Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (FUNDAMENTALS) Branch projects that follow GAP11.

***Finding 8: National stakeholders were effectively engaged but with some gaps***

GAP11 used many effective strategies to engage national stakeholders in the project's design and implementation that were conducive to promoting national ownership of project objectives and outcomes. They included tailoring project interventions to stakeholder needs and requests, involving them in the determining terms of reference for research, mobilizing a large variety of stakeholders and good communication practices. These processes contributed to a sense of ownership and commitment to advance the project's objectives among the people and institutions who were most actively involved. However, the same processes did not guarantee buy-in from higher level decision makers who influence resource allocations and policy priorities. Their buy-in and participation was hindered when interventions were not aligned with their top priorities. Moreover, ownership and actual capacity to advance the project's objectives and outcomes in the future are not synonymous; many stakeholders expect continued ILO leadership, technical assistance and additional resources to move forward.

***Finding 9: Technical and management lessons may be learned from cancelled activities. In some cases in which the project faced challenges mobilizing national stakeholders, the project would have been more efficient had it cancelled activities sooner. Better communication between the donor and the grantee may have facilitated more collegial discussion and timely decision making on these matters.***

Lessons learned from cases in which project activities had to be canceled were both technical and managerial. On the technical side, all project stakeholders acknowledged that effective dialogue with national stakeholders on forced labor issues required special handling to initiate and maintain key stakeholder participation. On the management side, the main lessons were learned from cases in which project activities had to be cancelled, especially because of issues related to counterpart buy-in, related to knowing when and how to change plans and move on to other alternatives.

***Finding 10: Project was effective in its collaboration with other ILO initiatives and support units***

GAP11 managers coordinated and integrated project activities with current country activities of other ILO initiatives through staff and activity cost-sharing arrangements, by building on previous projects' outputs and outcomes, and by linking with new ILO projects. The project successfully collaborated with regionally-based ILO Specialists, some of whom contributed their time and technical assistance for project implementation. The project also integrated child labor and (where relevant) forced labor activities with ongoing concerns of ILO country offices and regional Decent Work support teams.

***Finding 11: Limited overlap between GAP11 components constrained programmatic synergies***

Synergies between the three components were limited because only a limited number of activities from the different components overlapped in the project target countries. As a consequence, collaboration between the various GAP11 Component Senior Advisors on program implementation was also fairly limited. However, where feasible, the project team worked together effectively.

***Finding 12: Component Senior Advisors were given significant decision-making authority with mainly positive but some negative outcomes***

In response to the limited overlap of component activities in target countries and the large number of countries and activities, the project's Chief Technical Advisor allowed Component Senior Advisors a high degree of autonomy to plan and implement their work plans. This management approach was efficient in many program management aspects by limiting decision-making bottlenecks. However, there were also some negative aspects of management decentralization which were highlighted by the donor. It made it more difficult to obtain timely information on overall project progress.

***Finding 13: Project put in place good strategies for ensuring sustainability but with some limitations***

GAP11 proposed strategies and developed plans to contribute to the sustainability of their interventions. Still, lack of political will and insufficient counterpart capacity were often cited by stakeholders as obstacles to sustaining positive outcomes of program interventions. The limited scope and duration of project interventions negatively affected sustainability in some situations.

## Good Practices and Lessons Learned

---

GAP11 interventions featured many good practices including: cost effective capacity building approaches making use of global toolkits, online learning resources, and policy notes; building the capacity and capitalizing on the outsized impact of champion/leaders; innovative methods for conducting research; and promoting greater coordination among national stakeholders.

## Recommendations

---

The following are some recommendations to guide future initiatives.

**Recommendation 1:** Future multi-country policy and capacity building-related projects should be more focused geographically and target fewer countries.

**Recommendation 2:** In future projects, operational management of project implementation should be mainly handled by national program officers who are based in the country.

**Recommendation 3:** In future policy and capacity building projects, when appropriate, project managers should be able to shift resources to countries and intervention strategies that present the best opportunities to garner buy-in from relevant national stakeholders or to seize on new opportunities that emerge in the implementing environment during the course of the project

implementation period. Contractual and administrative mechanisms should be designed to facilitate this kind of flexibility.

**Recommendations 4 and 5:** The next generation of projects on child labor and forced labor should invest fewer resources in reforming laws and legal instruments at the national level and put more effort into helping stakeholders to apply/enforce/implement existing laws and policies. Future projects should also look less into improving or updating the NAPs and more into helping local stakeholders to mobilize their own resources and implement pieces of the NAP.

**Recommendation 6:** Responsible Ministries for policies on the elimination of child labor and forced labor are often different in the target countries. As such, constituents and other concerned stakeholders do not always understand the linkages between the two issues. Future projects that wish to marry the two agendas should take a more long term approach, in consultation with national partners in the target countries, to ensure project activities and beneficiaries correctly respond to child labor and forced labor linkages and differences.

**Recommendations 7 and 8:** Future evaluations of ILO programs should look at more than one project and longer timeframes in order to assess the impact of the organization's legal, regulatory and policy framework and capacity building interventions. The final evaluation of GAP11 planned by ILO should have a particular emphasis on project sustainability-related aspects.

## I. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

This report documents the main findings and conclusions of an external independent final evaluation of the Global Action Program on Child Labor Issues 2011 (GAP11) which was carried out from October 2015 to January 2016. In September 2011, the International Labour Organization (ILO) signed a three-year Cooperative Agreement with the United States Department of Labor (USDOL) Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB) Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor and Human Trafficking (OCFT) worth US \$15,000,000 to implement a global project on child labor (CL) and forced labor (FL). In 2012, the project received \$900,000 in additional funding and its end date was extended to September 30, 2015. In early 2015 a no-cost extension moved the end date to March 31, 2016. A final project extension, granted on October 22, 2015, prolonged the project by an additional twelve months to March 31, 2017.

The project aimed to build critical knowledge and capacity for accelerating progress against child labor and, where relevant, forced labor in targeted countries, with particular reference to the 2010 Hague Global Child Labor Conference Roadmap for Achieving the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor by 2016.<sup>2</sup> Interventions were organized around three expected outcomes:

1. **Outcome 1:** Improved legislation, enforcement and policy coordination on child labor and forced labor as well as national capacity to implement policy initiatives to increase access to quality education and sustainable livelihoods for vulnerable populations.

The first component involved assistance to identify and address legal and regulatory gaps in the areas of child labor and forced labor, as well as to strengthening accompanying monitoring and enforcement mechanisms. It also supported the development and/or the implementation of national action plans (NAP) on the two issues, and promoted mainstreaming of child and forced labor concerns into broader sectoral policies.

2. **Outcome 2:** Innovative research and monitoring systems to guide policy development and program design.

The second component sought to improve information and statistics on child labor and forced labor in their various dimensions, and to apply this improved knowledge base in policy design. It formed part of the wider ILO strategy of using statistical information and policy analysis to guide scaled-up and accelerated action against child and forced labor. Most planned research was implemented by two research entities that were part of the project management team: the Statistical Information and Monitoring Program on Child Labor (SIMPOC), which is based within the ILO in Geneva, and Understanding Child Labor (UCW), which is an inter-agency research cooperation initiative

---

<sup>2</sup> Roadmap outcomes are summarized in the following document:  
<http://www.ilo.org/ipecinfor/product/viewProduct.do?productId=13453>

involving the ILO, the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and the World Bank, based in Rome.

### 3. **Outcome 3:** Strengthened protections to children in domestic work.

The third component sought to strengthen protections for children engaged in domestic work through support for a situational analysis; legal, regulatory and social service assessments; a variety of awareness raising and advocacy activities; and the formulation of enabling policy frameworks in twelve countries. The project component followed on the heels of the 2011 International Labour Conference during which Convention 189 (C. 189), concerning decent work for domestic workers, was ratified. The project sought to support stakeholders within ILO member states to analyze and apply the new Convention’s principles on decent work for domestic workers in order to increase protections for young workers within the broader framework of the two ILO fundamental conventions on child labor (Conventions 138 and 182).

The project planned to implement interventions relating to the three project components across a total of 41 countries in five major world regions, 31 of which were specified in the project solicitation. At the time of the evaluation, the countries targeted by the project, per component, were as follows:

1. For **Component 1**, the project operated in Azerbaijan, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Ecuador, Ethiopia, Haiti, Indonesia, the People’s Democratic Republic of Lao, Liberia, Mali, Mongolia, Namibia, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Timor Leste, and Togo.
2. For **Component 2**, the project operated in Bangladesh, Belize, Brazil, Dominican Republic, Ghana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Jordan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Philippines, South Africa, Swaziland, Togo, Turkey, Ukraine, Uganda, and Zambia.
3. For **Component 3**, the project operated in Cameroon, Ecuador, Gabon, Haiti, Indonesia, Kenya, Namibia, Panama, Pakistan, Philippines, Togo, and Vietnam.

## II. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

---

### 2.1 Evaluation Objectives

---

According to the Terms of Reference (TOR, see Annex 2), the overall purpose of the external independent final evaluation was to:

1. Assess the benefits and challenges of the project's multi-component and multi-country structure and whether this was a successful model;
2. Determine whether the project has achieved its expected outputs and outcomes, and identify the challenges encountered in doing so;
3. Assess the sustainability of project activities;
4. Identify next steps to advance the project's objectives and outcomes; and
5. Identify good practices that should be considered for replication in the future.

The scope of the evaluation included a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL Cooperative Agreement with ILO. All activities that had been implemented from project launch through time of evaluation fieldwork were considered. The evaluation assessed the achievements of the project toward reaching its targets and objectives as outlined in the cooperative agreement and project document. In particular, the evaluation team considered issues of project design, implementation progress, management, efficiency, lessons learned and sustainability. The intended users of the evaluation are OCFT, ILO and its constituents, as well as other stakeholders working to combat child labor and forced labor more broadly who may be interested in its recommendations for current or future projects.

### 2.2 Methodology

---

A team of two international consultants carried out the evaluation from October 2015 to January 2016. The Co-Evaluators' main data collection methods included reviewing project documents, conducting key informant interviews, holding extensive discussions with in-country project staff and key stakeholders in the three countries that were visited, performing a project performance analysis, reviewing the relevance and quality of project research and other products, developing an online questionnaire for national stakeholders from countries not visited by the evaluation team, and conducting a budget analysis.

After an initial review of key project documents, the evaluation team visited ILO's Headquarters (HQ) in Geneva as well as UCW's Headquarters in Rome, to interview the project Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), staff members responsible for the three project components, and other ILO relevant stakeholders (see Annex 4).

Following the orientation meetings in Geneva, the members of the evaluation team separately carried out missions to Cameroon, Haiti, and the Philippines. During these field missions, individual interviews and discussion groups with national stakeholders were carried out (see Annex 5). The purpose was to assess stakeholders' perception and satisfaction with project implementation, contrast the validity of project strategies used in the field, appraise the quality of services delivered by the project, and identify unexpected effects of project activities as well as other relevant features of project implementation.

In order to assess the outcome of project interventions in the project's other 38 target countries which were not visited by the evaluators, the evaluation team developed an online questionnaire addressed to ILO staff involved in implementation, as well as national stakeholders from Ministries of Labor and of Statistics, national research organizations, employers' and workers' organizations, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and other stakeholders. Fifty stakeholders from 22 countries<sup>3</sup> responded to the questionnaire, which was sent out in late October/early November 2015 and remained open for responses for approximately three weeks. A detailed report on the survey is included in Annex 9. The evaluation team also reviewed a sample of project research reports and other outputs produced by the same in order to assess their quality (see Annex 4).<sup>4</sup> Upon completion of the field work and the online questionnaire, the evaluation team presented the initial findings and recommendations to the ILO and USDOL in a debrief teleconference conducted in Geneva in November 2015.

### 2.3 Evaluation Limitations

---

The Co-Evaluators were only able to visit three out of the 41 countries included in this project. Direct feedback from stakeholders in other countries was collected using the online survey and is limited according to the countries and categories of stakeholders who responded. As a result, the information collected from most of the countries will not contain the same level of depth as the three countries visited. Because of the wide variety of contexts, intervention types and strategies used in GAP11, it is particularly difficult to generalize evaluation findings from one country to another.

In an effort to improve the relevancy of survey responses, the evaluation team designed the questionnaire so that stakeholders were only asked questions about the GAP11 components that

---

<sup>3</sup> Azerbaijan, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Comoros, Ecuador, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Lao PDR, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Panama, Paraguay, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, South Africa, South Sudan, Timor Leste, Togo, Turkey, and Ukraine. At least one stakeholder from 58% of the countries that were targeted by GAP responded to the survey. (Response rate by stakeholder is not available, as the link to the questionnaire was sent out in a decentralized manner.)

<sup>4</sup> The selection criteria for the document review included: documents relevant to country evaluation field visits, documents representative of various types of research conducted by the project, documents on a spectrum of topics addressed by the project.



were implemented in their country. However, because there may have been several ILO supported projects implemented in GAP11 countries during the project implementation period, respondents most likely were not able to draw a fine line between what was funded by GAP11 versus other ILO projects. Additionally, the qualitative data collected via the online questionnaire varied in depth and could not be clarified or enriched through follow-up questions.

The evaluation findings are based on information collected from background documents and in interviews with stakeholders and project staff. The accuracy of the evaluation findings will be determined by the integrity of information provided to the Co-Evaluators from these sources.

Lastly, the ability of the Co-Evaluators to determine project efficiency will be limited by the amount of financial data available. A cost-efficiency analysis is not included because it would require impact data which is not available.

## 2.4 Evaluation Questions

---

The evaluation was guided by the following list of questions, which were jointly agreed upon by the evaluation team and USDOL with input from the grantee.

### Relevance and Project Design

1. What were the different strategies/approaches to increase the capacity of target countries to address child labor and forced labor issues? Which capacity-building strategies/approaches worked well or not so well, and why or why not?
2. What factors contributed to, or hindered, the creation of an “enabling environment” for GAP 11? To what degree did external factors influence the achievement of outcomes? To what extent did GAP 11 adapt its work in a timely and continuous manner in response to the changing social, political and economic environment?
3. What are the various benefits and challenges of the large scale and complex nature (multi-component and multi-country) of the project? Does this model permit an efficient use of available resources?
4. Was the approach of combining child labor and forced labor relevant and effective to addressing each?
5. How were the outcome (GPRA) targets set? What lessons can be learned from the project’s experience in this regard?

### Effectiveness and Implementation

6. Has the project completed all planned outputs? Has it achieved its three outcomes as described on page 5? Why or why not?
  - a. How effective were the interventions at mainstreaming CL and FL into legislation, policies and development plans?

- b. Has the project's research component achieved its objectives?
  - c. To what extent has the project strengthened protections to children in domestic work?
- 7. To what extent did national stakeholders participate in the project's design and implementation? Do local stakeholders regard the project as their own and are they committed to advancing the project's objectives and outcomes? What lessons can be learned from cases in which project activities had to be canceled, for example, in Malaysia and Indonesia, as well as Bangladesh?
- 8. How did the project coordinate country activities with other ILO initiatives, such as the Decent Work Country Programs?
- 9. What value has ILO/IPEC/ILO Forced Labor specialists/UCW added? What was the extent of collaboration among these units, in particular between IPEC and ILO Forced Labor Specialists?

### Sustainability

- 10. Which project activities or aspects of these activities will likely be sustainable? For example, what is the likelihood that:
  - a. Legal and regulatory frameworks against child labor and forced labor will continue to be strengthened, including National Action Plans (NAP)?
  - b. Enforcement mechanisms will continue to be strengthened? Are there sufficient resources and political will to enforce improved legislation?
  - c. Pilot schemes on child labor and forced labor will be mainstreamed into development policies?
  - d. National child labor surveys will continue to be conducted at regular intervals?
  - e. Lessons learned from child labor modules to impact evaluations will be implemented?
  - f. Policy recommendations from country situational analyses and policy appraisals will be adopted?
  - g. Thematic studies will inform policy and programs on child labor and forced labor?
  - h. Universities and non-profit research organizations will continue to conduct research on child labor?
  - i. Legal frameworks and social services for child domestic workers will be strengthened?
  - j. Protective policies for child domestic workers will be adopted and implemented?
- 11. What good practices can be identified in the project for possible replication?
- 12. What would be the next steps to advance the project's objectives and outcomes?

## III. EVALUATION FINDINGS

---

### 3.1 Relevance and Project Design

---

#### 3.1.1 CAPACITY-BUILDING STRATEGIES

**Finding 1:** *GAP11 implemented a wide variety of strategies to increase the capacity of target countries to address child labor issues (see examples below). Stakeholders' satisfaction with the ILO's efforts was almost uniformly high based on in-country interviews and stakeholder responses to the GAP11 evaluation questionnaire. Although GAP11 implemented capacity building strategies that were reported to have contributed to increased knowledge and awareness on child labor among other positive results, many stakeholders thought that the longer term effectiveness of project capacity building interventions would be diminished by insufficient follow-up support from the ILO coupled with a lack of national ownership.*

GAP11 capacity building strategies included increasing the knowledge base through quantitative and qualitative research and analysis, supporting awareness raising activities, mobilizing key stakeholders for consensus building activities, procuring and delivering technical support for the preparation and adoption of legal and policy documents (NAP, laws and hazardous lists), learning by doing with coaching (data collection, research), South-South exchanges and training in various forms including face-to-face workshops, online training, and training of trainers.

Most stakeholders who responded to the evaluation questionnaire indicated that the project contributed to increasing their knowledge and awareness on child labor. Of particular value was stakeholder feedback indicating what capacity building allowed them to do, because it implied that learning was being applied. Various stakeholders indicated that they were able to: assess gaps in existing policy and practices affecting the prevalence of child labor and make relevant recommendations for changes (Azerbaijan); increase understanding of child labor among specific target groups such as people in the agricultural sector (Mali); monitor child labor more effectively (Burkina Faso); collaborate more with social partners (Azerbaijan); and conduct labor inspections more efficiently (Sierra Leone).

##### ***3.1.1.1. Successful Approaches***

Although there is insufficient data on the impact of various project capacity building strategies to conclude which approaches worked best, project stakeholders highlighted examples of what they consider to be good approaches:

#### **A. Tailored Approaches**

According to the Component 1 Manager, tailored approaches (approaches that responded to a specific need expressed by stakeholders) were effective because they tended to increase stakeholder ownership. She cited the example of Mongolia where the GAP11 was able to respond to a request from the Ministry of Justice for assistance to support the revision of the Criminal Code

and related legislation for the full and effective prohibition of the worst forms of child labor (WFCL) and forced labor and protection of the rights of child victims and witnesses in Mongolia. ILO assistance was deemed effective because it was timely and relevant (corresponded to a government counterpart's priorities). Similarly, a questionnaire respondent from Timor Leste said s/he was very appreciative of ILO assistance for the upcoming national survey on child and forced labor because it responded to a government request for numbers on both issues.

### **B. Sharing Experiences with Other Countries**

Several stakeholders highlighted the value of experience-sharing with other countries because they were able to learn from the practical experiences of their peers who many times shared common challenges. One stakeholder in Haiti noted that after attending so many workshops and seminars, some government counterparts have become rather indifferent to their content; in contrast, he noted keen interest when representatives from a country in the region organized a workshop to share their experiences on labor inspection. South-South exchanges featured in several GAP11 countries.<sup>5</sup>

### **C. Learning by Doing**

ILO personnel also believed learning-by-doing approaches to have been effective. One stakeholder described inspector training in Timor Leste as innovative and effective because it featured morning training sessions followed by the inspectors' regular inspections in the afternoon. In effect, GAP 11 adjusted its training program to their schedule and incorporated learning by doing into the training by accompanying them on their regular inspections and providing feedback and comments, thereby coaching them to apply what they learned immediately. Similarly, UCW provided personalized coaching to university grant recipients to carry out their research projects. One questionnaire respondent from Turkey noted "UCW has been very responsive in our collaboration. We communicate well via emails and Skype chats. The researchers have been able to receive feedback, though sometimes a little late, and the feedback has always been helpful."

### **D. Using a Former Labor Inspector to Train Labor Inspectors**

With benefits similar to South-South cooperation, the ILO used a former labor inspector to train

---

<sup>5</sup> Examples of South-South exchanges funded, facilitated or capitalized on by GAP11 include Timor Leste (Brazilian labor inspectors-led training), Haiti (involvement of GAP11 stakeholders in Latin America and Caribbean regional pact and exchanges with Brazil), Cameroon (exchange with West African Parliamentarians and visit to Ghana), DRC (country delegation participated in regional workshop on NAP implementation held in Burkina Faso), Liberia (GAP11 brought in expertise from Ghana to assist with NAP development), Cambodia (workshop bringing together different GAP11 countries from the region at various stages of NAP and national child/forced labor survey development and implementation to share experiences), among others. Before the end of the project, additional exchanges are planned including an exchange on Child Labor Monitoring Systems and labor inspection between the Dominican Republic and El Salvador.

inspectors in three GAP11 countries (Azerbaijan, Ethiopia and Sierra Leone<sup>6</sup>) where the training was reported by the ILO to be very effective, at least in part because the consultant was able to share his practical experiences with participants. The evaluators interviewed the consultant who evidenced practical, down-to-earth knowledge about how to make labor inspection effective even with limited resources. According to one questionnaire respondent from Sierra Leone, the training is being put into practice: “Results are encouraging since much awareness has been created among key enforcement partners. Some of the partners are currently engaged in child labor monitoring activities.”

### ***3.1.1.2. Selection of Partners***

The selection of partners to benefit from GAP11 capacity building is an important factor in project effectiveness and there were many positive aspects of GAP11 strategies in this regard:

#### **A. ILO Constituents**

In most countries, the focus of ILO International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) capacity building was its “traditional” partners or constituents within the Ministry of Labor and social partners. A government stakeholder from Azerbaijan reported, “ILO had close cooperation and involvement of all its social partners and the Ministry of Labor in Azerbaijan in the framework of implementing child labor [initiatives].” The long-standing relationship that the ILO has with its constituents is valuable for policy dialogue because there is a relatively high degree of trust between the parties and integrates with other, on-going assistance provided by ILO specialists related to national commitments to uphold international conventions and related accountability systems. For example, the Ministry of Labor of Cameroon was called before the Committee of Experts in June 2015 to account for the country’s slow progress fulfilling its obligations related to C. 182; during the evaluator’s field visit to this country, it was understood that it was important to the Ministry to improve the country’s record. Similarly, Paraguay was examined under Convention 169 on the rights of Indigenous Persons at the 2015 International Labour Conference, which may have provided additional incentive for the government to step up their efforts to address forced labor in the Chaco.

#### **B. Variety of Stakeholders**

The project was in many cases effective in mobilizing a large number of relevant stakeholders in consensus-building activities that may contribute to more coordinated responses to child labor in the relevant countries. For example, two thirds of the survey respondents considered the GAP11 to be successful in involving a variety of stakeholders in the development of the NAP. In Haiti, Component 3 was innovative in pulling together a multi-stakeholder working group with other UN agencies and important NGOs in child protection to research and work together to improve protections for children in domestic work (see Good Practices).

---

<sup>6</sup> The same approach is also planned for South Sudan.

### 3.1.1.3. Suggestions for Improvement

Stakeholders also made suggestions for how capacity building could be improved:

#### A. Better Targeting

Some stakeholders indicated that capacity building could have been targeted better in their country. One stakeholder from Mali indicated that the project approach to capacity building in his country was too top-down and did not adequately engage stakeholders at the regional and local levels who are ultimately charged with implementing national policies and laws. Stakeholders in both Haiti and Cameroon indicated that within the Ministry of Labor, the people who participate in policy and plan formulation are often not the people who later are involved in directly implementing the plan or policy.<sup>7</sup> In Haiti,<sup>8</sup> one stakeholder indicated that she thought that law enforcement and the judiciary should receive more attention. In Cameroon, one stakeholder thought that the national efforts to combat child labor would be strengthened by additional ILO capacity building and collaboration with the Ministry of Social Affairs.

#### B. More Extensive Follow-up

National stakeholders indicated that more ILO and government follow-up are needed for capacity building results to translate into sustainable, positive outcomes. For example, a government stakeholder from Comoros noted, “The National Action Plan Against the WFCL delivered many successful results, notably the establishment of the steering committee, the analysis of the sectors most affected by child labor, and the study on institutional partners’ capacity building needs. However, there is a problem sustaining the gains after the end of the project.” This observation was echoed in the remarks of a government stakeholder from Togo, “Although there were satisfactory results immediately after the activities, the lack of follow-up at the national level reduces the effectiveness of the results.”

## 3.1.2 EFFECTS OF ENABLING ENVIRONMENT ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

***Finding 2:** Prior interventions to combat child labor and/or forced labor in GAP11 countries were a positive factor enabling project interventions. Past or ongoing activities, and in particular an ongoing ILO presence in the country, often meant that the project’s relatively limited interventions and budget could build on existing foundations or leverage complementary resources. Project managers seized on opportunities to mobilize existing ILO human resources, collaborate with other international organizations and institutional partners, and capitalize on complementary resources from other projects. However, this required time investment and contributed to implementation delays.*

---

<sup>7</sup> In order to overcome this difficulty, project staff at field level would be required.

<sup>8</sup> It should be noted that in Haiti, following the legal review no GAP capacity-building has taken place. The next steps, in combination with Component 3, will address the issues of law enforcement and justice.

*Additionally, there were numerous external factors beyond the project's control that hindered progress, including conflict, natural disaster, economic upheaval and civil unrest, as well as frequent turnover in project counterpart personnel.*

Prior interventions to combat child labor and/or forced labor in GAP11 countries were a positive factor enabling the implementation of project interventions, especially of Components 1 and 3. Past or ongoing activities often meant that the project's relatively limited interventions and budget could build on existing foundations or leverage complementary resources. An ongoing ILO presence in the country and the opportunity to follow-up on GAP interventions with other programs and forms of assistance was also important to achieving project outcomes. To maximize the project's limited resources at country level (given the large number of countries), project managers were resourceful in mobilizing existing ILO human resources, collaborating with other international organizations and institutional partners and leveraging complementary resources from other projects where these were available in order to realize their objectives, but this took time and contributed to implementation delays.

### ***3.1.2.1. Leveraging Resources***

To compensate for country budget limitations, GAP11 managers leveraged other ILO resources in target countries, mobilized in-kind and cost shared resources with relevant partners and projects with similar goals and objectives. Some examples include:

- GAP11 interventions in Mali built on the foundation laid by another ILO and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) project that established a roadmap for eliminating child labor in the agricultural sector. Even though the roadmap required updating, it provided a framework for GAP11 to mainstream child labor interventions in the activities of farmers associations, agricultural extension services and other key stakeholders at the regional level within Mali's agriculture sector. Project activities were also planned in coordination with a Dutch-funded project on child labor and education (which ended in September 2015). The same project funded most of the salary of the national staff person who planned and implemented GAP 11 activities.
- In Haiti, GAP11 is integrating with another ongoing Norway-funded child labor project focused on youth employment that will allow the ILO to continue with activities to address child labor in domestic work after GAP11 interventions finish. The project CTA noted that one way her project is considering doing this is by offering youth training to "professionalize" domestic service.
- In the Philippines, GAP11 built on the work of two projects: the Time Bound Program and "Towards a Child Labor Free Philippines" (ended in 2013) and is being followed up by the Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor (CLEAR) Program. GAP11 is contributing to the cost of a program manager with the latter two projects.



- In Ethiopia, GAP11 was able to collaborate and cost share for inspector training with World Vision, which is implementing a program on child labor in weaving.
- In contrast, ILO stakeholders found that initiating planned GAP11 interventions in Belize and Gabon, where child labor was a relatively new issue and there was no ILO presence in the country, was extremely difficult. Similarly, the absence of IPEC after the end of a previous project in Namibia had left a gap in work on child labor that made interventions more challenging.

### *3.1.2.2. Collaboration with Other ILO Units and Other Agencies*

In the absence of permanent project personnel in target countries, the project management team found ways to collaborate effectively with other ILO units, other UN agencies, and with NGOs which contributed to improved coordination among people and institutions with complementary goals. This may enable more continuity of support and sustainability for GAP11 interventions in some target countries.

- In Cameroon, the ILO Decent Work Support Team Office for Central Africa, located in Yaoundé, provided on-the-ground assistance to manage GAP11 activities. The ILO Norms Specialist, in particular, invested significant time and effort to support ILO constituents with NAP formulation and to follow-up on Geneva-based GAP11 personnel actions. He was instrumental in integrating child labor interventions into the Support Team plans for Cameroon in the coming years. The same specialist also provided support for GAP11 activities in Gabon.
- In Mongolia, GAP11 mobilized the ILO International Standards Specialist based in Bangkok to provide technical support to the Ministry of Justice for the revision of the criminal code and related legislation in order to more comprehensively prohibit the worst forms of child labor and forced labor.
- In Haiti, GAP11 co-funded comprehensive research on the child labor in domestic work with UNICEF, the International Organization on Migration and several large international NGOs. UNICEF funded the activity manager and covered a substantial portion of the research costs while ILO contributed funds and technical inputs. According to a stakeholder from UNICEF in Haiti, UNICEF plans to follow up on the GAP11 activity with other interventions to address the recommendations of the study in the coming years.
- In Mali, GAP 11 worked closely with FAO for the revision of the Roadmap to Eliminate Child Labor in Agriculture and follow-up activities.
- In Liberia, the ILO, Winrock and UNICEF are collaborating around NAP development and implementation.

- UCW's impact evaluation research projects leveraged data from larger impact evaluations collected by the World Bank, FAO and UNICEF in Malawi, Lesotho, the Philippines, Kenya, Zambia and Mali.

### ***3.1.2.3. Challenges and Limitations***

#### **A. Time Investment and Dependence on External Circumstances**

Stakeholders within the GAP11 project management team said that although arrangements like the ones described above allowed them to advance project objectives with fairly limited resources, they took time to set up, sometimes required extensive negotiations, and made them dependent on people and budget allocations that they did not fully control, all of which contributed to implementation delays. For example, the co-funded research project with UNICEF in Haiti took a long time to set up administratively and overall project coordination was managed by UNICEF. Implementation arrangements that engaged ILO Decent Work Team Specialists (Cameroon, Namibia) required the project to work within the specialists' work plan and team priorities. The UCW manager also said that UCW impact evaluation work could only follow partner research, which in recent years was mainly on the impact of social protection programs, and in particular cash transfer programs, and that this limited his ability to explore other issues that affect the incidence of child labor.

#### **B. Natural and Man-made Disasters**

Other challenges that slowed or halted project interventions and/or limited the achievement of desired outcomes included natural or man-made disasters that diverted the attention of key stakeholders and the population alike to issues of more immediate concern. The Ebola crisis in Liberia, the civil wars in Ukraine, South Sudan and Mali, and Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines are high profile examples but not necessarily the only cases of this type.<sup>9</sup> Because of the various project extensions, project managers were able to temporarily halt work or delay start-up in crisis countries and resume/start-up once conditions improved (for example, Liberia, Ukraine and Mali), although some activities were also cancelled (for example in South Sudan). One way the project

---

<sup>9</sup> Stakeholders in Cameroon cited the threat from Boko Haram as consuming the government's attention. In Haiti, in the start-up phase, the project was affected by post-earthquake emergency and more recently the dissolution of Parliament followed by eight months of electoral campaigning greatly slowed project momentum. UCW cited political changes in Honduras as contributing to implementation delays. Changes in government in the Democratic Republic of Congo and insecurity in Mali caused by the insurgency in the north of the country also affected project implementation in these countries.

capitalized on its work in emergency situations was by producing an unplanned policy note on child labor and education in emergency situations.<sup>10</sup>

### C. Changes in the Policy Environment

Turn-over in counterpart agencies, national elections and other political changes also affected project interventions in many countries. For example, in Paraguay, the separation of the Ministry of Labor and the Ministry of Justice required substantial changes in project plans and slowed the development of the NAP on forced labor. Stakeholders within the GAP11 project management team reported that in most cases even with political turnover, they were able to continue work on project outputs with lower level civil servants who are less susceptible to be changed.

However, difficulty maintaining political will at the highest levels of government at times affected the project's achievement of outcomes. After GAP11's successful collaboration with the Ministry of Justice in Mongolia, a new Minister of Justice assumed office and withdrew the revised criminal code, which had been pending Parliamentary approval, from further review. One questionnaire respondent from Mongolia noted, "It was a significant change when the national program on combating worst forms of child labor was released and ILO played the key role for the program to be approved. However, the implementation process slowed down; furthermore [the] planned first stage evaluation has not been done. Community reps believe that this is the negative result of political circumstances as every time new people and new government takeover, the previous work became left out and ignored."

#### 3.1.3 PROJECT DESIGN

***Finding 3:** The design of GAP11 significantly contributed to implementation challenges. The sheer number of interventions spread across the globe, in combination with relatively small activity budgets per country, the absence of built-in synergies between components in target countries, and insufficient flexibility to shift resources strategically, were not conducive to efficient implementation. The large number and geographically dispersed countries targeted by GAP11 favored centralized management while its legal, regulatory and policy-oriented activities would have been served better by having more in-country human resources to sustain dialogue and provide technical support.*

---

<sup>10</sup> [http://www.ilo.org/ipecc/Informationresources/WCMS\\_IPEC\\_PUB\\_26995/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/ipecc/Informationresources/WCMS_IPEC_PUB_26995/lang--en/index.htm). "No to child labour YES to safe and quality education in emergencies is a four page note that targets humanitarian child protection and education actors. It was developed in close collaboration with both the [Child Protection \(in Emergency\) Working Group](#) and the [Global Education Cluster](#). The note (in English, Spanish and French) has been widely disseminated to humanitarian actors in the field through the coordinators of these two networks (these mailing lists include thousands of people around the world).

### ***3.1.3.1. Factors Affecting Project Efficiency***

There were many factors related to the design<sup>11</sup> of the GAP11 that affected project efficiency negatively:

#### **A. Centralization of Project Management**

Due to the project coverage, structure and resource allocation, GAP11 was managed in a centralized way from ILO HQ. In one of the early project modifications, the donor, responding to requests from the ILO, allocated an additional \$900,000 to the project budget which included US\$340,000 for hiring short and medium term national staff.<sup>12</sup> Stakeholders within the ILO expressed appreciation for this change, indicating that it significantly improved project implementation in a number of countries.

In some cases, the centralization of project management, in combination with other project design challenges (many countries, limited per country budgets) and limited resources for national staff, contributed to short, ineffective “drop in and drop out” types of interventions in some countries as well as to delays in project implementation. For example, in many of the countries where protective policy frameworks were developed (Component 3 on domestic work), there has been very little project capacity to follow up after the framework was validated by stakeholders. In Cameroon, short term consultants carried out the research to inform the protective policy framework design and the Senior Technical Advisor participated in the workshop during which the framework was developed and validated by stakeholders. Geneva-based personnel also returned to participate in the workshop during which the framework was integrated into the NAP several months later. In both cases, the output was achieved but the short-term nature of the assistance may hinder the achievement of the project’s broader objectives. In Cameroon, as in most of the Component 3 countries, follow-up mainstreaming work with policy makers and trade unions has yet to be started (see Output 3.2.4 in the Output Table in Annex 1). One of the reasons for this result is most likely the absence of national program staff on the ground.

In contrast, in Lao PDR, the project has been able to place a full time staff person within the Ministry of Labor to provide continuous capacity building for the implementation of the NAP. Having a person on the ground allowed the project to carry out institutional capacity mapping and other training to support NAP implementation, including mainstreaming child labor in the education and agriculture sectors.

---

<sup>11</sup> Responsibility for project design is shared between USDOL, which provided specific guidance on design in the project tender document and the ILO, which developed a strategy to respond to the donor’s specifications.

<sup>12</sup> The remaining funds were for outputs across Components 1 and 2.

## B. High Transaction Costs

Even though GAP11 was a large, multi-component project, in many GAP11 target countries it was a very small, and sometimes a single component, project. Carrying out a large number of small- to medium-sized interventions in many geographically dispersed countries engendered high transaction costs. GAP11 project management said that they made efforts to organize their missions so that one staff person could push forward multiple objectives to lower transaction costs.

## C. Complicated Project Management Arrangements

Stakeholders within the project management team reported that they worked with other projects to build a “critical mass” of funding and resources for capacity building and policy interventions at the country level, but that this took considerable time and effort to set up. It often required complicated arrangements to harness resources from projects in the process of closing down (for example, previous GAP projects in Burkina Faso and Liberia, TACKLE in Sierra Leone and a Brazilian-funded South-South project in Timor Leste) and from other projects in the process of starting up (the Child Labor project in Paraguay, the Forced Labor project in Dominican Republic).

## D. Senior Staff Managing All Aspects of Implementation

There were also inefficiencies created by having a small number of mostly senior staff managing almost all aspects of project implementation from strategy, procurement, implementation, monitoring and reporting. There was no dedicated administrative support or monitoring and evaluation (M&E) staff in Geneva, and as a result the CTA, who is specialized in advanced statistical analysis, spent a significant amount of his time keeping budget spreadsheets and updating reporting tables. A stakeholder within the ILO reported that the project requested that resources be allocated for a Monitoring and Evaluation Officer but that the donor did not approve the request.<sup>13</sup>

### 3.1.4 COLLABORATION BETWEEN CHILD LABOR AND FORCED LABOR

***Finding 4:** Within GAP11, project activities on child labor and forced labor overlapped in fairly limited ways, mainly in legal and regulatory framework assessments. Project follow-on capacity building interventions at the country level tended to address the issues separately. Timor Leste, where the project is implementing a joint data collection exercise and intends to develop a joint NAP, is an exception but it is too early to evaluate the relevance of this approach at this early stage. Frequent contact and collaboration between child labor and force labor specialists was fostered by GAP11 and contributed positively to knowledge sharing among some team members.*

---

<sup>13</sup> The justification provided by the donor was that the project was competitively tendered and that the grantee placed a bid without an M&E Officer. The donor understood from the proposal that the Project Director at 100% would serve the role of the M&E Officer. In FY 2013, DOL began to require that there be an M&E Officer as key personnel for all projects.

GAP11 work on forced labor and child labor overlapped in a number of countries but in limited ways. Component 1 on the legal and regulatory framework assessments covered both issues in Cameroon, Indonesia, Mongolia, Paraguay, South Sudan and Timor Leste. Otherwise, GAP11 target countries (mainly for Component 1) were divided among IPEC or Special Action Program on Forced Labor (SAP-FL)<sup>14</sup> managers so that interventions turned out to be primarily focused on one or the other of the issues.<sup>15</sup> One senior stakeholder within the ILO explained this outcome by noting that although the two issues share some common determinants and coincide together in a number of sectors and types of work, many of the policy responses are different. She said that the most natural link was on issues related to enforcement; for example, GAP11 labor inspector capacity building addressed both issues in Ethiopia (in 2013) and Timor Leste. Several stakeholders within the ILO noted that in many countries, work on forced labor is more politically sensitive than child labor work and therefore it was often more productive to separate the issues.

The two teams are currently working closely in Timor Leste where a national survey will combine data collection on child labor and forced labor and intends to follow up with support for the development of a NAP addressing both issues.<sup>16</sup> Project implementation is in its early stages in the country, so it was too early to evaluate if/how the collaboration was beneficial. The collaboration may produce more holistic planning in the labor sector and avoid separate action plans when one could feasibly cover both issues.

According to the people involved, GAP11 collaboration between child labor and forced labor specialists was beneficial because they were able to learn from one another, including from their respective areas of expertise. One forced labor specialist said that she learned about developing a NAP from her counterparts in IPEC, many of whom have extensive experience with the process. She anticipated that collaboration with IPEC within GAP11 would be beneficial as the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (FUNDAMENTALS) Branch<sup>17</sup> prepares to begin implementation of a much larger, forced labor-focused program with funding from USDOL.

---

<sup>14</sup> SAP-FL is the name of the forced labor unit before it was merged with other units to create the FUNDAMENTALS Branch.

<sup>15</sup> According to GAP11 management, focusing on only one issue had not been GAP11 management's intention. In practice, SAP-FL simply took the lead in countries where there was a forced labor issue, and IPEC did so for child labor.

<sup>16</sup> It is not yet confirmed that the NAP in Timor Leste will cover both CL and FL. While this is the project's intention, the final decision will be made when the stakeholder consultations for the NAP begin. GAP11 hopes to be able to develop a combined NAP but this will depend on the demands and needs expressed by the constituents and other stakeholders.

<sup>17</sup> The FUNDAMENTALS Branch was recently established to manage programs covering all four fundamental labor principles: Freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; the

### 3.1.5 OUTCOME TARGETS

***Finding 5:** GAP11 project managers anticipated attaining a large number of achievements under the Government Performance Result Act (GPRA) capacity indicator that to date, it has not reached and is unlikely to reach before the end of the project. <sup>18</sup> There are a variety of explanations for this result, including unforeseen project implementation delays or cancellations, difficulty obtaining the required level of official validation/adoption from counterpart governments, and in some cases, poor target setting. The main lesson learned from the project's experience in this regard is that the process for establishing GPRA indicator targets should be more tightly managed and thoughtful. In addition, future legal, regulatory and capacity building projects should have a broader set of indicators rather than using GPRA as the main monitoring tool by which project achievements will be judged and evaluated. Rather than mainly focusing on government adoptions, project-specific outcomes and indicators should also be set to measure what other actions national stakeholders take on the basis of the project's work on policies and laws.*

By mutual decision with the donor, the ILO GAP11 project management team adopted the USDOL GPRA capacity indicator as its project outcome indicator. The reason for taking this approach was because the project did not finalize its own monitoring and evaluation framework or Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP). The development of the GAP11 CMEP was assigned to the ILO-implemented Global Evaluation and Monitoring (GEM) Project. It provided technical support to GAP11 to develop a customized CMEP based on outcome monitoring in a non-random, purposeful sample of countries. The plan was never completed for a number of reasons. Cooperation from the GAP11 project management team for its development was mixed, mostly likely due to the investment of time it required from program managers, lack of interest/understanding of the importance of M&E by some, and because there was no M&E person on the team to lead the process or to take charge of the necessary data collection process related to plan indicators. In addition, it was the first CMEP developed for a global project of the magnitude of GAP11 and although GEM adjusted its methodology, given the large number of target countries and intervention strategies, some stakeholders thought the plan was becoming unwieldy. The inability of GAP11 management and the donor to agree on and finalize the plan in a timely manner led to the decision to use the GPRA capacity building indicator to measure project outcomes. GAP 11 component managers set GPRA targets pertaining to their activities, which were compiled into an overall set of targets with anticipated achievement dates and submitted to the donor bi-annually.

#### *3.1.5.1. Reasons for Missing Outcome Targets*

The project has missed many of its outcome targets for a variety of reasons:

---

elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labor; the effective abolition of child labor; and the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

<sup>18</sup> The updated list of targets for FY16 and 17 includes reduced target numbers that are more achievable.



#### A. Targets were relevant but were subject to unforeseen project implementation-related delays or cancelled activities.

The achievement of some GPRA indicators, such as those related to the institutionalization of child labor and forced labor research (including evaluation and data collection), were largely in the project's hands in so much as the indicators are more process-oriented<sup>19</sup> than other areas captured under the GPRA indicators. Most of these targets will eventually be met except in cases where a piece of research or a survey was cancelled.<sup>20</sup>

#### B. Targets were relevant but both the timing and actual achievements were hard to predict.

To achieve many GPRA targets, policies, plans, laws or regulations and programs should be formally adopted and/or institutionalized by the GAP11 counterpart government. While it is in the hands of the project to highlight the need for a given policy or legal reform and to provide the required technical assistance to implement a reform, plan or a program within the life of a project, their formal adoption by the government is ultimately largely beyond the project's control.<sup>21</sup> Formal adoption processes can be lengthy<sup>22</sup> and are often subject to the vagaries of shifting political and institutional priorities. Even fully committed government and nongovernmental counterparts may find it difficult to influence the pace of formal validation processes that occur at the level of the Prime Minister's office or in Parliament. For example, an official in Cameroon was quoted as saying that if it were up to him alone to sign off of the NAP, it would already be done.

#### C. Targets were over ambitious and/or inappropriately set.

When setting GPRA indicator targets, not all GAP 11 component managers understood what was required to achieve the stated outcomes and set over-ambitious, and in some cases inappropriate, targets. For example, in all twelve countries in which Component 3 activities were implemented, the project predicted that activities related to the protective policy framework for children in

---

<sup>19</sup> Research targets are achieved in the first instance when data collection has been designed and there is an implementation plan; in the second instance, when data collection is complete and in the third instance, when the report is published.

<sup>20</sup> To date, cancelled research projects include the Malaysia Forced Labor Study and the Bangladesh Forced Labor Study. There is, in addition, some doubt about whether the National Statistics Office of Mozambique is sufficiently committed to complete the planned National Child Labor Survey.

<sup>21</sup> Examples of unmet GAP11 GPRA indicators that fall into this category include: government approval of NAP in Cameroon; government adoption of revised criminal code to prohibit certain criminal worst forms of child labor in Mongolia; the establishment of a training program and budget for judicial and law enforcement officials on child labor/forced labor in Ethiopia; and child laborers (from herding community) considered a priority target group in educational strategies in South Sudan.

<sup>22</sup> Therefore, DOL allows projects to count GPRA achievements within a reasonable timeframe after a project has closed.

domestic work would lead to the formulation and adoption of specific policies, plans and programs to eliminate child labor in domestic work and to protect young domestic workers of legal working age. Likewise, the project predicted that the practical guide/toolkit on child domestic workers protection would be integrated into a national training program in all twelve target countries. The component manager apparently believed that producing and validating the framework during a tripartite stakeholder workshop was sufficient to achieve the relevant GPRA indicator target. Similarly, targets related to the practical guide/toolkit did not take into account the need for the counterpart to use the tool in their own training programs which would imply project investments in identifying and training appropriate human resources and national counterpart organization commitment duplicate the training in a meaningful way.

The project is now seeking a more formal stamp of approval for the framework and has succeeded in some countries.<sup>23</sup> The protective policy framework is a set of recommendations meant to be adapted and validated by stakeholders, but in most cases was not designed or implemented in such a way as to require formal government validation. Moreover, arguably the spirit of Component 3 would be served better by moving from the protective policy framework to mobilizing stakeholders involved in the workshop to put in place codes of practice, compliance directives and/or pilot actions<sup>24</sup> rather than trying to get its endorsement by the government.<sup>25</sup>

### *3.1.5.2. Lessons Learned*

The main lessons learned from the GPRA target setting process are:

#### *A. There needed to be tighter management by both the donor and the ILO for the GPRA target setting process.*

The donor indicated that since it used the inputs from the ILO to set its own targets, it should have made sure that it understood how the ILO set the targets and what activities would lead to their achievement. Likewise, the differences in the initial understanding of GPRA indicator by the GAP11 team indicate a lack of strong management of the target setting process by the ILO. It is the understanding of the evaluators that the ILO and the donor have since had a thorough discussion on GPRA indicator target setting, share a common understanding what is required to achieve them, and have revised their targets.

---

<sup>23</sup> In the following countries, the protective policy framework document was officially endorsed by the National Steering Committee on Child Labor or a similar body: Ecuador, Kenya, Panama and Togo.

<sup>24</sup> Even though the approved project document had included contemplated pilot interventions in selected countries, resources allocated to this output were later transferred to Component 2.

<sup>25</sup> At the same time, it is clear (as stated by a member of the GAP11 team) that a protective policy framework document on child labor in domestic work, where available, will have very little practical impact, irrespective of its official endorsement, if behind it there is no actual political will to change the social realities.

## B. The outcome indicators related to policy and research work needed to be more thoughtfully set.

Several ILO stakeholders regretted the abandonment of the CMEP process because the GPRA outcome indicator was not adequate to monitor and assess project contributions in its target countries. GAP11 allocated unprecedented resources for research and child labor/forced labor policy-related capacity building for relevant national institutions, areas ILO regards to be its comparative advantage and necessary for sustained progress towards the elimination of child labor and forced labor. GRPA indicators related to policy and legal frameworks focus on their formal adoption by a relevant governmental body. Not only is this hard for the project to influence in a timely fashion, indicators that mainly focus on formal government approval do not measure what, if anything, is done afterwards on the basis of the validation. This can lead to projects focusing on updating hazardous lists or developing national action plans and getting them “stamped” without adequately supporting their implementation through actions such as resource mobilization for programs or action-oriented training for service providers and enforcement agents. Similarly, the process oriented indicators that measure the success of research activities do not require the producers to demonstrate the use of their research. If the project was held accountable not only to build national capacity for research but also to demonstrate that their research responds to some demand from relevant stakeholders and that it is used in some relevant ways (for example, in the design of a program or policy, in training or in awareness raising), then it would be likely that more stakeholder consultations and follow-up would be required than is currently the case.

The CMEP should have facilitated institutional learning from project successes and failures. A stakeholder within the ILO indicated that the project plans to undertake evaluation activities to draw out lessons learned from GAP11. This is a good opportunity to extract additional learning from GAP11 (for a possible line of investigation, see Recommendation 8).

## 3.2 Effectiveness and Implementation

---

### 3.2.1 ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTPUTS

***Finding 6:** Overall the project has achieved about 60% of its planned outputs. Another 29% are in progress and 11% have not yet been started. Based on progress to date and project management projections, GAP11 will achieve most of its planned outputs before the end of the project. Because of various delays, the project’s period of performance was extended by a total 30 months from its original time frame. According to various key informants, varying degrees of cooperation from national counterparts, administrative delays, the absence of long term project management personnel in the field, inadequate funding as well as other unfavorable circumstances affected project implementation and causes delays. However, the project cancelled planned interventions in only a few countries and in nearly all these cases, for reasons beyond its control.*

#### 3.2.1.1. Outputs by Component

Component 1 on Capacity Building and Strategic Policy Approach has four subcomponents. The first two components cover legal and regulatory frameworks and monitoring and enforcement. The third subcomponent is divided into two parts: one on the development of NAPs and the other on

institutional capacity building for the implementation of existing NAPs. The fourth component supports mainstreaming child labor and forced labor policy into development policies. Legislative and regulatory assessments and capacity building activities to strengthen legal enforcement mechanisms are nearly all done or in progress. NAPs are either already developed or in progress in all but one target country, and assistance for NAP implementation is in progress in all but one country.<sup>26</sup> Project support for mainstreaming is ongoing in its six target countries and will be completed, although the level of support provided will vary from country to country.<sup>27</sup>

Component 2 has five subcomponents covering national and sub-sector surveys, child labor modules for impact evaluations, UCW country situational analysis and policy appraisals, thematic reports, and capacity building of local universities and nonprofit research organizations. Three out of nine planned surveys are complete, four are in progress, one is on hold<sup>28</sup> and one is not yet started.<sup>29</sup> Four out of six child labor modules for impact evaluations are complete with the remaining two in progress. Likewise, all of the six UCW country-level situational analyses are either complete or in progress. Three out of five policy appraisals have not been started, but UCW anticipates their completion by the current project end date (March 31, 2016). The thematic reports are complete or in progress with the exception of one that is cancelled (Bangladesh) and one on child labor in domestic work that is not yet started. UCW collaboration with national universities and nonprofit research institutions is well advanced and it expects to expand activities with some existing partners and extend the program to additional universities if the project extension is approved.<sup>30</sup>

Component 3 on the protection of child domestic workers has two subcomponents: one to support awareness raising and advocacy and the other on regulatory and policy frameworks. All of the outputs under the first subcomponent are completed or in progress. On the second, which was implemented in twelve countries (two more than originally planned), there were five outputs planned in each country, including: a rapid analysis of the situation of children engaged in domestic

---

<sup>26</sup> NAP development was planned in Comoros but GAP08 end up producing the NAP, leaving GAP11 to support implementation. NAP development in South Sudan was cancelled and related funds transferred to Mongolia. GAP11 still plans to assist the Government of Ethiopia to update its NAP but at the time of the evaluation, work had not yet started because of issues identifying national personnel to support the process.

<sup>27</sup> For example, in South Sudan, the project did a study on child labor and education in herding communities but because of instability in the country, did not follow up with significant support to use the findings of the study to influence education policy.

<sup>28</sup> The survey in the Dominican Republic is on hold because it is expected to be combined with a survey planned in a new forced labor program funded by USDOL that was recently approved.

<sup>29</sup> A forced labor and child labor survey in Timor Leste is replacing the cancelled survey in Malaysia and is expected to commence in early 2016.

<sup>30</sup> UCW is currently exploring the possibility of including Ghana (ISSER) and of expanding the collaboration with South Africa (SALDRU) and Brazil (ESAQL).

work; legal and regulatory framework and social service assessments; the development of a protective policy framework for child domestic workers; and support to trade union partners to mainstream the child domestic worker concerns into their policy agendas and operational plans. Implementation of Component 3 activities is advanced in nearly all target countries with the exception of Haiti, which followed a different approach, and Pakistan, which was integrated relatively late in the project. The least advanced output is trade union and policy mainstreaming, which is currently described as ongoing or not yet started in most of the twelve target countries.

### ***3.2.1.2. Reasons for Delays in Implementation***

Some of the reasons the project was delayed were related to factors in the social and political enabling environment that were largely beyond its control (see Finding 2 on the enabling environment) but GAP11 component managers also indicated that there were many project management challenges. It took a long time to set up and progress on some outputs in many countries because of the absence of long term national staff, the lack of availability of qualified consultants, and administrative issues. Stakeholders within the project management team also indicated that delays in some outputs were because the countries were not well-chosen (most countries were pre-identified in the SGA while others were selected by the ILO). For example, within Component 2, national stakeholders in a few countries had limited direct interest in or felt uneasy about the topic of project research but were expected to invest their own resources for data collection and analysis. The following are some examples:

- The government of Nicaragua was not interested in UCW research, so after initial consultations, Honduras was substituted.
- Malaysia withdrew its support for research planned on forced labor in palm oil production, and the study and policy appraisal to be conducted by UCW were cancelled. A study of child labor and forced labor in Timor Leste took the place of the study, while a policy appraisal in Ecuador took the place of the policy appraisal. Although work is progressing in Lebanon, survey work there is very difficult due to various sectarian and religious conflicts.

To accommodate implementation delays, the end date of the project has been extended 3 times to date for a total of 30 months. Annex 1 provides a detailed accounting of the status of project deliverables. Section 3.4 of the stakeholder survey report in Annex 9 summarizes national stakeholder comments on obstacles that may have affected the completion of outputs.

## **3.2.2 OTHER RESULTS**

***Finding 7:*** *GAP11 achieved some of its anticipated outcomes but many were missed based on GPRA indicator reporting (see Finding 5). However, there were many positive results produced by GAP11 that are not measured by the GPRA indicator. Moreover, achievement of the GPRA outcome may be realized later given that policy and regulatory changes often lag behind other kinds of changes and that some of the capacity building outputs may be built upon by other FUNDAMENTALS projects that follow GAP11.*

**Component 1** set out to improve legal and regulatory frameworks, strengthen enforcement and monitoring, and improve planning and coordination of national programs to combat child labor and where relevant forced labor. National stakeholders who participated in the GAP11 survey highlighted project-supported achievements in the areas of policy, legal and institutional reform that include the elaboration of a National Action Plan in several countries, the institutionalization of National Steering Committee on Child Labor (Cameroon), the adoption of a Roadmap against child labor in domestic work (Philippines, where Components 1 and 2 overlapped), and the revision of the legal code to include child labor issues.

GAP11 national stakeholder survey respondents indicated that GAP11 legal and regulatory assessments were effective in identifying areas for reform. The Philippines is a country where the legal review had a positive impact on national capacity, based on stakeholder feedback. The Director of the Bureau of Workers with Special Concerns in the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) noted that it had proposed amendments to the recent Basic Education Law, based on findings from the legal review. In addition, several stakeholders within DOLE praised the project's support for the revision of the Hazardous Work List for Children, for its relevance, usefulness and technical quality. They indicated that GAP11 support had built capacity within DOLE on this issue and acted as a catalyst by helping to bring the concerned departments together (which otherwise would have been a challenge). The finalization of the List is still pending however, because DOLE is still gathering information and consulting key personnel.

GAP11 support to strengthen the capacity of national stakeholders engaged in enforcement and monitoring activities also achieved several good results in the area of labor inspection (see Finding 1, comment from labor inspection in Sierra Leone and additional comments under Sustainability). A survey respondent from Burkina Faso said, "ILO support has been crucial for the labor inspection services in the country. Indeed, it is thanks to that support that specific child labor tools have been made available to the labor inspection services to carry out effective workplace inspections in sectors with a high incidence of hazardous work namely agriculture (cotton), the artisanal mining sector (gold) and the informal sector." In addition GAP11 met one of its GPRA targets for its contribution to the establishment of the Child Labor Monitoring System in the Dominican Republic.

To date, GAP11 assisted national stakeholders to finalize and/or to implement NAPs in Azerbaijan, Cameroon, Comoros, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Lao PDR and Mongolia and anticipates that four additional plans will be created or updated before the project ends (Ethiopia, Liberia, Paraguay, and Timor Leste). More than half of the relevant stakeholder survey respondents indicated that the assistance that their institution received to formulate and/or implement the NAP was very useful. For example, NGOs in Cameroon, which were involved in previous project direct action programs, felt their participation in NAP formulation was effective to support the integration of good practices and lessons learned into larger scale government plans and intervention strategies. At the same time, survey respondents were only moderately optimistic regarding the availability of sufficient resources for implementing the NAP.

NAP Implementation is facilitated by a number of factors that the project was able to influence to some degree, including engagement of a large number of national stakeholders in the development

process, resource availability, the capacity of implementing organizations and the degree to which implementation is monitored. In Cameroon, GAP11 made contributions toward resource mobilization strategies.<sup>31</sup> In Comoros, Mongolia and Laos, it assessed institutional capacity building needs through mapping exercises and delivered actual capacity building. For other countries, the ILO had limited scope (time and budget limitations) for supporting NAP implementation within GAP11. For example, because NAP implementation in Liberia was delayed by the Ebola crisis, little GAP11 support will be offered for implementation. However, additional efforts are planned to support NAP implementation in projects that follow GAP11 so progress may continue in some countries (for example, Winrock may be able to support NAP implementation in Liberia).

**Component 2** on research had as its goal to deliver relevant research to guide national policies and inform program design to combat child labor and, where relevant, forced labor. To date, GAP11 completed the child labor survey in Belize and the survey on child labor in agriculture in Morocco in cooperation with the National Statistics Office, while other surveys are in various stages of finalization. According to the GAP11 stakeholder survey, 60% of the respondents (10 stakeholders) considered the recent SIMPOC survey either useful or very useful for increasing their institution's understanding of child labor and/or forced labor.

UCW's interagency cooperation encourages dialogue between the ILO, UNICEF and the World Bank on child labor issues and offers avenues for mainstreaming child labor into these organizations' work on education, employment, and social protection, among other areas where policy improvements have high potential to reduce the prevalence of child labor. For example, GAP11 collaborated with these and other agencies to implement child labor modules within larger impact assessments. The project contributed to the World Bank, adding child labor as an area of analysis within their impact evaluation of public work in Malawi. Only three survey respondents gave a mark on the usefulness of the recent UCW research and policy appraisal for increasing their institutions' understanding of child labor and/or forced labor, with all three giving high marks.

UCW work with national universities was positively received by those involved. All the universities involved in the program replied to the stakeholder survey and provided largely positive feedback on the program. One evaluation survey respondent from South Africa elaborated on the relevance

---

<sup>31</sup> In Cameroon, the project organized a workshop on NAP implementation and resource mobilization that included a presentation from a representative of the Ministry of Planning to explain the budgeting process, including the basis on which budget decisions are made. This was a positive initiative; however, information communicated in the presentation indicated that money for activities not previously included by Ministries in their existing budget plans would not be available until two years after the NAP is officially validated by the government, and only if initiatives coincide with priority government initiatives. Because the NAP in Cameroon covers 2014-2016 and it is not yet validated by the government, it is unlikely that new resources will be allocated for its implementation unless the period of implementation is extended. However, during the NAP process, the Ministry of Labor included money for child labor awareness-raising in its budget and is optimistic that resources will be available in 2016.



of the program, “The project addresses an important policy topic using a credible empirical strategy and new longitudinal data. Therefore I think the project is highly relevant.” Analysis of its potential impact on policy and sustainability is provided in the sustainability section of this evaluation.

**Component 3** aimed to contribute to increased protections for children engaged in domestic work in target countries through awareness raising, advocacy and by proposing policy frameworks to increase protections for young workers engaged in domestic work in permissible situations.

Many of the national stakeholders who were involved in Component 3 activities indicated that the project was effective in raising awareness. Two thirds of the GAP11 national stakeholder survey respondents indicated that the project’s support around World Day Against Child Labor (WDACL) had helped raise awareness on child labor in domestic work. Materials produced with support from GAP11 were used extensively during WDACL in 2013, which was organized under the banner “No to child labor in domestic work.” Within the WDACL 2013 context, IPEC launched a major campaign both at HQ and field levels with the aim of spreading the WDACL message to as many countries and places as possible. The campaign was regarded as one of the more successful WDACL campaigns in recent years by several indicators. Activities were organized in over 50 countries including nearly all GAP11 Component 3 countries. WDACL 2013 received significant coverage in the media, including TV, radio, print and web.

In addition to the global WDACL campaign, GAP11 supported a campaign implemented by the Global March Against Child Labor. The campaign had two main objectives: to increase awareness on the need to protect child domestic workers and to strengthen capacities of trade unions (especially of domestic workers) and civil society to advocate for better protection for child domestic workers (in permissible situations). It carried out activities in Indonesia, Panama, Togo and Pakistan. ILO national staff from Togo underlined the importance of the enhanced knowledge on strategies for promoting decent work for young people in domestic work. An NGO representative from Indonesia heralded the impact on child domestic work, saying that “Continuing socialization about child domestic workers, including a campaign not to employ children as domestic workers, has affected community members. Many of them stopped employing children and began employing adults. As a result, the number of children employed as child domestic workers decreased significantly.”

Work with national stakeholders on child labor in domestic work was carried out in twelve countries. A stakeholder from Indonesia, where GAP activities complemented another ongoing project on domestic work, indicated his/her appreciation for ILO “capacity building for governments, NGO and communities related to domestic workers.” Protective policy framework documents engaged national stakeholders in debate and discussion on how to protect young domestic workers (of legal working age) and eliminate child labor in the sector. Framework documents were officially adopted by the national steering committees of Ecuador, Panama, Kenya and Togo and work is still ongoing to obtain official validation in other countries. In Togo, the Ministry of Labor has followed up on the guidelines by proposing a template/model contract for domestic workers. More analysis of the potential impact of Component 3 activities on policy in its twelve pilot countries is provided in the section on sustainability.

### 3.2.3 STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

***Finding 8:** GAP11 used participatory processes to implement project activities in all three components. Based on stakeholder feedback, these processes contributed to a sense of ownership and commitment to advance the project's objectives among the people and institutions who were most actively involved. The same processes did not guarantee buy-in from higher level decision makers or from all necessary stakeholders within counterpart organizations, particularly in government. Moreover, the sense of ownership and actual capacity to carry on advancing the project's objectives and outcomes are not synonymous; many stakeholders expect continued ILO leadership, technical assistance and additional resources to move forward.*

#### **3.2.3.1. Strategies to Engage National Stakeholders**

GAP11 used many effective strategies to engage national stakeholders in the project's design and implementation that were conducive to promoting national ownership of project objectives and outcomes:

##### **A. Tailoring to Stakeholders' Requests and Needs**

The project designed some sub-components to tailor to specific requests and needs. UCW policy appraisals, which focused analysis on a particular policy area, were selected based on dialogue with the stakeholders following the situational analysis. For example, in Uganda, the priority of the government was for additional analysis on issues affecting vulnerable youth access to vocational training and apprenticeship programs. The sub-component on strengthening legal enforcement offered national stakeholders a menu of intervention options from which they could choose based on their needs and priorities. The GAP11 component manager noted that initially, the project had planned to organize a one-off inspector training in Turin for all countries targeted under this output but changed course so that project assistance could be adapted to the project counterparts' needs.

##### **B. Engaging Stakeholders in the Development of Terms of Reference for Research**

The Component 2 Manager engaged stakeholders in the development of survey/research terms of reference. SIMPOC processes rely almost exclusively on national statistics offices for data collection and analysis, in large part because their experience demonstrates that governments are more likely to own research that is conducted by these offices. In most instances, the GAP11 (through SIMPOC) supported national statistics offices in target countries to design the survey instruments, collect data and write up the survey/research findings themselves. A survey respondent from Ukraine highlighted the reasons for his/her engagement in the child labor survey: "The prevailing opinion in this country has a negative attitude towards child labor. This often leads to the fact that the problem of child labor in Ukraine is not discussed. As a result, public policies and civil society know and do little to reduce child labor."

##### **C. Mobilizing a Large Variety of Stakeholders**

All components involved ILO stakeholders through tripartite meetings in planning stages and validation stages and reported making efforts to mobilize national media to reinforce the visibility

of stakeholder decisions and commitments. For example, 72% of respondents to the GAP11 national stakeholder survey indicated that the project was successful in involving a large variety of relevant stakeholders in the formulation of NAPs. In Comoros, as part of its support for the NAP, GAP11 supported training workshops for members of the National Human Rights and Liberty Commission and for other key stakeholders at the regional level.

#### **D. Good Communication with Stakeholders**

Good communication with stakeholders by GAP11 managers also helped to foster national ownership among those involved in project activities. According to a government counterpart from Kenya, the project has been “very efficient in communicating various issues concerning child labor.” An NGO representative from Mali echoed this response when s/he characterized project communication as “direct at all levels and via various channels (telephone, email, personal interaction) and on all aspects of the collaboration.” One NGO representative from Indonesia praised the fact that the project had not only focused on the fulfillment of specific target, “but also understood the process happening in the field, listening and being responsive to our difficulties, and providing the consultations needed for searching for a solution.” A government counterpart from Ecuador noted that the project has been “strengthening conversation bridges and carrying out an implementation that is close to the ground.”

#### **E. Broadening Ownership**

Previously highlighted project management efforts to collaborate with other international organizations, NGOs, other in-country ILO projects or support teams and other child labor and forced labor projects in target countries, to the extent that they succeeded, gave additional people and organizations a stake in project objectives and may have increased the degree of national ownership for project objectives. For example, many stakeholders in Haiti believed that the formation of a large working group of international and national organizations concerned with child protection to oversee the study on children in domestic work was a major achievement because it fostered member ownership of the study findings and recommendations. It is noteworthy that although UNICEF and the ILO could have funded the study on their own, they asked for financial contributions from members of the working group as a means to strengthen ownership.

There are also some good examples of GAP11 including strategies to foster ownership by regional and sector-specific stakeholders in some countries. Examples include Comoros, where workshops were organized on NAP monitoring at the regional level and Laos PDR, where capacity building activities have been organized for education and agriculture sector stakeholders. In Ecuador, the project produced a study on the “Features and Nature of Forced Labor and Child Labor in Amongst Afro-Descendants in the Esmeraldas and Quinindé Provinces” and is planning on conducting capacity building interventions focused on local governance structures which will include sharing the Peruvian experience developing local guidelines for public officials.

### ***3.2.3.2. Factors that Hindered Ownership***

Certain characteristics of GAP11 design and implementation were less conducive to national ownership.

#### **A. Challenges with Making Child Labor and Forced Labor Policy Priorities**

Many of the GAP11 countries were named in the donor solicitation for grant applications and were selected based on recommendations found in USDOL's Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor country report. While the issues highlighted in the reports were based on relevant research, insufficient consultations with national stakeholders prior to the selection of some project interventions may have diminished national ownership in cases where they did not align closely with constituent priorities at the time of GAP11 implementation. For example, according to the Component 3 technical advisor, domestic work and by extension child labor in domestic work was not part of the national social policy agenda as a key/significant issue in most of the countries where interventions were indicated. Although the country may have been selected because child labor in domestic work was an accurately identified problem in the country, it did not mean that decision makers considered it a high priority which made getting buy in for project actions, especially on policy, more difficult. In Namibia, GAP11 adjusted their strategy to focus on child labor more generally, in part because national stakeholders did not see the relevance of narrowly focusing on child labor in domestic work.

#### **B. Inability to Influence Broader Policy Priorities**

As noted previously, although the ILO is a trusted partner among its constituent organizations and can influence their priorities through a variety of means, it is less able to influence the broader national priorities that often drive national budget allocations and reform agendas. Therefore although child labor is raised as an issue, the absence of broader buy-in affects the availability of resources for direct action and political will to reform policies that affect the prevalence of child labor. For example, in Cameroon, a representative from the Ministry of Planning indicated that although child labor was an important issue, the top priority of the government was fostering higher rates of economic growth and that it would be a challenge to get resources allocated from the national budget for some of the social programs proposed in the NAP. UCW researchers noted that they believe one of the secrets to getting more traction with counterpart governments is by mainstreaming child labor with priority issues, noting that this was one of the reasons they reformulated their situational analysis to feature a section on youth employment and school-to-work transitions.

#### **C. Ownership versus Capacity to Take Action**

Finally, although the project created ownership and commitment among many national stakeholders to combat child labor and where relevant, forced labor, this sense of ownership does not clearly or easily translate into capacity to advance project objectives. Many organizations lack sufficient means to take action without additional support from the ILO and/or international donors. "Necessary means" may include access to the financial resources that are needed to run

programs or having the ability to mobilize all the relevant stakeholders that are required to take action effectively. For example, the lead evaluator interviewed highly committed members of the NGO community in Cameroon whose programs to combat child labor are dependent on continuous donor funding. A stakeholder from Sierra Leone indicated that inadequate logistical support for child labor monitoring in the non-formal sector challenged labor inspectors' capacity to take action against child labor. One national stakeholder respondent from Mali indicated there was insufficient capacity building for regional and local technical offices in GAP11 interventions. In Haiti, one stakeholder suggested that capacity building for regional inspection offices was necessary to make work on the Hazardous List relevant.

GAP11 countries are in various places on the spectrum regarding capacity to take action and ownership. While it may be possible to mobilize support for the cause through relatively limited interventions, creating sustainable capacity to take action takes a longer period of time and more varied strategies. For example, in the Philippines, the government is able to drive forward its own initiatives to combat child labor in part because it has strong leadership and in part because it has received nearly continuous support from various partners, including the ILO and USDOL, to work on the issue for over ten years.

#### **3.2.4 LESSONS LEARNED FROM CANCELLED ACTIVITIES**

***Finding 9:** Cases in which project activities had to be canceled should contribute to both technical and management lessons learned. On the technical side, all project stakeholders acknowledge that effective dialogue with national stakeholders on forced labor issues requires special handling to initiate and maintain key stakeholder participation. On the management side, the main lessons learned related to knowing when and how to change plans and move on to other alternatives. In some instances in which the project faced challenges mobilizing national stakeholders, it would have been more efficient for the project to cut its losses earlier. In these cases, better communication between GAP11 management and the donor may have enabled a clearer understanding on all sides about what was feasible and what was not, and facilitated decision making on what actions could/should be taken and when more timely and collegial.*

The ILO GAP11 team cancelled planned research related to forced labor in Malaysia, Indonesia<sup>32</sup> and Bangladesh due to its sensitivity. According to the ILO, because of lack of buy in from counterpart governments and the ILO country offices, proceeding with the research was not feasible. They indicated that in Malaysia and Indonesia, government counterparts were initially

---

<sup>32</sup> GAP 11 ILO project management cancelled "Output 2.1.3 Survey dataset and survey report on child labor and forced labor in palm oil sector in Malaysia" approximately two years into project implementation due to lack of cooperation from the Government of Malaysia. GAP11 ILO management suggested to replace the Malaysia survey with qualitative research on forced labor in the palm oil sector through interviews with returned migrant workers in Indonesia and moved ahead on this activity until certain changes occurred in the political environment.

supportive of the research into forced labor in palm oil production but later had second thoughts due to its potential to reflect badly on the national or a key economic partners' reputation. In all three countries, the ILO country office was initially in favor of the studies but later withdrew its support because of they were apprehensive about pursuing research that might have adverse implications for the larger overall work program in the respective countries. In other words, they did not want to put larger programs at risk by introducing a small, potentially controversial, research project.

#### ***3.2.4.1. Lessons Learned About How to Approach Sensitive Issues***

Lesson learned about how to approach sensitive labor issues from these cases include:

##### **A. Association with Trade Issues is a Complicating Factor**

According to stakeholders within the ILO, a close association with trade issues is a complicating factor in the initial stages of policy dialogue on sensitive child labor/forced labor topics. From the perspective of ILO management, the ILO is well-suited enter into dialogue with national governments on sensitive topics related to child and forced labor, but it is important that it is perceived as a fair broker. In some cases, this requires entering into dialogue on a sensitive topic before it becomes a real or perceived trade issue.

##### **B. Offering Conflict-Sensitive Solutions**

Although stakeholders within the ILO noted that outside pressure could be a positive force to raise awareness and create political will to address problems, in cases where national stakeholders are not ready to publically acknowledge an issue, having the ability to offer solutions to offset public loss of face are important in order to get political buy-in from national counterparts. In the case of one GAP country, the ILO tried to offset the government's fears that the study would be used to shine a spot light on labor practices by offering not to publish the study, but this was evidently not enough.

##### **C. Sequencing of Strategies**

The ILO also considered the sequencing of strategies to be important. In reference to the US governments' list of products produced with child labor or forced labor, one stakeholder within the ILO said that for obvious reasons national governments were more willing parties to surveys if the data could be used to show progress or get them off the list than in cases where it might put them on it.

##### **D. Managing Implementation Barriers**

When faced with implementation barriers, knowing when to cut one's losses is important for project efficiency. In the case of Malaysia, it took two years before GAP11 managers looked for an alternative strategy to investigate forced labor in palm oil production and quite a while longer to decide that that strategy (research in Indonesia) was not going to work.

Wait-and-see approaches worked to overcome temporary project implementation blockages in many cases. For example, the project was able to restart some activities stopped by crisis situations in Liberia and South Sudan. Although it took time and required strategy changes, the child labor surveys in Ukraine and Lebanon are expected to be completed. The fact that the project was eventually able to achieve most of its outputs is an argument that with enough time, most of the planned work was feasible. However, delays engendered administrative and opportunity costs. Arguably in a project like GAP11 with so many relatively small, limited interventions, the impact of simply dropping a country or intervention strategy because of lack of national counterpart engagement would be minimal. Moreover, reallocating resources to countries that have already evidenced political will vastly increases the chances that project resources will contribute to meaningful reforms. For example, the GAP11 managers reallocated some resources from cancelled activities in South Sudan to Mongolia and Azerbaijan on the basis of their initial good collaboration with national counterparts in these countries. With either strategy, good grantee/donor communication is important so that each party can weigh in on the decision, based on its priorities and partnership considerations.

### 3.2.5 INTEGRATION WITH OTHER ILO INITIATIVES

***Finding 10:** Project collaboration with other ILO initiatives and support units was extensive. GAP11 managers coordinated and integrated project activities with current country activities of other ILO initiatives through staff and activity cost-sharing arrangements, by building on previous projects' outputs and outcomes, and by linking with new ILO projects with similar objectives. The project successfully collaborated with regionally-based ILO Specialists, some of whom contributed their time and technical assistance for project implementation, integrated child labor and (where relevant) forced labor activities with ongoing concerns of ILO country offices and regional Decent Work support teams.*

Many stakeholders within the ILO indicated that the level of coordination and integration of GAP11 country activities with other ILO initiatives was more extensive than had been the case historically. GAP11 cost shared human resource and activity costs with other ILO country projects in Haiti, Liberia, Mali, Panama, Pakistan, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Timor Leste, and Vietnam. This was natural where there were other child labor activities but also occurred with youth employment and social protection projects.<sup>33</sup> In addition, GAP11 was able to build upon previous IPEC country initiatives in numerous countries including GAP09 initiatives in Azerbaijan, Laos PDR, and Liberia and on the European Union (EU)-funded TACKLE project in South Sudan.

The degree of integration of GAP11 activities with Decent Work Country Programs and other ILO country office planning varied, and so in some cases getting the support of the relevant offices required negotiation. According to stakeholders within the ILO, regional and country offices prefer

---

<sup>33</sup> During its start-up phase in Timor Leste, GAP11 personnel relied on a big youth employment project. In Rwanda, GAP11 integrated with other activities on social protection.



implementing activities that are controlled at their level because they are more likely to respond to their priorities and are less time consuming administratively. The fact that many GAP11 initiatives were small and with limited budgets did not help. Nevertheless, in several countries, regionally-based ILO Specialists contributed their time and technical assistance to carry out project activities. The ILO Norms Specialist in Yaounde indicated he felt compelled to provide his support because GAP11 initiatives responded to ILO constituent priorities in Cameroon even if they were not yet part of formal country plans. Support from Decent Work Team field specialists was instrumental for GAP11 implementation in Cameroon, Gabon, Mongolia, and Namibia. One positive outcome of GAP11 was that child labor was subsequently integrated into country plans and programs, as was the case in Cameroon.

### 3.2.6 LIMITED OPPORTUNITIES TO CREATE SYNERGIES BETWEEN GAP11 COMPONENTS

***Finding 11:** Programmatic synergies between the three components were limited. This was because there were only a limited number of activities from different components that overlapped in the project target countries. As a consequence, collaboration between the various GAP11 Component Senior Advisors on program implementation was also fairly limited. However, where feasible, the project team worked together effectively.*

ILO-IPEC, ILO Forced Labor and UCW team members all indicated that they considered themselves to be members of one project team and took measures to ensure that they had a unified dialogue with project counterparts even though in most countries, there was little or no strategic overlap in their activities.<sup>34</sup> Components 1 and 3 seized on opportunities to work together to create synergies between some of their respective outputs (mostly assessments) and organized at least one joint activity in most of the countries where their activities overlapped. As previously highlighted in Finding 4, forced labor and child labor specialists also collaborated on programs but in fairly limited ways.

UCW and ILO-IPEC work overlapped in Togo, Indonesia, the Philippines and Rwanda. The GAP11 Component 1 manager reported that clear links between UCW research and Component 1 work was created in two of these countries. In Rwanda, UCW research on social protection supported Component 1 efforts to mainstream child labor in social protection policies and in Togo, the UCW policy appraisal, which assessed various national institutions' roles in child labor-related policy implementation, was used in the formulation of the NAP. Although few, the latter examples argue that there might have been more and broader program synergies with GAP11 research activities had the project design created more geographic and thematic overlap among project outputs.

---

<sup>34</sup> UCW and ILO/IPEC work overlapped in Togo, Indonesia, the Philippines and Rwanda. The GAP11 Component 1 manager reported that Rwanda was the only country with a clear link between UCW research and policy work mainstreaming child labor in social protection policies.



### 3.2.7 PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH

***Finding 12:** In response to the limited overlap in component activities in target countries and the large number of countries and activities, the project's Chief Technical Advisor allowed Component Senior Advisors a high degree of autonomy to plan and implement their work plans. This management approach was efficient in many program management aspects by limiting decision-making bottlenecks. However, there were also some negative aspects of management decentralization which were highlighted by the donor. It made it more difficult to obtain timely information on overall project progress, and in two cases errors were made that might have been avoided by stronger management oversight across all three components.*

Key stakeholders within the project management team indicated that the CTA in charge of GAP11 gave component Senior Technical Advisors significant decision making autonomy. This approach was appropriate in many aspects of project management because there were so many distinct, small activities across the globe which would have made more hierarchical approaches impractical and inefficient. However, the donor indicated that a lack of strong, centralized management oversight over project implementation was in some aspects less positive. They indicated that in some cases, it was more difficult to obtain timely information because there was not one centralized source of information within the team. They also cited two instances when stronger management oversight would have been beneficial: the first instance was when GPRA targets were set because there was inconsistency among the component managers in regards to their understanding of the indicators, which led to overly-ambitious targets. The second instance was in the Dominican Republic where a donor directive to put on hold a planned survey activity was not properly communicated to the person in charge, which led to the ILO having to back track on commitments it made to the National Statistics Office.

## 3.3 Sustainability

---

### 3.3.1. STRATEGIES FOR ENSURING SUSTAINABILITY AT NATIONAL LEVEL

***Finding 13:** GAP11 proposed strategies and developed plans to contribute to its sustainability after its interventions finished. Lack of political will and insufficient counterpart capacity (human and material resources) were often cited by stakeholders as obstacles to sustaining the positive outcomes of program interventions. Other obstacles were related to the scope and duration of project interventions.*

**Component 1** sought to build sustainable national capacity to combat child labor and forced labor using three main strategies: by strengthening legal and regulatory frameworks to guide stakeholder actions after project close; by mainstreaming interventions against child labor and forced labor into high priority, ongoing policies and plans; and by institutionalizing training for national stakeholders charged with enforcement.

Component 1 work to strengthen policy, regulatory and coordination frameworks supported sustainability by creating/strengthening policy, legal and institutional reference points to guide stakeholder action both during the project and after its finish. One example of such a regulatory

mechanism promoted by GAP11 in several countries was support for creating or updating the List of Hazardous Occupations for Children. The immediate and longer term value of this particular strategy, especially as a limited intervention, is largely dependent on context in the country and this was not always well considered in some GAP11 countries. The decision to devote limited resources to update the List should have considered whether or not there was an entity able to use it to sensitize relevant employers and workers and/or to enforce the prohibitions it outlined. For example, in the Philippines, where labor inspection is fairly well-developed, support for updating the Hazardous List is more likely to lead to some tangible form of impact than in countries like Cameroon and Haiti, where labor inspection is extremely weak and unlikely to be able to use the list once it was created/updated, or at least not without other, complementary interventions. In the latter countries, project investments might have had greater effect if they were invested in communication tools to be used by NGOs or teachers that highlight hazards rather than the legal and technical approach involved in updating the List.

Mainstreaming was another key strategy used in Component 1 to promote sustainability. Three quarters of respondents to the national stakeholder survey<sup>35</sup> thought that GAP11 was successful in mainstreaming child labor and/or forced labor in other sectors. The process for NAP formulation supported the integration of interventions to combat child labor, and forced labor where relevant, into education, child protection and social services, youth employment and agriculture, among other sectors or policy domains. For example, stakeholders from a variety of sectors participated in the NAP formulation process in Cameroon. As a result, the Plan includes interventions in a variety of sectors that are the responsibility of the various participating organizations and public institutions to implement. However, stakeholders in Cameroon reported that some organizations sent low-level civil servants to NAP formulation workshops and as a result, the level of ownership of the Plan by institutions outside the Ministry of Labor was weak. While the process for developing NAP favors coordination, its effectiveness depends a lot on buy-in from the various stakeholders involved and this also varies according to the country's context.

In some countries, the project focused its efforts to mainstream initiatives to combat child labor on one or few specific sectors; for example, in Rwanda it focused on social protection, and in Mali and the DRC, it focused on the agriculture sector. In these countries, GAP11 was able to provide more tailored assistance to stakeholders in the target sector that have the potential to deliver tangible and sustainable results. It also implemented interventions outside the capital in these countries. For example, in Mali and the DRC, GAP11 supported policy mainstreaming activities and capacity building for key stakeholders in agriculture including regional officials, agricultural extension officers and representatives of farmers' organizations. If additional evaluation exercises are planned to draw lessons from GAP11, it would be useful to compare sector-specific approaches with the broader NAP approach for impact and sustainability.

---

<sup>35</sup> Only national stakeholders in countries with activities under Subcomponent 1.4 were asked this question. There were a total of twelve respondents.

The majority of respondents thought that capacity building for strengthening enforcement and monitoring was very useful and expects that the tools and skills contributed by the project will be applied in law enforcement activities. According to one questionnaire respondent from Sierra Leone, the training is being put into practice: “Some of the partners are currently engaged in child labor monitoring activities.” GAP11 interventions to strengthen labor inspection in Ethiopia is an excellent example of a project effort to create conditions for sustainability by institutionalizing training for national stakeholders charged with enforcement. The interventions focused on building the capacity of labor inspectors and integrated a sustainability strategy by focusing on training trainers. According to the Component 1 Senior Advisor, the Ethiopian Government has committed to replicate the training twice annually.

Another example of a project good practice to promote sustainability from Component 1 (also Component 2) was the use of national experts to conduct background studies and assessments that were used to align project actions and recommendations with the actual state of advancement of target countries. The practice contributed to building the capacity of stakeholders within the country on issues related to child labor and forced labor and facilitated follow-up actions. In Cameroon, key informants indicated that project consultants were called upon by decision makers in government to advise on how to follow-up on project assessments.

**Component 2** strategies to promote sustainability were aimed at creating capacity within national research and statistics institutions to collect and analyze data on child labor and forced labor and to make recommendations for how to improve policy and practices aimed at combating child labor and forced labor. UCW, and in some cases SIMPOC, also sought to have a sustainable impact on policies and the formulation of programs by conducting and promoting its own research. In both cases, research contributes to knowledge and better knowledge and should enable more and better actions to combat child labor and/or forced labor. To the extent that research capacity contributes to a steady stream of relevant information, sustainable national capacity is created.

SIMPOC has a good track record of working with national statistics offices and places a lot of emphasis on capacity building and institutional ownership of the process which, contributes to a high degree of both statistic office and national ownership for the findings and recommendations. Approximately 60% of relevant stakeholder survey respondents indicated that the project’s collaboration has built their capacity to carry out future surveys, and claims that the findings of the survey will influence policies and/or programs on child labor or forced labor. One sustainability objective that the evaluation was not able to assess is the degree to which SIMPOC assistance contributes to ongoing or periodic data collection exercises on child labor. Anecdotally, the evaluator was informed that the National Statistics Office in Cameroon<sup>36</sup> followed up on a commitment made in 2008 to repeat data collection on child labor in the 2014 poverty survey, which was a positive outcome on the sustainability of a previous project.

---

<sup>36</sup> GAP11 did not fund a survey in Cameroon. The example is meant to illustrate the potential for sustainability of SIMPOC support for child labor surveys.

Two stakeholders involved in UCW research indicated in their response to the evaluation survey that they believed it very likely that the findings of UCW research will influence policies and/or programs. In addition, the World Bank Program Leader in Manila characterized the collaboration with the project as an “easy case,” facilitated by the availability of good data as well as good timing. She described the study as “high-quality research work, with interesting conclusions and good recommendations.” In particular, the study made a strong case for increasing the value of conditional cash transfer grants in the country that she thought could be used for orienting future policy dialogue. A researcher from UCW cited an example in Ghana where the World Bank was set to focus its youth employment strategy on unemployed graduates (1% of unemployed youth) and through dialogue with UCW was convinced to refocus on early school leavers who represent a much larger percentage of the unemployed or underemployed youth population.

Sharing of reports and report findings with relevant stakeholders is obviously a precondition for influencing policy and programs. According to one UCW researcher, unless the national stakeholder makes a specific request to withhold publication, all reports will eventually be available online on the ILO and UCW websites. In addition, some university-produced research will be published in academic journals and presented during academic conferences. However, some stakeholders remarked that they did not receive sufficient guidance on the distribution of research reports. For example, a stakeholder in Morocco said s/he was never given authorization to print and distribute the survey report on child labor in agriculture. She noted that although the report is available online, it would get more attention from some stakeholders if it were also available and distributed in print.

In most cases, launch events were also organized to share key findings of project-supported research and assessments with stakeholders. One stakeholder within UCW indicated that more needed to be done to follow up beyond the launch of the report. An obvious avenue for influencing policy is within the ILO, and stakeholders indicated that more could be done to link research with ILO programs. The manager of the UCW research component indicated that they have organized internal meetings with the ILO unit in charge of social protection to share their findings on the impact of social protection programs on child labor in various countries.<sup>37</sup> In addition, GAP11-funded UCW research and policy recommendations featured prominently in the last World Report on Child Labor, which is used by stakeholders within and outside the ILO as a resource for strategy formulation.

Two thirds of the research institutions supported by UCW indicated that the project was successful in integrating child labor within their institutions’ research agendas. This support is likely sustainable, as more than 76% say that future research on child labor is likely even in the absence of donor funding. As a result of GAP11 support in Turkey, the partner institution funded a research

---

<sup>37</sup> GAP11 impact assessment research analyzed the effects on child labor of cash transfer programs in Brazil, Mexico, Malawi and Kenya, of a public work program in Malawi and of a remedial education program in Mali.

paper on school-to-work transition, commenting that “as far as we know, it is the only research paper done on this topic. The results are being presented in various national and international conferences.” Moreover, the same partner agency announced that they were currently funding a research paper on the detrimental effects of having worked as a child on adult outcomes.

**Component 3** sustainability strategies were focused on raising awareness and influencing the policies and practices of key stakeholders concerned by or engaged in protecting children engaged in domestic work and more generally promoting decent work in domestic work.

Based on stakeholder feedback, Component 3 work on producing Protective Policy Frameworks was modestly effective at influencing policy. Responses to the question regarding “to what extent GAP11 support had influenced priorities for improving policies and programs on child labor in domestic work” were mixed. Just over half of the knowledgeable respondents thought that their country was advanced in implementing the recommendations set forth in the Protective Policy Framework, and fewer (42%) expect major progress over the next twelve months. The scope and duration of project assistance on formulating the policy frameworks may also not have been sufficient to influence policy. For example, during the evaluation visit, one key informant from the Philippines shared the opinion that the framework, which was called a Roadmap in his country, was not sufficiently developed to be considered a useful action plan.<sup>38</sup>

The most significant legacy of Component 3 is likely to be its contributions to a reexamination of how national governments understand the situation of children in domestic work and to clarify conceptual linkages between C.189 and C.182 and C.138. Based on past IPEC and as well as other organizations’ work on the issue, some national governments moved to classify all domestic work as being hazardous for children, putting it into the category of the worst forms of child labor. Key informants within and outside the ILO interviewed by the evaluators contended that such black and white categorizations of the sector do not accurately reflect the various types of domestic work and situations in which children are found. For example, one of the key findings of the study on child labor in domestic work in Haiti found that although children engaged in domestic work were worse off than children that were not (according to many key indicators including education), the differences were not great. Moreover, they observed that the spectrum of situations in which children engaged in domestic work found themselves was large (with slavery-like conditions on one side and greatly improved living conditions with their substitute families on the other), with relatively small numbers of children being found at the extremities. It is likely that the more nuanced approach that was promoted by GAP11-supported activities will be more effective in building a protective framework that allows children of legal working age to access opportunities for youth employment in domestic work.

---

<sup>38</sup> The ILO notes that additional work is planned on the Roadmap, which is going to be included in the Philippine Plan of Action on Child Labor 2016-2020. This action is currently being carried out with GAP11 and CLEAR Project funds

## IV. LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

---

GAP11 interventions featured many good practices that merit highlighting. These include cost effective capacity building approaches, strategic choices of target beneficiaries, innovative methods for conducting child labor research, promoting greater coordination among national stakeholders, and sharing national staff with other ILO projects.

### 4.1 Cost Effective Capacity Building Approaches

---

To date, GAP11 has developed or is in the process of developing a number of global capacity building tools: the child labor in domestic work report and World Day Against Child Labor awareness raising materials,<sup>39</sup> a toolkit for NAP development and implementation, an e-learning tool for labor inspectors, guidelines for conducting surveys on child labor in domestic work and the guidelines for education and child labor in fragile states.

These tools have the potential to be cost effective in as much as they may be used to build capacity or guide capacity building activities by stakeholders inside and outside the ILO over and over again, beyond the life of the project. Although by their nature they are standardized tools, they capture what has been learned by various stakeholders on a variety of issues in multiple contexts and likely, over time, will be translated into multiple languages. They will likely contribute to sharing knowledge created through GAP11 work. For example the CLEAR<sup>40</sup> project manager indicated that he plans to use the e-learning tool to train labor inspectors in his project.

### 4.2 Strategic Choices of Target Beneficiaries

---

The project identified and built the capacity of “champions” - people with strong personal commitments to fighting child labor. One example that stands out from field visits was a senator from Cameroon who benefited from training in Turin for Parliamentarians from West Africa and an exchange visit in Ghana (funded by another project). She came back from these experiences very committed to working with the ILO and was using what she learned first at the level of her constituency (changing mindsets and policy implementation at the regional and local levels through dialogue with governors and local authorities) in addition to sharing information with her peers in the legislature. She contributed to GAP11 work on the NAP with an action plan for the senate.

A key lesson learned from this experience is that building the capacity of well-selected individuals

---

<sup>39</sup> The project reported that awareness raising materials on child labor in domestic work developed for WDACL were used by stakeholders in more than 50 countries.

<sup>40</sup> CLEAR, which stands for Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor (CLEAR), is a USDOL-funded project supporting ten countries including Bangladesh, Paraguay, Philippines, Suriname and Uganda, to take targeted actions to eliminate the worst forms of child labor.

can have an outsized effect on levels of national ownership for child labor initiatives in a given country. It also showed the relevance of working with legislators and the value of regional exchanges between Parliamentarians when the right participants are selected for these programs.

### 4.3 Innovative Methods for Conducting Child Labor Research

---

GAP11 impact evaluation work was both innovative and relevant and constitutes a good practice. UCW researchers either introduced questions or developed modules on child labor (analysis of existing datasets) to planned or ongoing impact evaluations of programs with a direct or indirect bearing on child labor. One of the key lessons learned from the approach was that it is possible to generate knowledge on policy impact without having to undertake full impact evaluations looking specifically at child labor. One of the positive outcomes of UCW research is a better understanding of the role of social protection in explaining observed global child labor trends.

Building the capacity of national universities and nonprofit research organizations to collect and analyze data on child labor was also a good practice developed by UCW within GAP11. Support for capacity building is accompanied by small research grants designed to enable university researchers to apply their training by conducting actual field research on child labor. The sub component was highly appreciated by the institutions that took part in its activities and resulted in a wide range of new national-level research partnerships. One interesting aspect of the approach, according to one UCW researcher, was that it facilitated research in countries where approaching the government statistics office for collaboration on issues related to child labor would be otherwise difficult or impossible, such as in India.

### 4.4 Promoting Greater Coordination among National Stakeholders

---

The multi-stakeholder coalition created to steer research on child labor in domestic work in Haiti is also a good practice implemented by GAP11. The issue of the *restaveks*, children in Haiti who are sent by their parents to work for a host household as domestic servants, has garnered significant attention in the media, often being described as a version of modern day slavery. Even so, the practice only became more common in the wake of the 2010 earthquake near Port au Prince. In 2013, the ILO, UNICEF, International Organization for Migration (IOM) and several large, international NGOs came together and agreed to support in-depth research to support updated information about the magnitude and characteristics of the practice.

There are several good practices associated with the multi-stakeholder coalition that merit highlighting. The first is the relevance of coordinated action among NGOs, international organizations and government representatives in a country like Haiti which is highly dependent on aid but which does not have a strong central government that is able to adequately coordinate the actions of its partners. In these situations, organizations are often left to coordinate themselves, but

this is seldom done effectively. In the case of the multi-stakeholder coalition on *domesticité*<sup>41</sup> the research project brought together more than 30 organizations to debate and eventually to agree on the main recommendations coming out of the research. Ten of them actually contributed funds to the study, which should have reinforced their ownership for the process and results. Stakeholders in Haiti are very hopeful this will lead to more effective and coordinated work on the issue.

Secondly, the findings of the research were interesting because it brought about a more nuanced appreciation of the situation that children engaged in domestic work in Haiti find themselves, which should lead to more relevant interventions that respond to the full gamut of needs and opportunities to improve the welfare of the children involved.

#### 4.5 Sharing National Staff with Other ILO Projects

---

Sharing national staff with other ILO projects has allowed GAP11 to minimize costs and create various synergies.

In particular, in the Philippines the national staff was co-funded with 10% by GAP11, and 90% by the CLEAR project. This staffing arrangement contributed to a coherent approach, avoided disruptions in stakeholder relationships, and facilitated progress towards achieving project outputs in an efficient manner. These benefits of sharing the national staff were also confirmed by an ILO CLEAR project manager.

Given that there was consensus among the national stakeholders that work on developing a coherent policy framework on child domestic work was a time-consuming process and still in the early stages, linking the two projects allowed for extending the timeline for interventions on child domestic work, and avoided hastily pushing through any given agenda. Having the same national staff responsible for both projects was a necessary precondition for this process.

---

<sup>41</sup> *Domesticité* is the French term used in Haiti to describe child labor in domestic work.



## V. MAIN CONCLUSIONS

---

National stakeholders highlighted many GAP11 achievements, particularly in the areas of awareness-raising, knowledge base, capacity-building, and legal reform. Overall, they indicated that the project's efforts have led to an increased awareness and visibility of child labor and/or forced labor in many of their countries and contributed to their capacity to take action.

Although there were aspects of the project design that created implementation challenges, including the limited scope and budget of many planned activities, the ILO was resourceful in finding ways to achieve the majority of its planned outputs, albeit with significant implementation delays and higher-than-planned administrative costs. Moreover, many of the outputs that are in progress or not started are those that support implementation of the recommendations found in various project assessments and therefore are arguably more critical for the project's positive legacy than some of those that have been completed. Among project intervention strategies, there were many effective approaches, including participative approaches that enhanced national ownership, while others were less effective. Although more data is needed to confirm, on face value it would seem that capacity building for institutions that have an operational role in combating child labor, such as labor inspectors, provincial labor officials and members of farmers' associations, is more likely to affect the lives of children engaged in or at risk of child labor in the immediate future than stand-alone project support for higher level coordination frameworks (NAP, Protective Policy Frameworks). Overall, national stakeholders indicated that more ILO and government follow-up are needed for capacity building results to translate into sustainable, positive outcomes including measurable changes in policies and practices.

GAP11 is instructive for both USDOL and ILO because of the large number of countries it targeted, the wide variety of strategies that were tested and because the ILO worked in a more integrated way on child labor issues with other parts of the organization, which reflects the direction it has since taken with the creation of the FUNDAMENTALS Branch. Of the three components, Component 2 was suited best to a large, worldwide project in so far as carrying out effective research led by an external team of experts is somewhat less dependent on multiple and complex factors linked to the enabling environment than is direct work on national policy and capacity building. SIMPOC and UCW have over time developed "tried and true" processes to carry out their data collection and research in target countries, which makes them effective partners for child labor and forced labor research. However, much of the research that was produced by GAP11 was not strategically linked to other project work, making it very hard to determine who the users were and what they did with the research (except for the policy appraisals, which responded to specific stakeholder request).

The global awareness raising campaign on child labor in domestic work and the toolkits, e-learning modules and guidelines were also effective global strategies to assist national efforts to combat child labor and forced labor. Like research, their impact is difficult to measure but the linkages with project interventions are easier to draw and evaluate (for example national WDAFL awareness raising campaigns used global resource materials). Other GAP11 interventions to build national capacity would be more effective if they were part of smaller, more regionally focused projects that were able to take into account contextual factors more comprehensively.

## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

---

The following are some recommendations addressed to the donor and the ILO to guide future initiatives.

***Recommendation 1:*** *Future multi-country policy and capacity building-related projects should be more focused geographically and target fewer countries.*

Fewer, less geographically dispersed countries, higher levels of funding per country, more opportunities for inter-country exchanges and more strategically linked interventions would likely increase both project efficiency and effectiveness, especially for the capacity building and policy/legal framework oriented interventions of Components 1 and 3.

***Recommendation 2:*** *In future projects, operational management of project implementation should be mainly handled by national program officers who are based in the country.*

Responsibility for day-to-day ILO support should be given to competent national program managers based in the target countries, who know the context and are able to respond to opportunities or find means to overcome obstacles in fluid and appropriate ways. Geneva or regionally based managers should play a more strategic role in guiding overall program strategies and building the capacity of national managers.

***Recommendation 3:*** *In future policy and capacity building projects, when appropriate, project managers should be able to shift resources to countries and intervention strategies that present the best opportunities to garner buy-in from relevant national stakeholders or to seize on new opportunities that emerge in the implementing environment during the course of the project implementation period. Contractual and administrative mechanisms should be designed to facilitate this kind of flexibility.*

Because (a) buy-in from national governments and other stakeholders, as well as other contextual factors, are extremely important for successful legal, regulatory and policy reform and related capacity building work, but (b) are hard to assess accurately before implementation starts and are subject to rapid change from unforeseen political, economic and natural disasters, the ability to change course in a given country when merited by circumstances should be built into large, multi-country projects in particular. Contractual/administrative mechanisms should be designed to allow these kinds of adjustments without requiring lengthy modification processes. This may require more frequent donor/grantee reviews of project work plans and related targets and contract mechanisms that enable a greater degree of flexibility.

***Recommendation 4:*** *The next generation of projects on child labor and forced labor should invest fewer resources in reforming laws and legal instruments at the national level and put more effort into helping stakeholders to apply/enforce/implement existing laws and policies to protect children from economic exploitation and promote their education and welfare.*

An enormous amount of policy reform can occur without the need for a new regulation or law. Because laws and regulations change very slowly, it is often more practical and effective to focus time and resource-limited investments on codes of practice or compliance directives, and/or on capacity building for the implementation of mechanisms that already exist. Decisions of this sort should depend both on an analysis of the relevant legal and policy framework and available project and host government resources, as well as on an assessment of what needs to be done and what can realistically be done to strengthen protections for children within the available time and resource window. For example, it may be more effective to focus project resources on overcoming some of the more practical issues that limit labor inspection and/or to put in place complementary child labor monitoring strategies rather than adding new regulations and laws that are unlikely to be enforced.<sup>42</sup>

***Recommendation 5:** The next generation of projects on child labor and forced labor should look less into improving or updating the NAPs and more into helping local stakeholders mobilize their own resources and implement pieces of the NAP in order to promote further sustainability.*

Although there is value in fostering stakeholder coordination and formalizing roles and responsibilities for carrying out programs and other actions that are designed to reduce the prevalence of child labor and, where relevant, forced labor, it is quickly diminished if insufficient effort is put into supporting implementation. Moreover, where little or no support is given to translate plans into operational directives or to build the capacity of people and institutions that have more direct roles providing services to actual children engaged in or at risk of child labor, tangible improvements in the quality and availability of education, livelihood and social services for children at risk or engaged in child labor is unlikely. Therefore, in addition to good policies and plans, more implementation support is needed for stakeholders and institutions at the regional and local levels.

***Recommendation 6:** Responsible Ministries for policies on the elimination of child labor and forced labor are often different in the target countries. As such, constituents and other concerned stakeholders do not always understand the linkages between the two issues. Future projects that wish to marry the two agendas should take a more long term approach, in consultation with national partners in the target countries, to ensure project activities and beneficiaries correctly respond to child labor and forced labor linkages and differences.*

Although some of the root causes of child labor and forced labor are shared in some of the countries and sectors where they occur, there are also many contributing factors and corresponding solutions

---

<sup>42</sup> For example, in Cameroon, the Ministry of Labor was working on changing the regulation that prevented labor inspectors from inspecting domiciles as a measure to reinforce the potential of the labor inspectorate to protect domestic workers. This is indeed a relevant issue but in light of the weak capacity of the inspectorate (limited number of inspectors, lack of logistical means), perhaps not the most urgent.

which are quite different. While it is possible and potentially effective to address the two issues together, to do so requires careful planning based on good analysis.

Please see additional analysis under Finding 4.

***Recommendation 7:** Future evaluations of ILO programs should look at more than one project and longer timeframes in order to assess the impact of the organization’s legal, regulatory and policy framework and capacity building interventions.*

With declining resources and strategic changes in the ways the ILO addresses priority issues at the country level, it is likely that there will be fewer big projects funded by a single donor and more small projects funded by various donors in any given country where the ILO works. In these situations, it will no longer make sense to look at one project in isolation from the other in order to assess impact.<sup>43</sup> The only way to see whether focused, continuous, multi-dimensional, beyond-the-project-cycle interventions are effective is to extend evaluation timeframes and intervention sets.

***Recommendation 8:** The final evaluation of GAP11 planned by ILO should have a particular emphasis on project sustainability-related aspects.*

In countries where GAP11 activities have ended, the ILO evaluation should look at whether or not, and for what reasons, stakeholders have taken up the issues according to their commitments. Examples may include the telephone hotline in the Philippines, the implementation of the NAP in Comoros, inspector training in Ethiopia, the impact of the multi-stakeholder working group on coordination of child protection initiatives in Haiti, and more generally, the implementation of protective policy frameworks recommendations on child labor in domestic work in various countries. The evaluation may contrast the sustainability of interventions that were mainly focused on the national level with ones that extended capacity building to regions and specific sectors or interventions that were followed up by other programs such as CLEAR in the Philippines, with ones that were not.

---

<sup>43</sup> USDOL notes that as part of its accountability function as a donor, it needs to do project-level evaluations but that does not preclude other types of evaluations that may look at a broader portfolio.

## ANNEX 1: Overview of Project Progress by Output

INDICATOR	Country	Status	Description of Deliverable
<b>Component 1 Capacity Building and Strategic Policy Approach</b>			
<b>Sub-Component 1.1: Legal and Regulatory Framework</b>			
<b>Output 1.1.1 Improved legal and regulatory framework to prevent child labor and forced labor</b>	Cameroon	Done	"Analysis of the legal framework on child labor and forced labor, with particular emphasis on child labor in domestic work, in Cameroon" produced by national ILO consultant in February 2013.
	Haiti	Done	Assessment report "Analysis of the legal framework on child labor, with particular emphasis on child labor in domestic work, in Haiti" produced by national ILO consultant in June 2014. Workshop to identify hazardous work for children was organized in April 2015. A list was proposed to the Ministry of Labor but no official validation can occur until a new government is in place.
	Indonesia	Done	Situational Analysis Child Labor Enforcement In Indonesia, September 2014. Law Enforcement Framework of Child & Forced Labor in Indonesia finalized October 2014
	Liberia	Done	Analysis of the legal framework on child labor. Legal review presented and discussed in a workshop of the technical working group responsible for the drafting of the NAP (March 2015)
	Mongolia	Done	"Revision of the Criminal Code and related legislation for the full and effective prohibition of the worst forms of child labor and forced labor and protecting the rights of child victims and witnesses in Mongolia". Q4 FY13/14 Technical working session to discuss report findings took place on 25 March 2015.
	Namibia	Done	Analysis of the legal framework on child labor. Legal review presented and discussed in a workshop May 2014.
	Paraguay [SAP-FL]	Done	Legal Review carried out by another project in 2012 Additional Review on legislation on forced labor and links to child labor completed in March 2014.
	Philippines	Done	Legal review completed in early 2013. Provision of technical advice for the revision of the Hazardous Work List for Children in 2014.
	South Sudan	In progress	The project will conduct a legal review of national laws and regulations on child and forced labor at distance once the first reports on the application of Conventions No. 138 and 182 are available.
	Timor Leste [SAP-FL]	Done	Project carried out study on FL. Provided technical assistance to draft the hazardous CL list, which was adopted. Adoption of the Child Labor National Committee (CNTI) through a government resolution in January 2014.
	Global - Global Slavery Observatory	Done	Project contributed funds to compile and enter data into database on 18 GAP 11 countries. The ILO used the data to develop a legal review report which was an essential input to the new protocol to C. 29 which updates conceptual framework on FL and provides practical recommendations to ILO constituents on step they can take to implement the convention. The database is not yet published online.

INDICATOR	Country	Status	Description of Deliverable
<b>Sub-Component 1.2: Monitoring and Enforcement</b>			
Output 1.2.1 Strengthened enforcement mechanisms in target countries	Burkina Faso	Done	Carried out capacity-building workshop for the members of the National Child Labor Commission in October 2014. GAP11 provided technical support to the Ministry of labor to develop labor inspection checklists on child labor in agriculture, artisanal gold mining and the informal sector which were validated in 2014.
	Dominican Rep.	In Progress	Guidelines and operating manuals for the National Child Labor Monitoring System were developed. A brochure describing the system was produced. A follow-up south-south exchange between labor inspectors is proposed with El Salvador.
	Ethiopia	Done	Training on law enforcement for labor inspectors. Cost shared with World Vision. Second workshop trained trainers who followed up immediately by giving training to additional labor inspectors. The government has committed to replicating the training twice annually which once confirmed will meet GPRA target.
	Indonesia	Done	Training for members of the National Action Committee, including labor inspectors as well as other relevant stakeholders in the fight against child labor in February 2015. The training also had a training of trainers (TOT) component.
	Paraguay [SAP-FL]	Done	Law enforcement workshops, which trained 170 labor inspectors, were carried out in Q4 13/14.
	Philippines	Done	Training of multi-disciplinary child labor rescue teams (SBM-QAT) in four provinces (July 2013) and development of provincial plans.
	Sierra Leone	Done	Training for labor inspectors, other law enforcement officers (judiciary and police) and other stakeholders from civil society groups took place in April 2013. If there are resources available, GAP11 may provide additional capacity building for labor inspectors before project close out.
	South Sudan	Cancelled	Work in S. Sudan was halted for most of the project's period of performance due to civil conflict. The funds have for this output were re-allocated to Azerbaijan. If the security situation allows it and if there are savings, the project will envisage conducting the labor inspector training that had been initially planned for February 2014 (and was postponed due to the crisis).
	Timor Leste [SAP-FL]	Done	Organized Inspector training using Brazilian inspector. Organized as half day training + on the job coaching in afternoons. Sensitization activities on child labor and forced labor were carried out in two districts in Timor Leste
	Togo	Done	Project developed modules on child labor that were integrated in the national training curriculum for labor inspectors and the first group of trainees were trained. Similar modules were prepared for the national training curriculum of social workers, police and judiciary.
Global - E-learning tool	In Progress	The first version of the tool which is now available at: <a href="http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/ipec/elearning_laborinspectors_and_clmonitors/module_1/multiscreen.html">http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/ipec/elearning_laborinspectors_and_clmonitors/module_1/multiscreen.html</a> It has been used to supplement face-to-face training for labor inspectors in Ethiopia and elsewhere. CLEAR project intends to use the tool. It will be finalized before GAP11 ends based on feedback received during the piloting period.	



INDICATOR	Country	Status	Description of Deliverable
<b>Sub-Component 1.3 A: NAPs and other policies to address CL and FL</b>			
	Cameroon	Done	The project organized 3 tripartite workshops to produce and validate National Action Plan. Validation by stakeholders occurred during a workshop organized in March 2014. In April 2015, the project organized a workshop on NAP implementation that included presentation on how to integrate NAP interventions into the national budget framework.
	D R Congo	Done	NAP validated in 2011. Was approved by government which counted towards GPRA objectives. Project support for NAP implementation focused on agriculture. The project facilitated participation by constituents in a regional workshop on NAP implementation organized by another IPEC project. Project support is also being given for the revision of hazardous list and to date includes support for an occupational safety and health (OSH) risk assessment.
	Liberia	In progress	Activities to develop NAP were initiated in 2014 and later halted after Ebola outbreak. Work on NAP started back up in July 2015 in collaboration with Winrock and UNICEF. Before elaborating the NAP, the government wants consultations in provinces and has budgeted for this. Implementation is ongoing.
	Paraguay [SAP-FL]	In progress	The first Action Plan on Forced Labor was adopted in 2014 but the project is supporting its elaboration. GAP11 activities were delayed when the Ministry of Labor was reformed. The project estimates that it will be completed by mid-2016.
	South Sudan	Cancelled	Funds have been re-allocated to Mongolia under 1.3B.
	Timor Leste [SAP-FL]	In Progress	The project has initiated NAP preparatory. Timor Leste will attend workshop about how to use data in design of NAP (funded by another ILO project). Government is delaying development of NAP until CL/FL survey is complete so that its findings can be used to inform the NAP.
<b>Sub-Component 1.3 B: Effective and improved national institutions in charge of National Action Plans</b>			
Output 1.3.2 Effective and improved national institutions in charge of National Action Plans	Azerbaijan	In Progress	Produced background study. Identified an existing NAP and provided support for implementation The project funded awareness raising activities conducted by Workers' and Employers' Organizations and engaged consultant to mainstream child labor into National Plan on Children.
	Comoros	Done	The development and validation of a NAP was supported by GAP 08. GAP11 supported implementation. GAP11 participated in a national workshop to revise the Penal Code in February 2013 and provided recommendations on how to strengthen legal provisions related to the WFCL. It also supported training workshops in 2013 on child labor for members of the National Human Rights and Liberty Commission and for other key stakeholders at the regional level on the monitoring and implementation of the NAP.
	Ethiopia	In Progress	GAP 11 funded the participation of Ethiopian participants at a <b>Training Workshop on the Implementation of National Action Plans on the Elimination of Child Labour</b> , in Johannesburg, South Africa, October 2013. The Ethiopian Ministry of Labor requested support to revise its NAP. The Intention is to link the revised NAP with the new Growth and Transformation Plan. Because of staffing issues, the project has not yet started implementation.

INDICATOR	Country	Status	Description of Deliverable
	Laos PDR	Done	The NAP received final approval and signature from the Prime Minister in April 2014. The project provided technical support to the process of development. ILO has full time staff member base in Ministry of Labor providing capacity building for the implementation of the NAP being carried forward by Education and Agriculture. The project carried out institutional capacity mapping and other trainings to support NAP implementation.
	Mongolia (replaced S. Sudan)	In progress	The project is supported a variety of research/awareness raising activities related to NAP implementation It supported a <i>rapid assessment on child labor in the construction sector</i> and will support constituents to use the research in developing advocacy and sensitization materials. The project also drafted a technical note to guide the development of terms of reference for the study on skills and livelihood aspirations of youth. It is co-funding research on the issue of child horse jockey in spring horse racing with UNICEF. The project also carried out a donor mapping, with a particular focus on the area of child rights, child protection, employment, education and livelihood support to young people.
	Global – NAP toolkit	In Progress	The project identified a consultant to work on the toolkit. And anticipates that it will be completed by the end of 2016.
<b>Sub-Component 1.4: Policy development</b>			
<b>Output 1.4.1</b> Pilot schemes on child labor and forced labor policy mainstreamed into development policies	D R Congo	In progress	A national workshop on child labor in Agriculture was conducted in Kinshasa in May 2015. Among its objectives were to identify opportunities for mainstreaming child labor issues into existing agricultural programs and agree on strategic orientations. As a follow up, the project is considering to help farmers' organizations develop a sensitization tool on child labor in agriculture.
	Ecuador [SAP-FL]	In progress	Support in Ecuador focuses on improving the responsiveness of policies and programs targeting disadvantaged Afro-Ecuadorians and Indigenous persons. The project produced a study on the "Features and Nature of Forced Labor and Child Labor in Amongst Afro-Descendants in the Esmeraldas and Quinindé Provinces of Ecuador and it now looking at next steps to mainstream in local governance structures and plans to share the Peruvian experience developing local guidelines for public officials. It set a GPRA target related to training local officials but the training has not occurred yet and it is not sure there will be institutionalization.
	Mali	In progress	The project provided assistance to mainstream child labor in Agriculture, building on a project with the FAO that produced a NAP to eliminate Child Labor in Agriculture in 2011. To date, the project has delivered training for Ministry of Agricultural personnel in selected regions and updated a Roadmap.
	Rwanda	In progress	The project produced a report on "Mainstreaming child labor concerns into social protection planning and programming: an assessment of the opportunities" which was validated at a national workshop in May 2015. The project intends to follow up on one of the recommendations - the inclusion of information on child labor in the training and sensitization manual of the Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme (VUP), the largest government led social protection program.
	South Sudan	Done	The project conducted a rapid assessment on child labor and education in pastoralist communities in March 2014. Follow up work was cancelled because of civil unrest in the country.



INDICATOR	Country	Status	Description of Deliverable
			<a href="http://www.ilo.org/ipeinfo/product/download.do?type=document&amp;id=24057">http://www.ilo.org/ipeinfo/product/download.do?type=document&amp;id=24057</a>
	Timor Leste [SAP-FL]	In progress	Project produced a background study followed by small workshop. But additional work is pending the NAP.
	Global – Brief on child labor and education in crisis situations	Done	Brief was produced in Q3 14/16. The target audience is co humanitarian child protection and education actors. The intention is of the study draw attention on the issue of child labor and education in emergencies and to encourage humanitarian, child protection, and education actors to address it in a collaborative effort. ( <a href="http://www.ilo.org/ipecc/Informationresources/WCMS_IPEC_PUB_26995/lang--en/index.htm">http://www.ilo.org/ipecc/Informationresources/WCMS_IPEC_PUB_26995/lang--en/index.htm</a> ).

INDICATOR	Planned/Targets	Status	Description of Deliverable
<b>Component 2: Research</b>			
<b>Sub-Component 2.1: National or sub-sector child labor surveys</b>			
<b>Output 2.1.1</b> National child labor survey datasets and reports	Belize	Done	Belize Child Activity Survey 2013 Report finalized for printing and official launch on 8 May 2015
	Lebanon	In Progress	Project has completed data collection. Delays were caused by the complicated operating environment. The project has hired a consultant hired to write the survey report and estimates that it will be completed before project end.
	Mozambique	In Progress	The project completed data collection and has been waiting for the national statistics office to signal that it is ready to analyze the data and write report. The counterpart has not been responsive and the project is considering next steps.
	Ukraine	In Progress	The project completed data collection and at the time of the evaluation the survey report was being drafted. Progress was slowed by political crisis and conflict. It has not been a high priority of the government.
<b>Output 2.1.2</b> Survey dataset and survey report on child labor in agriculture	Morocco	Done	Study on data collection on children's activities in the small holder farmer sector in Morocco. This study identifies the different types of work done by children, the nature of the dangers and risks that children face as well as the effects on their health and safety and ability to succeed in school. <a href="http://www.ilo.org/ipeinfo/product/download.do?type=document&amp;id=26515">http://www.ilo.org/ipeinfo/product/download.do?type=document&amp;id=26515</a>
<b>Output 2.1.3</b> Survey dataset and survey report on child labor and forced labor in Timor Leste	Timor Leste (replaces FL in palm oil in Malaysia)	Not started	The original activity, survey on forced labor in the palm oil sector, was cancelled due to objections from the counterpart government. Funds for this activity have been reallocated to CL/FL survey in Timor Leste. In addition, the project proposed a small forced labor research or capacity building activity in Malaysia in the pending project extension request.
<b>Output 2.1.4</b> Survey dataset and survey report on child labor in informal mining	Indonesia	Done	The report on the survey of child labor in tin mining in Indonesia was finalized in 2015. It is being formatted for web-publication on the ILO website.
<b>Output 2.1.5</b> Survey dataset and survey report on child labor in agriculture	Dominican Republic	On hold	This survey was on hold at the time of the evaluation. A forced labor survey is planned in the Dominican Republic in a new forced labor project that is in its early start-up phase. It is likely that the GAP11 survey will be combined with the other survey.
<b>Output 2.1.6</b>	Swaziland	In Progress	At the time of the evaluation, the project had completed data

INDICATOR	Planned/Targets	Status	Description of Deliverable
Survey dataset and survey report on child labor in herding			collection and was preparing for data analysis and report writing. Both should be completed before project end.
<b>Sub-Component 2.2: Child labor modules to existing impact evaluations</b>			
<b>Output 2.2.1</b> Survey datasets and reports (for five modular evaluation surveys)	Mchiniji Pilot (Malawi)	Done	
	Child Grant Program (Lesotho)	In progress	Data analysis ongoing and drafting; this is being executed by a PhD student supervised by Fulio.
	Child Grant Program (Zambia):	Done	
	Cash transfer for Orphans and Vulnerable Children (CT-OVC, Kenya)	Done	
	Public Work in Malawi	In progress	
	Conditional Cash transfer (The Philippines)	Done	Will be published in an academic journal
	Remedial education in Mali	In progress	The project has completed data analysis completed and initiated on an analysis of the impact of the School Speed Program in Mali. The study, by providing insight on the impact of remedial education on child labor, is expected to contribute filling the knowledge base on what works to eliminate child labor.
<b>Sub-Component 2.3: Country-level situational analyses and policy appraisals</b>			
<b>Output 2.3.1</b> Country-level situational analyses	Ecuador (replaces Malaysia, which was cancelled)	In progress	UCW will complete the report by the current project end date (March 31, 2016). Work started late because Ecuador replaced Malaysia.
	Honduras	Done	Entender el trabajo infantil y el empleo juvenil en Honduras <a href="http://www.ucw-project.org/Pages/bib_details.aspx?id=12364">http://www.ucw-project.org/Pages/bib_details.aspx?id=12364</a>
	Togo	Done	Comprendre le travail des enfants et l'emploi des jeunes au Togo <a href="http://www.ucw-project.org/Pages/bib_details.aspx?id=12330&amp;Pag=0&amp;Country=207">http://www.ucw-project.org/Pages/bib_details.aspx?id=12330&amp;Pag=0&amp;Country=207</a>
	Uganda	Done	Understanding children's work and youth employment outcomes in Uganda <a href="http://www.ucw-project.org/Pages/bib_details.aspx?id=12343&amp;Pag=0&amp;Country=216">http://www.ucw-project.org/Pages/bib_details.aspx?id=12343&amp;Pag=0&amp;Country=216</a>
	Ghana	In Progress	The proposed project extension will permit UCW to take into account new data on child labor trends from the Ghana Living Standards Survey in the situational analysis report.
	Philippines	In Progress	Draft of joint ILO/World Bank research study on conditional cash transfers completed. Planned to be launched in December 2015.
<b>Output 2.3.2</b> Country-level policy appraisals	Malaysia	Cancelled	Will be replaced by Ecuador (pending approval of proposed project revision) TOR has been prepared and they are ready to go.
	Honduras	Not Started	Topic still being discussed with counterpart
	Togo	Done	The policy appraisal report was completed Q2 FY14/15. « Priorités et rôles des acteurs publics dans la lutte contre le travail des enfants » <a href="http://www.ucw-project.org/Pages/bib_details.aspx?id=12363&amp;Pag=0&amp;Country=">http://www.ucw-project.org/Pages/bib_details.aspx?id=12363&amp;Pag=0&amp;Country=</a>

INDICATOR	Planned/Targets	Status	Description of Deliverable
			<a href="#">207</a>
	Uganda	Done	Access by vulnerable youth to business and vocational training
	Ghana	Not Started	Topic still being discussed with counterpart.
<b>Sub-Component 2.4: Thematic Reports</b>			
<b>Output 2.4.1</b> Study on child labor and youth employment	Global	Done	World Report on Child labor 2015 Hazardous youth employment: Child labor among children aged 15-17 <a href="http://www.ilo.org/ipec/Informationresources/WCMS_358969/lang-en/index.htm">http://www.ilo.org/ipec/Informationresources/WCMS_358969/lang-en/index.htm</a> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Impact of early entry into the labor market: included in the 2015 World Report on Child Labor and Youth Employment ;</li> <li>2. School to work transition: completed and posted on <a href="http://www.ucw-project.org/Pages/bib_details.aspx?id=12365&amp;Pag=0&amp;Year=-1&amp;Country=-1&amp;Author=-1">http://www.ucw-project.org/Pages/bib_details.aspx?id=12365&amp;Pag=0&amp;Year=-1&amp;Country=-1&amp;Author=-1</a> . An academic version of the study has been submitted to Institute for the Study of Labor in Bonn, Germany for publication among its Discussion Paper Series (<a href="http://ftp.iza.org/dp9456.pdf">http://ftp.iza.org/dp9456.pdf</a>) .</li> <li>3. Youth in hazardous work: completed</li> <li>4. Labor demand determinants of child labor and schooling decisions: completed and included in the 2015 World Report on Child Labor and Youth Employment.</li> </ol>
<b>Output 2.4.2</b> Study on impact of social protection programs	Global	Done	World Report on Child labor 2013 (completed) Mexico: The impact of Oportunidades on school participation and child labor (completed) Brazil: the Impact of Bolsa Familia on Child Labor (draft completed and waiting for comments from the MDS) <a href="http://www.ilo.org/ipec/Informationresources/WCMS_178184/lang-en/index.htm">http://www.ilo.org/ipec/Informationresources/WCMS_178184/lang-en/index.htm</a> 2 workshops were held to disseminate findings (International Conference on Child Labour, Brazil, 2013; 'The limits of public policies in addressing child labour', Geneva, July 2015)
<b>Output 2.4.3</b> Study on Recruitment Patterns (child labor and forced labor)	Kenya, Brazil and Paraguay	In Progress	Project has carried out mapping exercises of recruitment patterns, including desk research and expert interviews in Brazil and Paraguay while Kenya is in progress. Data collection is finished in Brazil and ongoing in Paraguay and Kenya. Report on Paraguay and Brazil will be ready in August 2016 and on Kenya in September 2016.
<b>Output 2.4.4</b> Study on child labor and forced labor in the garment industry	Bangladesh	Cancelled	The ILO Dhaka office withdrew its support for the planned study due to the complexities of and multiple challenges facing the Ready Made Garment sector in Bangladesh. The decision was subsequently taken, in consultation with USDOL, to move the research funds reserved for Bangladesh to the Timor Leste FL and CL Survey.
	India	Done	The study was an analysis into working conditions in the garment sector, with a focus on whether or not any of these conditions amounted to forced labour or child labour. The study was done in collaboration the Garment Sector Roundtable, a multi-stakeholder initiative based in Bangalore, which ceased to operate in 2014. It was finalized in early

INDICATOR	Planned/Targets	Status	Description of Deliverable
			2015, shared in a validation stakeholder workshop attended employers, workers and garment sector buyers and disseminated to organizations working on the issue of forced labor in the garment sector in India, including the Global Fund and C&A Foundation. <a href="http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/forced-labour/publications/lang--en/nextRow--10/index.htm">http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/forced-labour/publications/lang--en/nextRow--10/index.htm</a>
	Jordan	In progress	SAP-FL is conducting research on Work Conditions and Recruitment Practices in the Apparel Sector in Jordan. Questions on forced labor were integrated into a quantitative survey with BetterWork Jordan. A follow-up qualitative survey is currently underway. To date interviews have been completed and a draft is expected to come by end-November 2015.
Output 2.4.5 Study on child domestic work		Not Started	The terms of reference are being discussed and finalized. Work has been delayed because of challenges compiling data sets
<b>Sub-Component 2.5: Building the capacity of local universities and non-profit research organizations</b>			
Output 2.5.1 Promoting national research on the issue of child labor	Brazil (ESAQL)	Done	
	Indonesia	Done	UCW organized a seminar in the university.
	India (JNU)	Done	UCW organized a seminar in the university.
	Turkey (BETAM)	Done	The project organized three seminars for researchers in the university.
	Mexico (UANL)	Done	UCW organized a seminar in the university.
	South Africa (SALDRU)	Done	A seminar was held in Sept. 2013 at SALDRU. Discussions were initiated with SALDRU on expanding the collaboration to deliver additional training and to develop additional studies. The implementation agreement that will allow implementing the expanded collaboration is currently being processed.
	ITC-ILO	Done	A student from the institute was coached by the UCW team in Rome.
Output 2.5.2 Grant-supported studies related to the promotion of national research	Brazil	Done	Project supported two students to develop studies on child labour and related issues: The analysis of the worst forms of child labor based on Brazil's demographic census from 2000-2010 and the impact of labor inspection on child labor. It recently agreed to expand the program and funded a third study on the impact of Bolsa Familia on the probability of being neither working nor studying, and research is currently in progress
	Indonesia	Cancelled	Notwithstanding the support provided to the Center on child protection of the University of Indonesia, the Center did not identified students to carry out research so this output was cancelled.
	India	In Progress	JNU (india): student currently being identified
	Turkey	In Progress	BETAM (turkey): i) Child labor, youth employment and school to work transition in Turkey (Completed); ii) Adult outcomes of having worked as a child in Turkey (grant currently being issued)
	Mexico	In Progress	UANL (mexico): i) Violencia contra las Mujeres y Trabajo Infantil en México 2011 (draft completed); ii) Migración interna y trabajo infantil en México (draft completed)
	South Africa	In Progress	SALDRU (south Africa): i) The impact of the LEAP program on

INDICATOR	Planned/Targets	Status	Description of Deliverable
			child labor in Ghana (completed); ii) Birth Order Effects on Educational Attainment and Child Labor: Evidence from Lesotho (draft completed)
	ITC-ILO	Done	ITC-ILO (university of Turin): Child labor and youth employment as a response to household vulnerability to shocks: Evidence from rural Ethiopia' (Completed)

INDICATOR	Planned/Targets	Status	Description of Deliverable
<b>Component 3: Protection of child domestic workers</b>			
<b>Sub-Component 3.1: Awareness raising and advocacy</b>			
<b>Output 3.1.1</b> WDACL activities on "protection of child domestic workers" in selected countries		Done	The main document produced for the WDACL was a technical report: "Ending child labor in domestic work and protecting young workers from abusive working conditions" <a href="http://www.ilo.org/ipec/Informationresources/WCMS_207656/lang-en/index.htm">http://www.ilo.org/ipec/Informationresources/WCMS_207656/lang-en/index.htm</a> This report was produced with funding from the GAP11 project; it was also made available in several languages: English, French, Spanish and Portuguese.
<b>Output 3.1.2</b> A general information leaflet on strengthening protections to children in domestic work		Done	The project produced a fact sheet, Q & A brochure (printed and online). The project is considering producing another document at the end of the project.
<b>Output 3.1.3</b> International advocacy campaign on C.189 along with the Global March against Child Labor and associated partners		Done	In early 2013 the ILO signed an implementation agreement (IA) with the Global March against Child Labor to design and launch an International advocacy campaign on C.189. The action program was initially for 18 months and was later extended to additional 9 months. They carried out a number of pilot actions Indonesia, Panama and Togo through their network of NGOs. C189 was ratified in Panama.
<b>Output 3.1.4</b> Special thematic session on the protection of child domestic workers during the Global Child Labor Conference, Brazil 2013		Done	
<b>Output 3.1.5</b> National rapid situational analysis on child domestic work in 12 selected countries	Cameroon	Done	Assessment report "Rapid situational analysis on child domestic work in Cameroon" produced by national ILO consultant in December 2012.
	Ecuador	Done	
	Gabon	Done	
	Haiti	In Progress	
	Indonesia	Done	Situational Analysis Child Labor Enforcement In Indonesia, Sept 2014
	Kenya	Done	Finalized combined situational analysis social services gap analysis in 2013 before WDACL.
	Namibia	Done	Rapid situational Analysis on Child Domestic Work including a proposal assessing and addressing gaps in social services finalized Q 2 FY 14/15.
	Panama	Done	

INDICATOR	Planned/Targets	Status	Description of Deliverable
	Vietnam	Done	Survey on Child domestic Work in Hanoi City: Review of national legal framework and current existing social protection services for child domestic workers finalized Q2 FY13/14.
	Pakistan	Cancelled	No legal assessment done because information produced by another Canadian funded project.
	Philippines	Done	Rapid Situational Analysis on Child Domestic Work including a proposal assessing and addressing gaps in social services and proposing relevant solutions for child domestic workers protection finalized in Q2 FY13/14.
	Togo	Done	National rapid situational analysis on child domestic workers in Togo was finalized in 2013.
	Pakistan	In Progress	Draft report available. It combines the situational analysis, legal and regulatory and social services assessment.
<b>Sub-Component 3.2: Regulatory and policy frameworks</b>			
<b>Output 3.2.1</b> Reports on review of the national legal framework on child domestic work in 12 target countries	Cameroon	Done	Assessment report "Analysis of the legal framework on child labor and forced labor, with particular emphasis on child labor in domestic work, in Cameroon" produced by national ILO consultant in February 2013.
	Ecuador	Done	
	Gabon	Done	Study reviewing the national legal framework on domestic work in Gabon completed in Q4 FY12/13.
	Haiti	Done	Assessment report "Analysis of the legal framework on child labor, with particular emphasis on child labor in domestic work, in Haiti" produced by national ILO consultant in June 2014. (Combined with Component 1)
	Indonesia	Done	Child Domestic Workers (CDW) in Indonesia: Case Studies of Jakarta and Greater Areas, December 2013
	Kenya	Cancelled	Cancelled because not needed given recent previous analysis.
	Namibia	Done	Legal analysis done.
	Panama	Done	
	Vietnam	Done	Survey on Child domestic Work in Hanoi City: Review of national legal framework and current existing social protection services for child domestic workers finalized in Q 2 FY13/14.
	Philippines	Done	The legal review (Component 1 and 3 combined) was completed and submitted to USDOL in 2013.
	Togo	Done	Study reviewing the national legal framework on child domestic work in Togo was finalized in 2013.
	Pakistan	In Progress	Draft report available. It combines the situational analysis, legal and regulatory and social services assessment.
<b>Output 3.2.2</b> Proposal for addressing gaps in social services for child domestic workers protection in 12 target countries	Cameroon	Done	Report on gaps in social services for the protection of children engaged in domestic work submitted in February 2014.
	Ecuador	Done	
	Gabon	Done	Rapid situational Analysis on Child Domestic Work including a proposal assessing and addressing gaps in social services finalized in Q4 FY13/14.
	Haiti	In Progress	Child Domestic Workers in Haiti 2014: Analytical Report has been concluded and it in the final stages to be launched (Situational Analysis on Child Domestic Work including a social services gap assessment).
	Indonesia	Done	Situational Analysis Child Labor Enforcement In Indonesia, Sept 2014
	Kenya	Done	Finalized combined situational analysis social services gap

INDICATOR	Planned/Targets	Status	Description of Deliverable
			analysis in 2013 before WDAFL.
	Namibia	Done	Rapid situational Analysis on Child Domestic Work including a proposal assessing and addressing gaps in social services finalized Q 3 FY 14/15.
	Panama	Done	Child Domestic Workers social services gap assessment study finalized in Q4 FY13/14.
	Vietnam	Done	
	Philippines	Done	Incorporated into rapid situational analysis (Output 3.1.5.)
	Togo	Done	Study Assessing Gaps on social services for child domestic workers protection in Togo was finalized in early 2013.
	Pakistan	In Progress	Draft report available. It combines the situational analysis, legal and regulatory and social services assessment.
<b>Output 3.2.3</b> A child domestic workers protective policy framework document available in 12 target countries	Cameroon	Done	Validation workshop 17 October 2014; Integrated into NAP in 2015.
	Ecuador	Done	Protective policy framework document on the elimination of child labor in domestic work and the protection of young domestic workers of legal working age (29 August 2014) adopted in tripartite workshop. Endorsed by NSC in 2015 (counts toward GPRA target)
	Gabon	Done	All analysis carried out. Protective policy framework validated by a tripartite +working group on 26 March 2015
	Haiti	In Progress	Progress on this output is pending official launch of the Child Domestic Labor study which is planned for early 2015. The project plans to produce policy recommendations during the workshop and, in the context of another ongoing project, integrate the recommendations into a NAP on child labor.
	Indonesia	Done	Framework was produced and adopted in a tripartite workshop on March 2015.
	Kenya	Done	"Road Map to Protecting Child Domestic Workers in Kenya: Strengthening the Institutional and Legislative Response" (24 April 2014) adopted in tripartite + workshop.
	Namibia	Done	Framework was produced and validated by tripartite + workshop. Scope of workshop was more general on child labor with some focus on domestic work. Final report was prepared by Ministry and now the ILO is revising.
	Panama	Done	Protective policy framework document on the elimination of child labor in domestic work and the protection of young domestic workers of legal working age) was adopted by stakeholders in August 2014 and officially validated by the National Steering Committee in July 2015.
	Vietnam	Done	"Guidelines for the protection of child domestic workers within the framework of the adoption of the National Plan of Action on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor 2015-2020" (22 <sup>th</sup> May 2014) adopted during tripartite + workshop.
	Philippines	Done	Workshop organized in January 2015 for the adoption of a Roadmap document towards strengthening the institutional and legislative response for the elimination of child labor in domestic work and the protection of young domestic workers in the Philippines.
	Togo	Done	The child domestic workers protective policy framework document was adopted in a March 2014 in during a tripartite workshop and validated the National Steering Committee in



INDICATOR	Planned/Targets	Status	Description of Deliverable
			August 2015.
	Pakistan	In Progress	
Output 3.2.4 Protection of child domestic workers concerns mainstreamed into the policy agendas and operational plans of domestic workers' unions with the support of the IUF/IDWN	Cameroon	Not started	
	Ecuador	In Progress	Working with an organization of domestic workers to put young domestic worker concerns
	Gabon	Not started	
	Haiti	Not started	
	Indonesia	Not started.	Discussions are under way with PROMOTE project to ensure follow up of the Sectorial Action Plan, including through activities with workers organizations.
	Kenya	Not started	
	Namibia	Not started	
	Panama	In progress	Working with USDOL funded Panador Project (policy level on CL) to follow-up.
	Vietnam	In progress	Looking on how to mainstream recommendations with workers. Contacts are being maintained with the CTA of the new USDOL funded project on Child Labor in Vietnam, to explore joint follow up action.
	Philippines	In progress	Roadmap expected be integrated into the Philippine Program Against Child Labor (PPACL) during a workshop in January 2016.
	Togo	Done	Training workshop for trade unions on strengthening the role of trade unions for the promotion of decent work for domestic workers, especially youth aged 15-17. Working sessions to design a domestic worker contract template, agree on recruitment procedures in the context of a private public collaboration between the labor inspectorate and private sector employment agencies involved in recruiting and placing domestic workers.
	Pakistan	Not started	



## ANNEX 2: Evaluation Terms of Reference

---

# TERMS OF REFERENCE

for the  
**External Independent Final Evaluation**  
of  
**Global Action Program on Child Labor Issues (GAP11)**

Cooperative Agreement Number:	IL-22509-11-75-K
Financing Agency:	U.S. Department of Labor
Grantee Organization:	International Labour Organization
Dates of Project Implementation:	30 September 2011 - 31 March 2017
Type of Evaluation:	Independent Final Evaluation
Evaluation Field Work Dates:	October 19 - November 30, 2015
Preparation Date of TOR:	August 2015
Total Project Funds from USDOL Based on Cooperative Agreement:	US \$15,900,000

Vendor for the Evaluation Contract:



*Sistemas, Familia y Sociedad*  
Consultores Asociados

## ACRONYMS

CL	Child Labor
CMEP	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
EO	Expected Outcome
FY	Fiscal Year
GAP	Global Action Program on Child Labor
HH	Household
ILAB	USDOL Bureau of International Labor Affairs
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPEC	ILO International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OCFT	USDOL Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor and Human Trafficking
SFS	Sistemas, Familias y Sociedad – Consultores Asociados
TPR	Technical Progress Report
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labor

# I. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

## USDOL - OCFT

The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) is an office within the Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL). OCFT activities include research on international child labor (CL); supporting U.S. government policy on international child labor; administering and overseeing cooperative agreements with organizations working to eliminate child labor around the world; and raising awareness about child labor issues.

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated over \$900 million to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects to combat exploitive child labor in more than 90 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL range from targeted action programs in specific sectors of work to more comprehensive programs that support national efforts to eliminate child labor. USDOL-funded child labor elimination projects generally seek to achieve five major goals:

1. Reducing exploitative child labor, especially the worst forms (WFCL) through the provision of direct educational services and by addressing root causes of child labor, including innovative strategies to promote sustainable livelihoods of target households;
2. Strengthening policies on child labor, education, and sustainable livelihoods, and the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, address its root causes, and promote formal, non-formal and vocational education opportunities to provide children with alternatives to child labor;
3. Raising awareness of exploitative child labor and its root causes, and the importance of education for all children and mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures;
4. Supporting research, evaluation, and the collection of reliable data on child labor, its root causes, and effective strategies, including educational and vocational alternatives, microfinance and other income generating activities to improve household income; and
5. Ensuring the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

## Project Context<sup>44</sup>

The last decade saw important achievements in the fight against child labor. Globally, the number of working children and incidence of child labor declined, particularly among girls and in the worst forms of child labor. The reduction was driven by legislative, policy and advocacy initiatives:

---

<sup>44</sup> Adapted from the GAP Technical Proposal

Ratifications of key International Labour Organization (ILO) child labor Conventions Nos. 138 and 182 continued to increase; many countries developed national plans to tackle child labor; and the Hague Global Conference on Child Labor in 2010 helped to reinvigorate the worldwide movement and adopted the “Roadmap for Achieving the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor by 2016.” However, in spite of this dynamic, the rate of child labor reduction has slowed in recent years. At the start of the project there were still 215 million children in child labor with approximately 115 million children in its worst forms. The majority of child labor is found in agriculture, mining, fishing and the informal economy.

The Roadmap adopted at The Hague Global Child Labor Conference highlighted the urgent need to upscale and accelerate country level actions against child labor in order to meet the ambitious 2016 target date of eliminating the worst forms of child labor worldwide. Policy priorities identified in the Roadmap included adopting and enforcing legislation on child labor, developing and implementing national action plans, providing adequate resources to achieve policy goals, and supporting decent and productive work for adults and youth of working age. In addition, the Roadmap underscored the importance of improved child labor statistics and knowledge to inform policy action. In November 2010 the ILO's Governing Body adopted a Global Action Plan which incorporated the Roadmap.

Among the overall group of child laborers, child domestic workers constitute an important target group for action. At least 15 million children were engaged in domestic work globally at the start of the project. The number of girls far outnumbered boys. In June 2011, the International Labor Conference adopted a Convention and Recommendation on the protection of domestic workers paving the way for a more comprehensive, better integrated and coherent approach to domestic work, including child domestic labor.

The continued presence of forced labor around the world equally remains a pressing concern. In the technical proposal, the ILO estimated the number of men, women and children in forced labor at 12.3 million globally. Modern forms of forced labor, often linked to cross-border movement of workers, increasingly penetrate global supply chains. According to ILO research, manufacturing, agriculture and mining are among those sectors in which forced labor is most prevalent. In 2009, the Governing Body adopted the ILO's third global action plan against forced labor which called inter alia for more quantitative and qualitative research on forced labor, effective enforcement of laws and policy measures against abusive labor recruitment practices in global supply chains. ILO's Conventions against Forced Labor (No. 29 and 105) enjoy almost universal ratification but their effective implementation is often hampered by gaps in laws and regulations. In recent years, forced labor, trafficking and slavery-like practices have received increased international attention, and action to eliminate these practices is beginning to show impact.

It is not by coincidence that child labor and forced labor often occur in tandem. While their mechanisms and extent differ, they share many of the same determinants and require a more consolidated policy response.

The Global Action Program on Child Labor (GAP) project aimed to build critical knowledge and capacity for accelerating progress against child labor and, where relevant, forced labor in targeted countries, with particular reference to the Roadmap and the 2016 target date for eliminating worst forms.

### The Global Action Program on Child Labor<sup>45</sup>

In September 2011, the ILO signed a three-year Cooperative Agreement with OCFT worth US \$15,000,000 to implement the Global Action Program on Child Labor Issues. The purpose of the Cooperative Agreement was to support the further elimination of child labor and forced labor through (1) improvements in legislation, enforcement, and policy coordination, and by building national capacity to implement policy initiatives to increase access to quality education and sustainable livelihoods for vulnerable populations; (2) promotion of innovative research and monitoring systems to aid with policy development and program design; and (3) support for new efforts to protect children from exploitation in domestic work. In 2012 the project received a cost extension for \$900,000, which extended the end date to September 30, 2015, and in early 2015 a no-cost extension moved the end date to March 31, 2016.

The project aimed to build critical knowledge and capacity for accelerating progress against child labor and, where relevant, forced labor in targeted countries, with particular reference to the Roadmap and the 2016 target date for eliminating worst forms. Interventions were organized around three expected outcomes:

**Outcome 1:** Improved legislation, enforcement and policy coordination on child labor and forced labor as well as national capacity to implement policy initiatives to increase access to quality education and sustainable livelihoods for vulnerable populations.

The first component involves assistance to identifying and addressing legal and regulatory gaps in the areas of child labor and forced labor, as well as to strengthening accompanying monitoring and enforcement mechanisms. It also supports national action plans on the two issues, and promotes mainstreaming of child and forced labor concerns into broader sectoral policies.

**Outcome 2:** Innovative research and monitoring systems to guide policy development and program design.

The second component seeks to improve information and statistics on child labor and forced labor in their various dimensions, and to apply this improved knowledge base in policy design. It forms part of the wider ILO strategy of using statistical information and policy analysis to guide scaled-up and accelerated action against child and forced labor.

---

<sup>45</sup> Adapted from the GAP Technical Proposal, Cooperative Agreement, Project Modifications and TPRs

### **Outcome 3: Strengthened protections to children in domestic work.**

The third component helps strengthen protections for child domestic workers, and supports a variety of awareness raising and advocacy activities in line with the relevant international legal instruments. It also supports the formulation of enabling regulatory and policy frameworks and the development of pilot intervention models for protecting child domestic workers.

The project planned to implement interventions relating to the three project components across a total of 41 countries in 5 major world regions, 31 of which were specified in the project solicitation. For Component 1, the project has operated in Azerbaijan, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Comoros, Dominican Republic, DR Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Haiti, Indonesia, Laos, Liberia, Mali, Mongolia, Namibia, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Timor Leste, and Togo. For Component 2, the project has operated in Bangladesh, Belize, Brazil, Dominican Republic, Ghana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Jordan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Philippines, South Africa, Swaziland, Togo, Turkey, Ukraine, Uganda and Zambia. For Component 3, the project has operated in Cameroon, Ecuador, Gabon, Haiti, Indonesia, Kenya, Namibia, Panama, Pakistan, Philippines, Togo and Vietnam.

The interim evaluation carried out between January and February 2014 found that the project design and strategy were relevant to increasing the capacity of the target countries to address child and forced labor issues. The evaluation report indicated that the project was on track, with some exceptions, to achieve most of its outputs. While the project had spent only 30% its budget, resources were being allocated in an efficient manner and complementarities and synergies had been generated with other ILO projects. The project had not developed a CMEP, as stated in the MPG; however, it had developed an Outcome Matrix with outcome indicators, which at the time of the interim evaluation was yet to be implemented. Management was efficient, although the project seemed understaffed, particularly at country level. Management had worked on the basis of an output-based management, which enable it to adapt activities to concrete contexts. Coordination between USDOL and ILO was to be improved. The interim evaluation found that the geographic scope of the project was too wide, making it difficult to execute and implement activities. Given relevant differences among the multiple target countries, the pace of implementation, the outputs produced and the probability of achieving the project's objectives would differ greatly from country to country. Sustainability of the various outputs and outcomes at country level was difficult to establish and often uncertain. In some countries, the viability of project activities and/or results had been affected by changes in the social, security or political context.

## II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION

OCFT-funded projects are subject to external independent interim and final evaluations. An external independent interim evaluation was conducted in April 2014 and the external independent final evaluation is due in late 2015.

### External Final Evaluation Purpose and Scope

The scope of the external independent final evaluation includes a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL Cooperative Agreement with ILO. All activities that have been implemented from project launch through time of evaluation fieldwork should be considered. The evaluation should assess the achievements of the project toward reaching its targets and objectives as outlined in the cooperative agreement and project document.

The evaluation should address issues of *project design, implementation progress, management, efficiency, lessons learned* and *sustainability*, and provide recommendations for current and future projects. Relevant questions, as determined by USDOL and the project, are listed below. The Co-Evaluators may also identify further points of importance during the mission that should be included in the analysis as appropriate.

The overall purpose of the final evaluation is to:

1. Assess the benefits and challenges of the project's multi-component and multi-country structure and whether this was a successful model;
2. Determine whether the project has achieved its expected outputs and outcomes<sup>46</sup> and identify the challenges encountered in doing so;
3. Assess the sustainability of project activities;
4. Identify next steps to advance the project's objectives and outcomes; and
5. Identify good practices that should be considered for replication in the future.

### Intended Users

The intended users are OCFT, ILO and its constituents, as well as other stakeholders working to combat child labor more broadly. The evaluation will provide an assessment of the project's experience in implementation and its effects on the child labor climate. The evaluation findings,

---

<sup>46</sup> Those outcomes are listed above on page 5, and again are: **Outcome 1:** Improved legislation, enforcement and policy coordination on child labor and forced labor as well as national capacity to implement policy initiatives to increase access to quality education and sustainable livelihoods for vulnerable populations. **Outcome 2:** Innovative research and monitoring systems to guide policy development and program design. **Outcome 3:** Strengthened protections to children in domestic work

conclusions and recommendations will serve to inform any project adjustments that may need to be made in order to maximize effectiveness and sustainability during phase-out, and to inform stakeholders in the design and implementation of future global technical assistance or capacity building projects.

The evaluation report will be published on the USDOL website, so the report should be written as a standalone document, providing the necessary background for readers who are unfamiliar with the details of the project.

### Evaluation Questions

Specific questions that the evaluation should seek to answer are found below. Evaluators may add, remove, or shift evaluation questions, but the final list will be subject to approval by USDOL.

#### Relevance and Project Design

1. What were the different strategies/approaches to increase the capacity of target countries to address child labor and forced labor issues? Which capacity-building strategies/approaches worked well or not so well, and why or why not?
2. What factors contributed to, or hindered, the creation of an “enabling environment” for GAP 11? To what degree did external factors influence the achievement of outcomes? To what extent did GAP 11 adapt its work in a timely and continuous manner in response to the changing social, political and economic environment?
3. What are the various benefits and challenges of the large scale and complex nature (multi-component and multi-country) of the project? Does this model permit an efficient use of available resources?
4. Was the approach of combining child labor and forced labor relevant and effective to addressing each?
5. How were the outcome (GPRA) targets set? What lessons can be learned from the project’s experience in this regard?

#### Effectiveness and Implementation

6. Has the project completed all planned outputs? Has it achieved its three outcomes as described on page 5? Why or why not?
  - a. How effective were the interventions at mainstreaming CL and FL into legislation, policies and development plans?
  - b. Has the project’s research component achieved its objectives?
  - c. To what extent has the project strengthened protections to children in domestic work?



7. To what extent did national stakeholders participate in the project's design and implementation? Do local stakeholders regard the project as their own and are they committed to advancing the project's objectives and outcomes? What lessons can be learned from cases in which project activities had to be canceled, for example, in Malaysia and Indonesia, as well as Bangladesh?
8. How did the project coordinate country activities with other ILO initiatives, such as the Decent Work Country Programs?
9. What value has ILO/IPEC/ILO Forced Labor specialists/UCW added? What was the extent of collaboration among these units, in particular between IPEC and ILO Forced Labor Specialists?

### Sustainability

10. Which project activities or aspects of these activities will likely to be sustainable? For example, what is the likelihood that:
  - a. Legal and regulatory frameworks against child labor and forced labor will continue to be strengthened, including National Action Plans?
  - b. Enforcement mechanisms will continue to be strengthened? Are there sufficient resources and political will to enforce improved legislation?
  - c. Pilot schemes on child labor and forced labor will be mainstreamed into development policies?
  - d. National child labor surveys will continue to be conducted at regular intervals?
  - e. Lessons learned from child labor modules to impact evaluations will be implemented?
  - f. Policy recommendations from country situational analyses and policy appraisals will be adopted?
  - g. Thematic studies will inform policy and programs on child labor and forced labor?
  - h. Universities and non-profit research organizations will continue to conduct research on child labor?
  - i. Legal frameworks and social services for child domestic workers will be strengthened?
  - j. Protective policies for child domestic workers will be adopted and implemented?
11. What good practices can be identified in the project for possible replication?
12. What would be the next steps to advance the project's objectives and outcomes?

### III. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME

#### A. Approach and Evaluation Methods

Technical assistance/capacity building projects aim to produce relevant indirect effects on specific issues through the action of third parties. Project outcomes acquire an utmost importance in this kind of project because the effectiveness of project interventions is to be measured by medium term outcomes at the institutional and enabling environment levels. Additionally, institutional responsibilities and means may vary substantially in each project target country. The evaluation methodology will take into account these factors, as well as the fact that it will only be able to collect information on the ground for three target countries over a total of 46 target ones. The latter will be compensated through the use of on line questionnaires to be filled in by local staff in the other countries and by face-to-face interviews of ILO staff and review of project databases and documentation. Likewise, in order to adequately address the varied cultural and linguistic differences in the target countries to be visited, SFS has engaged two Co-Evaluators, who have are both English and French speakers, and with work experience in the countries to be visited.

The evaluation team will meet Project Management Team members at Geneva, as well as ILO staff and other relevant stakeholders working in Cameroon, Haiti and Philippines. Staff and key stakeholders in the other 43 countries not visited during the evaluation will fill in an online questionnaire about the main features, successes and challenges of the project.

The Co-Evaluators will collect diverse information using a varied set of (mainly) qualitative and quantitative methods, including but not limited to:

Method	Tools / Target Groups / Products
<b>Interviews with key Informants</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Various questionnaires/interview forms to be used with Geneva project management team, local ILO in-country staff, and representatives of relevant stakeholders in each country.</li> <li>-Visits to communities and institutions, as relevant, to interview key stakeholders. assess their perception and satisfaction with project implementation, contrast the validity of project strategies used in the field, appraise the quality of services (technical assistance, training) delivered by the project, and identify unexpected effects of project activities as well as other relevant features of project implementation.</li> </ul>
<b>Document review and extensive discussions with in-country project staff and key stakeholders</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Review project's investments in capacity building: Training materials and curricula of the courses produced for various target groups.</li> <li>-Review project contributions to local legal frameworks where relevant</li> <li>-Review project strategies to promote ownership and implementation of NAP by national institutions</li> <li>-Review legal/ policy documents and draft regulations on CL developed with project support in target countries</li> </ul>
<b>Project performance Analysis</b>	Review initial situational assessments per country, where available. Compare planned/actual achievements per output/ country, identify factors that favor or hamper project success in each case.

Method	Tools / Target Groups / Products
<b>Review results of project's investments in capacity building at selected target countries</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Analyze project effect on the capacity of countries' Labor Inspectorates to carry out labor inspection, where relevant</li> <li>-Assess project contribution to research capacity on CL in target countries</li> <li>-Assess results of formulating a National Action Plan (NAP) in Cameroon</li> </ul>
<b>Review relevance and quality of project research at selected target countries</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Analyze the project's contribution to the knowledge base on child labor where relevant</li> <li>-Review the quality, dissemination and ulterior use of project-supported assessments on Child Domestic Work (Cameroon, Haiti, Philippines), policy appraisals on CL (Philippines) and introduction of child labor modules/ analysis into impact assessment (Philippines)</li> </ul>
<b>On-line questionnaire to countries not visited by the Co-Evaluators</b>	For the elaboration of the questionnaire, the Co-Evaluators will take into account, as relevant, the issues/ questions recommended in the interim evaluation, among other (cf. Midterm evaluation recommendations, V).
<b>Budget analysis matrix</b>	Review project expenditures (planned/actual) per component under most recent budget revision.

The following principles will be applied during the evaluation process:

1. Methods of data collection and stakeholder perspectives will be triangulated for as many as possible of the evaluation questions.
2. Gender and cultural sensitivity will be integrated in the evaluation approach.
3. Consultations will incorporate a degree of flexibility to maintain a sense of ownership of the stakeholders, allowing additional questions to be posed that are not included in the TOR, whilst ensuring that key information requirements are met.
4. As far as possible, a consistent approach will be followed in each project site, with adjustments made for the different actors involved, activities conducted, and the progress of implementation in each locality.

### B. Final Evaluation Team

The evaluation will be conducted by Co-Evaluators. Ms. Sandra Wark will serve as Lead Evaluator and Mr. Peter Matz will be Co-Evaluator.

The Co-Evaluators will be responsible for developing the methodology in consultation with Sistemas, Familias y Sociedad (SFS), USDOL, and the project staff; directly conducting interviews and facilitating other data collection processes; analyzing the evaluation material gathered; and preparing the evaluation report. The Co-Evaluators will decide on the composition of field visit interviews in order to ensure the objectivity of the evaluation and will develop and implement an evaluation methodology that will answer the evaluation questions. The Co-Evaluators will also develop a proposed agenda for field visit interviews in coordination with the Grantee.

Local interpreters in *Bantu* (Cameroon), *Creole* (Haiti) and *Tagalog* (Philippines) will be selected as needed in consultation with the grantee. The responsibility of the interpreter in each provincial locality is to ensure that the evaluation team is understood by the stakeholders as far as possible, and that the information gathered is relayed accurately to the evaluator.

### C. Sampling and Data Collection Methodology

#### **Criteria for selecting interventions to be sampled to assess final outcomes:**

The evaluators will visit three countries from among the 46 countries where the project intervenes. They will assess outcomes related to all three project components by evaluating project interventions in these countries as summarized below:

**Philippines:** Component 1- Capacity building to strengthen monitoring and enforcement; Component 2- Impact Evaluation grant on Conditional Cash Transfer; Component 3- Rapid situation analysis, proposal for addressing gaps in social services for domestic workers, technical support to develop a protective policy framework for child domestic workers.

**Cameroon:** Component 1- National Action Plan (NAP) development, National Action Plan institutions capacity building; Component 3- Rapid situation analysis on child domestic labor, proposal for addressing gaps in social services for domestic workers, technical support to develop a protective policy framework.

**Haiti:** Component 1- Improved legal and regulatory framework to prevent child labor and forced labor; Component 3- Rapid situation analysis on child domestic labor, proposal for addressing gaps in social services for domestic workers, technical support to develop protective policy framework for child domestic workers.

To assess outcomes of project interventions in countries not visited, the evaluation team will use online questionnaires directed to ILO staff involved in implementation, implementing partners (where applicable) and national stakeholders/capacity building activity beneficiaries (e.g. Ministries of Labor, Statistics, National research organizations, Employers and Workers Organizations). The evaluation team will send a questionnaire to assess outcomes to all relevant stakeholders in all target countries in which project interventions took place and are well advanced or completed. The evaluators will rely on contact information provided by ILO/IPEC. While, the evaluation team will follow-up on its requests for feedback, it will have little control over the response rate, which is one reason it will begin with a large sampling of stakeholders.

#### **Criteria for selecting sample to assess research quality:**

Component 2 of the project planned to produce a large number of research products including national or sub-sector child labor survey reports (9), reports from child labor modules within existing impact evaluations (6), country-level situational analyses and policy appraisals (6), thematic study reports (5), and grant-supported studies related to building capacity of national research organizations (7). Because of the large volume of research and evaluation time

constraints, the evaluation team will select a sample of these reports for quality assessment using the following criteria:

- At least 2 reports from each of the 5 categories listed above;
- Report should be finalized and validated;

Geographic representation (sampling will include reports from research activities in Africa, Asia and the Americas)

### **Verification of completion of program services or technical assistance activities (outputs):**

The evaluation team will verify completion of program services or technical assistance activities comprehensively. This means it will establish a comprehensive list of planned outputs under each component and sub-component and will request evidence of completion from ILO/IPEC. The team will summarize its findings in an annex, recording completed outputs as well as the status of incomplete outputs.

## **D. Data Collection Milestones**

### **1. Document Review**

- Pre-field visit preparation includes extensive review of relevant documents
- During fieldwork, documentation will be verified and additional documents may be collected
- If available, documents may include:
  - CMEP documents,
  - Project document and modifications,
  - Cooperative Agreement,
  - Project Monitoring Plans,
  - Work plans or Plans of Action of implementing agencies,
  - Technical Progress Reports and other status or trip reports,
  - Correspondence related to Technical Progress Reports,
  - Country or situational assessments,
  - National Action Plans, country regulations and local legal frameworks, where relevant;
  - Other legal/policy documents and draft regulations on CL developed with project support in target countries,
  - Research reports produced by the project,
  - Interim Evaluation,
  - Management Procedures and Guidelines,
  - Training materials and curricula, as appropriate,
  - Research or other reports undertaken by the project or relevant to its aims, and
  - Project files and strategies, as appropriate.

## 2. Question Matrix and List of Stakeholders

Before beginning fieldwork, the Co-Evaluators will work with SFS, USDOL and ILO to create a list of stakeholders to interview and a question matrix, which outlines the source of data from where they plan to collect information for each TOR question. This will help the Co-Evaluators to make decisions as to how they are going to allocate time in the field. It will also help the Co-Evaluators to ensure that they are exploring all possible avenues for data triangulation and to clearly note where their evaluation findings are coming from. The question matrix and list of stakeholders shall be forwarded by Co-Evaluators to SFS before start of field work and shared with USDOL.

## 3. Interviews with Stakeholders

Informational interviews will be held with as many project stakeholders as possible. The Co-Evaluators will meet with the Geneva project management team as well as ILO staff and other stakeholders working in Cameroon, Haiti and Philippines. They will also visit communities and institutions, as relevant, to interview key stakeholders; assess their perception and satisfaction with project implementation; contrast the validity of project strategies used in the field; appraise the quality of services (technical assistance, training) delivered by the project; and identify unexpected effects of project activities as well as other relevant features of project implementation. Depending on the circumstances, these meetings will be one-on-one or group interviews.

## 4. Online Questionnaire

Staff and key stakeholders in the other 43 countries not visited during the evaluation will fill in an online questionnaire about the main features, successes and challenges of the project. Given the country-scattered nature of this project, this will necessitate systematization and integration on the part of the Co-Evaluators. The design of the questionnaire will take into account, as relevant, the issues/questions recommended in the interim evaluation as well as the specific questions listed in this TOR for the final evaluation.

## E. Ethical Considerations and Confidentiality

The evaluation mission will observe utmost confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. To mitigate bias during the data collection process and ensure a maximum freedom of expression of the implementing partners, stakeholders and communities, only the respondents will be present during interviews. However, implementing partner staff may accompany the Co-Evaluators to make introductions whenever necessary, to facilitate the evaluation process and to allow the Co-Evaluators to observe the interaction between the implementing partner staff and the interviewees.

## F. Stakeholders' Workshop

Following the field visits, the Lead Evaluator will conduct a debriefing in Geneva for the project and ILO-FPRW. The participants at this de-briefing would be concerned ILO/FPRW management, GAP 11 project, and external evaluators. The meeting will be used to present the major preliminary

findings and emerging issues, solicit recommendations, and obtain clarification or additional information as needed. If possible, USDOL will attend by video or phone teleconference.

It is expected that the de-briefing meeting will take place on November 24, 2015. A debrief call will be held with the Co-Evaluators and USDOL after the de-briefing in Geneva to provide USDOL with preliminary findings and solicit feedback as needed.

### G. Limitations

The Co-Evaluators will only be able to visit 3 out of the 46 countries included in this project. Online questionnaires will be used for countries that are not visited during the evaluation. As a result, the information collected from most of the countries will not contain the same level of depth as the three countries visited. Additionally, the quality of information gathered by the online questionnaires will be determined by the responses received and the Co-Evaluators may not have the ability to ask follow-up questions.

Findings for the evaluation will be based on information collected from background documents and in interviews with stakeholders and project staff. The accuracy of the evaluation findings will be determined by the integrity of information provided to the Co-Evaluators from these sources.

Furthermore, the ability of the evaluator to determine efficiency will be limited by the amount of financial data available. A cost-efficiency analysis is not included because it would require impact data which is not available.

### H. Timetable

The tentative timetable is as follows. Actual dates may be adjusted as needs arise.

<b>Task</b>	<b>2015 Date(s)</b>
Draft TOR submitted to USDOL	Mon, Aug 17
Draft General Itinerary sent to ILO	Wed, Aug 19
List of Stakeholders received from ILO and sent to Evaluators	Wed, Aug 19
Evaluation Questions and feedback on Draft TOR received from USDOL and sent to Evaluators	Mon, Aug 24
Input received from ILO on Draft General Itinerary and sent to Evaluators	Wed, Aug 26
Evaluators submit Methodology/Sampling Plan to SFS for TOR	Tues, Sept 8
ILO provides Evaluation Questions and feedback on selected List of Stakeholders/ Interviewees <sup>47</sup>	Mon, Sept 14
TOR Finalized	Fri, Sept 25
TOR sent to ILO	Mon, Sept 28
Cable Clearance Request sent to USDOL	Mon, Sept 28

<sup>47</sup> GAP Component 2 (Research) to send its input later, by September 28

<b>Task</b>	<b>2015 Date(s)</b>
Evaluators submit Question Matrix and Detailed Itinerary	Wed, Sept 30
DOL and ILO provide feedback on Matrix and Detailed Itinerary	Fri, Oct 2
Logistics Call	Fri, Oct 2
Contracts signed by Evaluators	Mon, Oct 5
Finalized Field Itinerary and Stakeholder List	Wed, Oct 7
Evaluators interview USDOL	Thurs, Oct 7
Evaluation Team: Fieldwork in Geneva (Data collection in Rome: Oct 15-16; data collection in Geneva: Oct 19-21; evaluators' planning meeting: Oct. 22)	Oct 14-22
Lead Evaluator: Fieldwork in Cameroon	Nov 1-7
Co-Evaluator: Fieldwork in Philippines	Nov 1-7
Lead Evaluator: Fieldwork in Haiti	Nov 15-21
Window for receiving responses to online questionnaires from relevant countries	Oct 29 – Nov 9
Stakeholders' Workshop in Geneva	Nov 24
Post-fieldwork Debrief Call with USDOL	Wed, Dec 2
Draft Report sent to SFS for quality review	Mon, Dec 14
Draft Report to USDOL and ILO for 48 hour review	Fri, Dec 18
Draft Report sent to USDOL, ILO and stakeholders for comments	Tues, Dec 22
Comments due to SFS	Fri, Jan 15
Revised Report sent by Evaluators to SFS for quality review	Thurs, Jan 21
Revised Report sent to USDOL	Mon, Jan 25
Approval from USDOL to Copy Edit/Format Report	Mon, Feb 1
Final Report sent to USDOL	Mon, Feb 15

## IV. EXPECTED OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES

Ten working days following the evaluator's return from fieldwork, a first draft evaluation report will be submitted to SFS. The report should have the following structure and content:

- I. Table of Contents
- II. List of Acronyms
- III. Executive Summary - Providing a brief overview of the evaluation, including sections IV-IX
- IV. Project Description
- V. Evaluation Objectives, Methodology and Table listing evaluation questions and corresponding report findings sections
- VI. Findings - Answers to each of the evaluation questions, with supporting evidence included and organized into sub-sections as evaluators see fit
- VII. Lessons Learned and Good Practices



- VIII. Main Conclusions - Primary takeaways and main conclusions of the evaluation
- IX. Recommendations
- Key Recommendations – critical for successfully meeting project objectives and judgments on what changes need to be made for future programming
  - Other Recommendations – as needed
- X. Annexes, including but not limited to:
- An overview of project progress (see template in Annex 1 below)
  - TOR
  - Question Matrix
  - List of documents reviewed
  - List of interviews, meetings and site visits
  - Stakeholder workshop agenda and participants

The total length of the report should be approximately between **30 - 45 pages** for the main report, excluding the executive summary and annexes.

The first draft of the report will be circulated to OCFT and ILO for a 48 hour review. This initial review serves to identify and correct potentially sensitive information and/or inaccuracies before the report is released for formal, detailed comments. Then the draft report will be officially submitted to OCFT, ILO, and key stakeholders individually for a full two week review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated and incorporated into the final report as appropriate, and the Co-Evaluators will provide a response to OCFT, in the form of a comment matrix, as to why any comments might not have been incorporated.

While the substantive content of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report shall be determined by the Co-Evaluators, the report is subject to final approval by ILAB/OCFT in terms of whether or not the report meets the conditions of the TOR. **All reports, including drafts, will be written in English.**

## V. EVALUATION MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT

SFS has contracted with Ms. Sandra Wark and Mr. Peter Matz to conduct this evaluation. Sandy and Peter will work with OCFT, SFS and relevant ILO staff to evaluate this project.

- Ms. Sandra Wark will serve as Lead Evaluator. She is an American evaluator with work experience in Haiti, Philippines and several other countries, who has carried out evaluations for both USDOL and the ILO. Mrs. Wark has evaluated child labor projects in Cambodia, Madagascar

and Thailand and Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work projects in Morocco and Sri Lanka. Mrs. Wark has relevant additional experience in the design of CMEPs for projects USDOL-funded CL projects in Morocco and Liberia. Ms. Wark is based in Casablanca (Morocco) and is fluent in English and French.

- Mr. Peter Matz will serve as Co-Evaluator. He is a German evaluator with relevant experience in the Philippines and regarding child labor projects and who has extensive experience in research, capacity building, management and M&E. Mr. Matz has carried out assignments for various international agencies in more than 30 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. He is based in Frankfurt, Germany and speaks English and French.

SFS will provide logistical and administrative support to the Co-Evaluators, including travel arrangements (e.g. plane and hotel reservations, purchasing plane tickets, providing *per diem*) and all materials needed. SFS will also be responsible for providing the management and technical oversight necessary, including quality reviews of all deliverables, to ensure completion of the evaluation milestones and adherence to technical standards as well as the clarity and comprehensiveness of the evaluation report.

## ANNEX 3: Evaluation Data Collection Matrix

FINAL EVALUATION FOR GAP				
Evaluation Question	Methodology	Data Source(s)/ Means of Verification	Stakeholders to Interview	Relevant Desk Review Documents
<b>Relevance and project design</b>				
<p>1. What were the different strategies/approaches to increase the capacity of target countries to address child labor and forced labor issues? Which capacity-building strategies/approaches worked well or not so well, and why or why not?</p>	<p>- Review technical progress reports (TPR), other activity reports and products, and ask ILO program managers in order to identify project's main strategies and approaches to capacity building (e.g. short term training, technical assistance from national and international experts, or learning by doing approaches).</p> <p>- Assess how project contributed to integrating CL and FL topics into relevant national training programs (USDOL GPRA reporting indicates training programs were to be institutionalized by FY 2015 in Ecuador, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, East Timor, Togo based on ILO targets)</p> <p>- Assess how project contributed to target country capacity to carry out data collection and research on CL/FL (USDOL GPRA reporting indicates research was to be institutionalized by FY 2015 in Bangladesh, Belize, Brazil, Dominican Republic, Ghana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Lebanon, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, Paraguay, Philippines, South Africa, Swaziland, Togo, Turkey,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Review of project databases and documentation</li> <li>• Interviews with donor, ILO program manager and national stakeholders in countries visited by evaluation team and through questionnaire in countries not visited.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three main ILO component managers + forced labor specialist/project lead (Leanne Melanyk, Sophie de Coninck)</li> <li>• In field visit and non-field visit countries: national counterparts in capacity building activities such as labor inspectors, Ministry of Labor officials, Ministry of statistics officials, research institution personnel.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Reports on capacity building activities, including training workshops, e learning courses, and stakeholder meetings.</li> </ul>

	Ukraine, Uganda, Zambia based on ILO targets)  One are to focus on will be capacity building work with national universities.			
2. What factors contributed to, or hindered, the creation of an “enabling environment” for GAP 11? To what degree did external factors influence the achievement of outcomes? To what extent did GAP 11 adapt its work in a timely and continuous manner in response to the changing social, political and economic environment?	<p>-Ask relevant ILO program managers and stakeholders to identify contextual factors that contributed to successful interventions in GAP 11 countries.</p> <p>-Assess how factors such as the existence or not of previous ILO CL/FL projects or other ongoing ILO projects/staff presence affected project implementation.</p> <p>- Assess how current or recent interventions by other relevant child protection agencies (e.g. UNICEF) affected project implementation.</p> <p>-Assess how political, economic, social and/or war and natural disaster related factors affected project implementation in target countries.</p> <p>-Identify decisions/actions taken by project to manage/capitalize on unforeseen opportunities and barriers linked to target country implementation environment.</p> <p>-Identify and evaluate reasons for delays and strategies used to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPRs</li> <li>• Review of project databases and documentation</li> <li>• Interviews with donor, ILO program manager and national stakeholders in countries visited by evaluation team and through questionnaire in countries not visited.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three main ILO component managers</li> <li>• National stakeholders in Cameroon, Haiti, and the Philippines (includes ILO project staff and consultants, tripartite partners and others)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Other project intervention reports</li> </ul>

	overcome management hurdles.			
3. What are the various benefits and challenges of the large scale and complex nature (multi-component and multi-country) of the project? Does this model permit an efficient use of available resources?	<p>-Ask donor and program managers to identify benefits and challenges of GAP 11 project that relate to its scale, multiple components and multiple countries.</p> <p>-Analyze resource use efficiency by reviewing budgets and budget expenditures.</p> <p>-Assess staffing patterns, mission planning for cost-effectiveness.</p> <p>-Assess how the project leveraged other resources in target countries (ILO, national partner institutions and other donor resources) to complement/contribute to project interventions.</p> <p>-Query ILO project managers and stakeholders on how they think project efficiency could have been improved.</p> <p>-Query ILO/donor if/how small investments in GAP interventions influenced later decisions on whether or not to invest additional resources in target countries.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Budget related documentation</li> <li>• Financial reports</li> <li>• Interviews with project managers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three main ILO component managers + SAP/FL + M and E focal point</li> <li>• Donor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Component budgets</li> <li>• Financial reports</li> </ul>
4. Was the approach of combining child labor and forced labor relevant and effective to addressing each?	<p>- Identify what “combining CL and FL” meant in operational terms within the project.</p> <p>- Assess what, if any, positive synergies/benefits were created in</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with ILO program managers w/child labor specialization + ILO SAP/FL</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three main ILO component managers + FL SAP manager</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Other project intervention reports if relevant</li> </ul>

	<p>cases where the project worked on both CL and FL in the same country.</p> <p>- Assess what, if any, positive synergies/benefits were created by including CL and FL interventions under the same project umbrella from an overall project management perspective.</p> <p>- Assess what, if any, challenges were associated with working on the two issues together.</p> <p><i>Possible benefits might be: increasing scope of interventions to more than one but related set of problems, possibility of leveraging of larger set of expertise/specialists, possibility of promoting more holistic laws/policies/programs; possibility of understanding links between two problems better.</i></p> <p><i>Possible challenges might be: coordination between teams, resource allocation between teams, national counterpart sensitivity to recognition of forced labor could spill over to CL related interventions.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project reports, other documents and products from CL+FL interventions</li> </ul>		
<p>5. How were the outcome (GPRA) targets set? What lessons can be learned from the project's experience in this regard?</p>	<p>- Ask donor and ILO program managers to describe the process they used to set GPRA targets for project: How were target countries selected? How were the</p>	<p>Interviews with donor, ILO program manager and national stakeholders in countries visited by evaluation team and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three main ILO component managers + FL SAP manager</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project SGA</li> <li>• ILO Prodoc</li> <li>• CMEP</li> </ul>

	<p>interventions planned for each target country determined?</p> <p>- Within the above described process, assess if/how/by whom stakeholders' needs &amp; priorities were considered/assessed. How were other feasibility factors assessed?</p> <p>- Based on answers to the above, query relevance/effectiveness of process: Did it produce clear, realistic targets? Did having targets improve management effectiveness and efficiency (why or why not). What could have been done better? Use answers to formulate lessons learned.</p>	through questionnaire in countries not visited.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• USDOL project focal point</li> <li>• ILO M&amp;E focal point for project (Peter Wichmand)</li> <li>• Mary Read</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness and Implementation</b>				
<p>6. Has the project completed all planned outputs? Has it achieved its three outcomes as described on page 5? Why or why not?</p> <p>d. How effective were the interventions at mainstreaming CL and FL into legislation, policies and development plans?</p> <p>e. Has the project's research component achieved its objectives?</p> <p>f. To what extent has the project strengthened protections to</p>	<p>-Compare planned/actual achievements per output/ country, identify factors that favor or hamper project success in each case.</p> <p>-Interview ILO program managers to determine status of undelivered outputs including time frame for their completion (if they will be completed).</p> <p>-Compare planned/actual achievements on GPRA targets. Update table in Annex 1 with findings. Use indicator definitions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Stakeholder interviews in Cameroon, Haiti and Philippines</li> <li>• Stakeholder questionnaire responses about outcomes</li> <li>• Review of project databases and documentation:</li> <li>-Review legal/ policy documents and draft regulations on CL</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three main ILO component managers + SAP/FL</li> <li>• Interviews w/national stakeholders in Cameroon, Haiti and the Philippines</li> <li>• Main project stakeholders in countries not visited through questionnaire</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Other relevant project intervention reports and products</li> </ul>

<p>children in domestic work?</p>	<p>provided by USDOL.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Assess how project contributed to strengthening national capacity to formulate specific policies, plans, and programs to combat WFCL and FL (USDOL GPRA reporting indicates project related achievements in the following countries: Azerbaijan, Cameroon, Ecuador, Gabon, Indonesia, Kenya, Laos, Namibia, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Togo, Vietnam)</li> <li>-Review project strategies to promote institutionalization of training on child labor or forced labor issues within government agencies such as by integrating training into training institution curriculum (USDOL GPRA reporting indicates training programs institutionalized by FY 2015 in Ecuador, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, East Timor, Togo)</li> <li>- Review “Practical guide/Toolkit on child domestic workers protection” and analyze GAP 11 strategy and implementation for supporting national stakeholders to use this tool in relevant national training programs</li> <li>-Assess if/how Component 2 (research/data collection) contributed to policy design in</li> </ul>	<p>developed with project support in target countries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Review training materials and curricula of the courses produced for various target group</li> </ul>		
-----------------------------------	--	---	--	--



	<p>target countries by intervention types:</p> <p><i>a. CL Surveys-</i> Lebanon, Mozambique, Belize, Ukraine</p> <p><i>b. Sector Specific Surveys-</i>Indonesia, Malaysia, Morocco, Swaziland, Dominican Republic</p> <p><i>c. CL modules in existing impact evaluations-</i> Philippines, Thailand, Ghana, Columbia, El Salvador</p> <p><i>d. Country level-situational analysis &amp; policy appraisal reports</i> Malaysia, Philippines, Togo, Uganda, Honduras</p> <p><i>e. Thematic reports</i> youth training &amp; employment, impact of social protection, Labor recruitment patterns, CL and FL in garment industry, child domestic work (See similar question below under sustainability)</p> <p>Assess if/how project contributed to increasing protections for child domestic workers in relevant target countries (Indonesia*, Pakistan, Philippines*, Vietnam*, Cameroon*, Gabon*, Kenya*, Namibia*, Togo*, Ecuador*, Haiti, Panama*)</p> <p><i>*to be accomplished through the formulation of specific policies, plans or programs on child domestic</i></p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p><i>work by FY2015 according to GPRA targets</i></p> <p>Intervention types:</p> <p><i>Legal and social service gap analysis</i></p> <p><i>Design of Policy frameworks</i></p> <p><i>Awareness Raising</i></p> <p>-Review the quality, dissemination and ulterior use of project-supported assessments on Child Domestic Work (Cameroon, Haiti, Philippines).</p>			
<p>7. To what extent did national stakeholders participate in the project's design and implementation? Do local stakeholders regard the project as their own and are they committed to advancing the project's objectives and outcomes? What lessons can be learned from cases in which project activities had to be canceled, for example, in Malaysia and Indonesia, as well as Bangladesh?</p>	<p>-In Cameroon, Haiti and the Philippines, visits to relevant institutions to interview key stakeholders: Assess their perception and satisfaction with project implementation overall, including their involvement in its design and sense of ownership of objectives and outcomes. To what extent were they consulted before and during project implementation? How were they consulted (ie what mechanisms were used, especially in countries without an extensive ILO presence)</p> <p>-Review project strategies to promote ownership and implementation of NAP by national institutions (Laos,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Interviews with project management personnel</li> <li>• Stakeholder interviews in Cameroon, Haiti and Philippines</li> <li>• Stakeholder questionnaire responses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three main ILO component managers and other relevant Geneva/Rome personnel</li> <li>• Interviews w/national stakeholders in Cameroon, Haiti and the Philippines (tripartite partners)</li> <li>• Main project stakeholders in countries not</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project revision requests</li> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Minutes/reports from tripartite workshops and other meetings</li> </ul>

	<p>Mongolia, East Timor, Cameroon, Comoros, DRC, Ethiopia, Liberia, S. Sudan, Paraguay, and Azerbaijan). What was the process used to develop and validate NAP in various target countries?</p> <p>-Identify instances that planned activities were canceled. Review reasons that ILO and USDOL decided to cancel these activities to identify what lessons might be learned.</p>		<p>visited through questionnaire (includes ILO project staff &amp; non project staff as identified by DOL and project)</p>	
<p>8. How did the project coordinate country activities with other ILO initiatives, such as the Decent Work Country Programs?</p>	<p>-Identify and assess synergies created with other ILO initiatives in target countries:</p> <p>-Request information from ILO project managers in Geneva.</p> <p>-In Cameroon, Haiti, and Philippines triangulate information by asking same question to stakeholders.</p> <p>-In other countries, triangulate answers with information found in TPRs and/or other reports on project interventions.</p> <p>-If possible, classify target GAP 11 countries as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CL/FL activities being initiated by ILO for the first time through GAP 11</li> <li>• Existence of past CL/FL relevant activities but no other</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DWCP documentation in Cameroon, Haiti and Philippines</li> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Review of other project documentation</li> <li>• Stakeholder interviews in Cameroon, Haiti and Philippines</li> <li>• Stakeholder questionnaire responses about outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three main ILO component managers and other relevant Geneva/Rome personnel</li> <li>• Interview w/ILO Country Director and/or other relevant ILO project personnel if possible in Cameroon, Haiti and the Philippines</li> <li>• Interviews w/national stakeholders in Cameroon, Haiti</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Other relevant project intervention reports and products</li> <li>• DWCP documentation</li> </ul>

	<p>ongoing besides GAP 11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existence of other ongoing ILO supported CL/FL relevant activities in addition to GAP 11 activities</li> </ul>		<p>and the Philippines (tripartite constituents and others if relevant)</p>	
<p>9. What value has ILO/IPEC/ILO Forced Labor specialists/UCW added? What was the extent of collaboration among these units, in particular between IPEC and ILO Forced Labor Specialists?</p>	<p>- Assess what, if any, positive synergies/benefits arose from the multi-disciplinary composition of the project management team (IPEC/SAP/FL and UCW).</p> <p>Assess if/how project management capitalized on the various sources of expertise to enhance the overall effectiveness of the project?</p> <p>Are there any examples of project outputs or outcomes that were the direct result of collaboration between the FL/SAP, UCW and IPEC staff?</p> <p>What, if anything, could have been done better to improve collaboration within thematic units of the GAP team?</p> <p>How did the project design help or hinder this collaboration?</p> <p>Have recent organizational changes within the ILO had</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Interviews with project management personnel</li> <li>• Stakeholder interviews in Cameroon, Haiti and Philippines</li> <li>• Stakeholder questionnaire responses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GAP program managers</li> <li>• FL specialists (Leanne, Beate Andrees)</li> <li>• Relevant UCW personnel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Other relevant project intervention reports and products</li> </ul>

**Sustainability**

<p>10. Which project activities or aspects of these activities will likely to be sustainable? For example, what is the likelihood that:</p> <p>i. Legal and regulatory frameworks against child labor and forced labor will continue to be strengthened, including National Action Plans? How effective were the interventions at mainstreaming child labor and forced labor into legislation, policies, and development plans?</p> <p>ii. Enforcement mechanisms will continue to be strengthened? Are there sufficient resources and political will to enforce improved legislation?</p> <p>iii. Pilot schemes on child labor and forced labor will be mainstreamed into development policies? Were there any?</p> <p>iv. National child labor surveys will continue to be conducted at regular intervals?</p>	<p>-Review project strategies to promote adoption of new/improved laws and regulations on child labor/forced labor. To what extent did project supported assessments of legal and regulatory frameworks on CL/FL contribute to actual changes in laws and regulations in the 10 countries where this strategy was used?</p> <p>-Review project strategies to promote ownership and implementation of NAP. To what extent did developing a NAP contribute to mainstreaming efforts to combat CL/FL into broader education, employment, anti-poverty and social policies in the 11 countries where this strategy was implemented?</p> <p>- Review project strategies to improve enforcement mechanisms? To what extent are these strategies likely to lead to sustainable improvements in enforcement in the 11 countries where this strategy was used? Are there examples of resources being increased for enforcements activities? Review project strategies, to establish sustainable child labor monitoring system for identification and referral of child laborers and at risk children</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Stakeholder interviews in Cameroon, Haiti and Philippines</li> <li>• Stakeholder questionnaire responses about outcomes</li> <li>• Review of project databases and documentation:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Review legal/ policy documents and draft regulations on CL developed with project support in target countries</li> <li>-Completed assessments (policy, regulations, legal framework on child domestic labor, social protection for domestic workers)</li> <li>-Completed research activity products</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three main ILO component managers and other relevant Geneva/Rome personnel</li> <li>• Interviews w/national stakeholders in Cameroon, Haiti and the Philippines (tripartite constituents and others if relevant)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Minutes/reports from stakeholder meetings/ ILO expert and/or consultant trip reports</li> <li>• Press clips</li> </ul>
--	---	--	--	--

<p>v. Lessons learned from child labor modules to impact evaluations will be implemented?</p> <p>vi. Policy recommendations from country situational analyses and policy appraisals will be adopted?</p> <p>vii. Thematic studies will inform policy and programs on child labor and forced labor?</p> <p>viii. Universities and non-profit research organizations will continue to conduct research on child labor?</p> <p>ix. Legal frameworks and social services for child domestic workers will be strengthened?</p> <p>x. Protective policies for child domestic workers will be adopted and implemented?</p>	<p>(Philippines, Dominican Rep.)</p> <p>-Have any of the countries that received project support to carry out child labor surveys committed to updating data at regular intervals for example by integrating new questions into reoccurring survey mechanisms and reports? (Countries that carried out CL surveys were: Belize, Lebanon, Mozambique &amp; Ukraine)</p> <p>-How successful/relevant were project efforts to integrate CL/FL indicators into broader impact evaluations? Did the data provide useful insights into what kinds of policies contribute to reducing the prevalence of CL? (look at countries where reports are completed – Malawi, Zambia &amp; Kenya)</p> <p>-In the two countries that country level-situational analysis &amp; policy appraisal reports, assess quality of reports and extent to which recommendations have been adopted (Togo, Uganda in progress in Philippines)</p> <p>-Assess the likelihood that completed thematic studies will influence policy</p> <p>-Review project strategies to promote institutionalization of</p>			
---	---	--	--	--

	<p>child labor and forced labor research by integrating topic into national research programs (Turkey, Indonesia reported as completed)</p> <p>-Review project strategies to ensure diffusion and use of research component research by policy and law makers among others</p> <p>-Review legal framework and social service assessments in countries where these have been completed (Indonesia, Pakistan, Philippines, Vietnam, Cameroon, Gabon, Kenya, Namibia, Togo, Ecuador, Haiti, Panama)</p> <p>-The project planned to link efforts to increase protections for young domestic workers with efforts in target countries to adopt C 189. How did this work in reality? Was it a good practice?</p> <p>-Did and if so how did making child domestic labor the theme of the 2013 World Day Against Child Labor contribute to protective policies for child domestic workers?</p> <p>-Assess if/how project contributed to increasing protections for child domestic workers in relevant target countries (Indonesia*, Pakistan, Philippines*, Vietnam*,</p>			
--	---	--	--	--



	<p>Cameroon*, Gabon*, Kenya*, Namibia*, Togo*, Ecuador*, Haiti, Panama*)</p> <p><i>*to be accomplished through the formulation of specific policies, plans or programs on child domestic work by FY2015 according to GPRA targets</i></p>			
<p>11. What good practices can be identified in the project for possible replication?</p>	<p>-Identify and analyze project practices that were effective, innovative and that might be usefully replicated in other contexts.</p> <p>-To identify good practices: ask project managers and/or other stakeholders to identify what they consider to be good practices, review TPRs and other relevant project reports.</p> <p>-Describe good practice.</p> <p>-Analyze contextual and other contributing factors that led to success.</p> <p>-Identify lessons learned.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Stakeholder interviews in Cameroon, Haiti and Philippines</li> <li>• Stakeholder questionnaire responses about outcomes</li> <li>• Review of project databases and documentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three main ILO component managers + FL SAP manager</li> <li>• Donor representative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Other project reports</li> <li>• ILO Good practice compendiums</li> </ul>
<p>12. What would be the next steps to advance the project's objectives and outcomes?</p>	<p>Identify actions to be taken before project close that would contribute to meeting targets, enhance sustainability of project outcomes, and improve likelihood of replication or scaling up of project interventions in target country</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPR</li> <li>• Stakeholder interviews in Cameroon, Haiti and Philippines</li> </ul>		

	and/or other countries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Stakeholder questionnaire responses about outcomes</li><li>• Review of project databases and documentation</li></ul>		
--	-------------------------	--	--	--

## **ANNEX 4: List of Documents Reviewed**

---

Child labour and youth employment as a response to household vulnerability to shocks: Evidence from rural Ethiopia (draft)

GAP11 Technical Progress Reports

Ending Child Labour in Domestic Work and Protection Young Workers from Abusive Working Conditions, International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour, International Labour Office

Insights into Working Conditions in India's Garment Industry, Fundamentals, International Labour Office

National Child Activity Survey Belize, 2013

World Report on Child Labour 2015: Hazardous work, Chapter V: "Adolescents in hazardous jobs: Child labour among adolescents aged 15 to 17 years" International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour, International Labour Office

### **Cameroon**

Aggregated Country Outcome Sheet for Comprehensive Monitoring of GAP Project Outcomes – Cameroon

Comprendre le Travail des Enfants et l'Emploi des Jeunes, UCW, June 2012

Consultation Pour Evaluer Et Combler Les Lacunes Dans Les Services Sociaux Et Proposer Des Solutions Pertinentes Pour La Protection Des Enfants Travailleurs Domestiques

Report on Restitution Workshop of the Situational Analysis on Child Labor In Domestic Work in Cameroon

Ndo, Aristide, Analyse Situationnelle Rapide Du Travail Domestique Des Enfants Au Cameroun, December 2012

Outcome Matrix for the Global Action Program on Child Labor Issues (GAP)

Tchakoua, Jean-Marie, Examen Du Cadre Juridique Sur Le Travail Des Enfants Et Le Travail Force, Avec Un Accent Particulier Sur Le Travail Domestique Des Enfants Au Cameroun, February 2013.

Plan D'action National Pour L'elimination Des Pires Formes De Travail Des Enfants Au Cameroun (PANETEC) (2014-2016)

## **Haiti**

Termes de référence pour « une analyse de situation de l'enfance en domesticité en Haïti ».

Projet d'analyse de situation sur la thématique de l'enfance en domesticité en Haïti : Déclaration d'intention entre les intervenants

Rapport De L'examen Du Cadre Juridique National Sur Le Travail Des Enfants En Haïti, Avec Un Accent Particulier Sur Le Travail Domestique, Norah Amilcar JEAN FRANÇOIS, June 2014.

CHILD DOMESTIC WORK Conceptual framework (Haiti) Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Branch (FPRW), International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)

Child Domestic Workers in Haiti 2014: Analytical Report, FAFO

## **Philippines**

ILO-IPEC. "Adopting a roadmap to eliminate child labour in domestic work in the Philippines." Workshop Report. January 2015

Nina Patricia Sison-Arroyo: "A Legal Review of National Laws And Regulations Related to Child Labour and Forced Labour in the Philippines". February 2013.

Clarita R. Carlos: "Rapid Situational Analysis on Child Domestic Work including a proposal assessing and addressing gaps in social services and proposing relevant solutions for child domestic workers protection in the Philippines." February 2014.

UCW, Child labor responses to a partial schooling subsidy: Experimental results from Conditional Cash Transfer Programs in the Philippines and Mexico (draft, June 2015)

UCW, Understanding children's work and youth employment outcomes in the Philippines

## **ANNEX 5: List of Interviews, Meetings and Site Visits**

---

### **GAP11 Project Staff, ILO (Geneva)**

Bijoy RAYCHAUDHURI (Chief Technical Advisor)

Bharati PFLUG (Component 1)

José María RAMÍREZ (Component 3)

Sophie DE CONNICK (Component 1)

Leanne MELNYK (Components 1 and 2)

### **GAP11 Project Staff, UCW (Rome)**

Furio ROSATI (Component 2)

Lorenzo GUARCELLO (Component 2)

Scott LYON (Component 2)

Gabriella BREGLIA (Component 2)

### **Other ILO Staff (Geneva)**

Beate ANDREES (Director, FUNDAMENTALS)

Azfar KHAN

Mary READ

Peter WICHMAND

Caroline O'REILLY

Michaëlle DE COCK

Michail KANDARAKIS

Federico BLANCO

Alex SOHO

Laurence DUBOIS

### **ILO Consultants**

Birgitte POULSEN (via telephone)

Sivananthiram ALAGANDRAM

## **Cameroon**

Benoit GUIGUET, ILO Normes Specialist, Decent Work Support Team for Central Africa

Sylvie CHRISTEL MBOG, Organisme de Développement, d'Etudes et de Conseil (ODECO)

Séraphin MVEING, Division Chief, Division for Social Affairs Planning, Ministry for the Economy, Planning and Territorial Improvement (MINEPAT)

Victoire DJELAKOUN KAMGAING, Demographer, MINEPAT

Aristide NDO, Consultant (NAP and Studies on Domestic Child Labor)

Dr. Joseph DIEUBOUE, Consultant (Update of Hazardous List)

Scholastique NGONO, General Secretary of the Ministry of Labor and Social Security (MINTSS)

Abdul KADRI, Division Chief, Division of Norms and International Cooperation, MINTSS

Joseph AWONO ENGOLO, Technical Cooperation Unit, MINTSS

Julienne ANDJONGO, Technical Cooperation Unit, MINTSS

Claire NGO NGUINDJEL, Technical Cooperation Unit, MINTSS

The Honorable Bouba DJAKAOU, Senator

Dr Njingti NFOR, Serve the Orphans Foundation

Issac BISSALA, Cameroon Workers' Union

Xavier ZINGUI MESSOMO, Association Enfants Jeunes et Avenir

Isabelle MAKASSO, Association Enfants Jeunes et Avenir

The Honorable M. ZONDOL, Senator

Mihaela Biliovschi SMITH, U.S. Embassy

T. REPEDE, U.S. Embassy

M. EYOUM, Director of the Occupational Safety and Health Division, MINTSS

Christine BEJEDI, former administrative and financial assistant, ILO/IPEC

## **Haiti**

Sylvie DUPUIS, Chief Technical Advisor, IPEC Youth Employment Project

Jefferson BELIZAIRE, Communications Officer, ILO Haiti

Julien MAGNAT, ILO Coordinator for Haiti

Judge Nora JEAN FRANCOIS, Consultant

Mr. Renan HÉDOUVILLE, Director of Labor, Ministry of Social Affairs and Labor

Ms. Marguise FERTUSTE, Unit for Women and Children's Affairs, Labor Division, Ministry of Social Affairs and Labor

Gina GEORGES, Trade Union representative

Maite MOIZE, former director of the Unit for Women and Children's Affairs, Labor Division, Ministry of Social Affairs and Labor and member of the NSC

Jean METENIER, Assistant Coordinator, UNICEF Haiti

Ina, Child Protection Officer, UNICEF Haiti

Mariam YAZDANI, VivoRio

Flore ROSSI, UNICEF consultant

Roosevelt JEAN-LOUIS, Institute for Social Welfare and Research

## **Philippines**

### **Individual interviews**

Simon HILLS, OIC, ILO Manila

Cesar Giovanni SOLEDAD, National Project Officer, ILO Manila

Ahmma Charisma LOBRIN-SATUMBA, Director IV, Bureau of Workers with Special Concerns, Department of Labor and Employment

Maribeth E. CASIN, Chief Labor and Employment Officer, Bureau of Workers with Special Concerns, Department of Labor and Employment

Blanca ORTIZ, Statistician III, Philippines Statistics Authority

Aleksandra POSARAC, Program Leader, The World Bank Group

Julius H. CAINGLET, Assistant Vice President, Association of Free Workers / Chair, Knowledge Management Sub-Committee of the National Child Labor Committee (via Skype)

Gabriella BREGLIA, Understanding Children's Work (UCW) Programme, Rome (via Skype)

**Focus Group Interview on the list of hazardous forms of child labor (Component 1.1.)**

Maribeth E. CASIN, Chief Labor and Employment Officer, Department of Labor and Employment, Bureau of Workers with Special Concerns

Brendalyn PEJI, OIC Workers' Welfare Division, Institute for Labor Studies, Department of Labor and Employment

Ray SURIANO, Media Specialist, Occupational Safety and Health Center, Department of Labor and Employment

**Focus Group Interview on SBM Quick Action Teams (Lucena, Quezon Province) (Component 1.2.)**

Edwin RAMIREZ, Provincial Director, Department of Labor and Employment, Quezon Province

Representative of Department of Social Welfare, Quezon Province

Representative of Department of Education, Quezon Province

Representative of Philippines National Police, Quezon Province

**Focus Group Interview on child labor in domestic work (Component 3)**

Maribeth E. CASIN, Chief Labor and Employment Officer, Department of Labor and Employment, Bureau of Workers with Special Concerns

Brendalyn PEJI, OIC Workers' Welfare Division, Institute for Labor Studies, Department of Labor and Employment

Myra DONCILA, Technical Assistant, ALU-TUCP

Roland PACIS, Trustee, Visayan Forum

Olivia LUCAS, President, Unang Hakbang Foundation



## ANNEX 6: Report of GAP11 Field Visit to Cameroon

---

GAP11 Independent Final Evaluation  
Report on evaluation mission to Cameroon  
Undertaken by Sandy Wark  
October 31-November 6, 2015

### 1.) Overview of Evaluation Mission

This report documents the main findings and conclusions of the evaluation mission to Cameroon carried by Sandy Wark, an external independent evaluator in the context of the final evaluation of the 2011 Global Action Program on Child Labor (GAP11). The mission took place in Yaoundé from November 1-6, 2015.

The ILO implemented activities under two components of the GAP11 project in Cameroon:

Component 1: Capacity Building and Strategic Policy Approach and Component 3: Protection of child domestic workers. The purpose of the mission was to meet with project stakeholders and assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of project accomplishments to date as well as what remains to be done.

### 2.) Overall Achievements and Sustainability

*Finding 1: Work done in Cameroon under GAP11 contributed meaningfully to building national capacity to combat child labor but is unlikely to have a significant and lasting impact on national policy and programs in the absence of follow-up actions from the ILO and/or other international technical support and funding organizations.*

Several national stakeholders said that earlier ILO/IPEC projects ended too early/abruptly before actions to combat child labor were adequately taken on by the Government or other sources of funding/capacity building were identified. Many saw GAP11 work on the National Action Plan (NAP) and the specific work done on child labor in domestic work as a way to redress the problem by focusing the attention of relevant stakeholders on the issues, deciding what needs to be done and by whom and agreeing on priority actions. GAP11 interventions succeeded in this respect – the NAP provides a relevant roadmap for national stakeholders.

The ILO has planned follow-up support for the NAP in its Decent Work Country Program 2014-2017 including actions to support the validation, diffusion and monitoring of the NAP and support for work on the Family Code and Child Protection Code<sup>48</sup>. The government reports that it will

---

<sup>48</sup> Work on this code will address among other issues the absence of laws prohibiting the use of children in some illicit activities.

conduct a public awareness raising campaign on child labor next year, for which the ILO and/or GAP11 may offer support. However, if all ILO actions were to end now, it is very unlikely that the NAP will be substantially implemented. The NAP has not yet been officially validated and additional resources for implementing proposed actions such as capacity building for relevant stakeholders at the regional level or government subsidies for NGO and other targeted social programs are unlikely to be allocated without its validation and continued advocacy from the ILO.

In order to provide a measure of sustainability for past ILO/IPEC child labor projects in Cameroon, additional support should be provided for NAP implementation. Such technical support should not be limited to national level “policy and legal framework” interventions, like updating the Hazardous List or reforms of laws that may not in any case be implemented any time in the near term. Support should also be given to ensure that some aspects of the Plan that may realistically affect children’s lives within a reasonable time frame are also implemented. Such actions may include planned awareness raising activities, training for service providers at the regional and local levels, and concrete efforts to improve access by marginalized populations to social protection and/or appropriate education and training.

Measures that should be implemented by GAP11 before project close include: (1) continued lobbying for formal government validation and resource allocation for the NAP, (2) technical support for the implementation of some proposed measures including the planned awareness raising campaign. Follow-up measures to GAP11 may include (1) continued efforts to promote convergence on the issue by other organizations concerned with child welfare such as UNICEF and international NGOs such as Plan International, CRS or Save the Children; (2) support for efforts to mainstream child labor into regional (for example, the far North) and sector (Agriculture, Education) policies and action plans; and (3) assistance to help relevant local organizations to mobilize resources and implement service-oriented pieces of the NAP.

*Finding 2: Projected outcomes of project interventions were partially achieved in Cameroon. Full achievement of planned outcomes was hindered by factors related to the enabling environment (see finding 4) – essentially the project is only partially able to affect (1) the speed at which formal government approval of the NAP is given, (2) the allocation of public resources to planned actions and (3) their implementation.*

There are two ways to measure project success producing the expected outcomes for the country (1) did the country meet the GPRA targets set by ILO? and (2) did they contribute to changes in the enabling environment for combating child labor in Cameroon in expected ways?

#### *GPRA Targets*

To date, the NAP has not yet been formally validated by the government which is the main reason why the GPRA target set by the ILO “The formulation and adoption of specific policies, plans and programs to combat WFCL, child labor and forced labor” was not achieved in FY2015; however, many stakeholders involved in the development process regard the Plan as validated in as much as it was completed and approved by a tripartite assembly in which three Ministers took part.

GAP11 may contribute to the achievement of a GPRA target before the end of GAP11 if the NAP is officially approved by the government. The General Secretary of the Ministry of Labor and Social Security reported that approval of the NAP by the head of state or Parliament requested by the ILO was not habitual but that she thought it was feasible. She noted that the President of Cameroon has requested a visit from the General Director of the ILO and that such a visit would be a good occasion to sign the Plan. At his stage, it is unlikely that the indicator on mainstreaming child labor training into national training programs will be met under component three since the guidelines/toolkit on addressing child labor in domestic work have not yet been developed and to the knowledge of the evaluator, there are no activities planned to integrate the tool into an existing national training program before the end of the project.

### *Project ToC*

In its (later abandoned) comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan (CMEP) for Cameroon, GAP11 staff postulated that as a result of providing assistance to assess gaps in the legal framework on child labor/forced labor, reform priorities would be identified and then integrated in the NAP. Through its support for developing the NAP, the ILO expected it would be validated by the tripartite stakeholders and widely diffused, that an implementation plan would be developed by the government and resources would be mobilized to implement the plan. This would result in strengthened policy, regulatory and legal frameworks and therefore increased national capacity to combat child labor. The ToC also proposed that by conducting analysis, proposing a framework for strengthened protective measures for children engaged in domestic work and integrating the proposed measures in national plans and programs, there would be increased policy and regulatory capacity to protect children in domestic work.

In terms of the project's broader impact, the MLSS reported that it has initiated a number of actions programmed in the NAP including:

- Proposing changes in the labor code to give labor inspectors the right to inspect domiciles where children work;
- Preparing the necessary arguments for the ratification of Convention 189 on domestic work;
- Creating the National Steering Committee (NSC) for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor in late 2014 by degree of the Prime Minister's office. The first committee meeting was held in April 2015; a second meeting was planned in May 2015 but postponed and to date, there is no precise date for the next meeting.

Other actions, such as a child labor communication campaign will be organized in 2016 when the budget becomes available, according to one MLSS representative. According to the Norms Specialist, the MLSS proposed a budget of nearly \$50,000.

Other national stakeholders have likewise moved ahead on some planned actions. A retired representative of the National Institute for Statistics of Cameroon (INS) said that the Institute had

collected data on child labor in 2014 as part of its commitment to follow-up on the 2008 collaboration with SIMPOC (a child labor module was added to the national poverty survey) and that the report was “in progress.” Two senators drafted a law on the worst forms of child labor and proposed a number of related actions to raise awareness on child labor within the national legislature. At least one of the senators reported that she has sensitized the Governor and local authorities in her region on child labor issues. She reported that she contributed to measures being taken by authorities to repatriate/reunite children with their families among the large numbers of unaccompanied minors found in her region, children she considers at risk of being recruited into the ranks of Boko Haram as child soldiers.

To support implementation of the NAP, the ILO provided technical assistance to initiate the process to update the hazardous list (one policy measure planned in the NAP). A national occupational safety and health medical expert hired as a consultant by the ILO reviewed the existing list, identified the major gaps that should be addressed and drew up a roadmap for updating it. Although this initiative received high level attention from the Minister of Labor, progress has stalled in recent months. The next step suggested by the consultant was a study to identify and map hazardous work carried out by children. The new OSH director indicated to the evaluator that he was waiting on the ILO to initiate the study while the ILO indicated that the next actions were the responsibility of the government. The OSH director now plans to revert to the Minister for instructions.

To support the allocation of a budget for NAP implementation, as part of an April 2015 workshop, the ILO mobilized the Ministry of Planning to explain to stakeholders how the state budgeting process is carried out. He explained that budget planning is done two years before funds are made available so unless NAP measures were funded from preexisting Ministry budgets (which is the case in some instances, especially for broad development programs in sectors like education and vocational training) or measures were proposed for funding during the NAP development process, (which appears to have been true in regards to the planned child labor awareness raising campaign), no new funding will be available until two years after the plan is officially validated. Since the period covered by the Plan is 2014-2016, it will need to be extended to allow for approval delays. Civil Society Organizations, which had hoped to receive government support for their grassroots actions, expressed disappointment in this regard, especially since many of them are facing decreased availability of donor funding owing to the financial crisis. They requested ILO assistance to mobilize donor funding for their actions.

### **3.) GAP11 in Cameroon – activities and status of outputs**

#### **Finding 3:**

**Significant progress has been made on all planned GAP11 outputs in Cameroon.**

The table below shows the expected GAP11 outputs, summarizes the main activities and indicates the current output status.

Output	Activities	Output Status
<b>Component 1- Capacity Building and Strategic Policy Development</b>		
<p><b>Output 1.1.1</b></p> <p>Improved legal and regulatory framework to prevent child labor and forced labor</p>	<p>Assessment report “Analysis of the legal framework on child labor and forced labor, with particular emphasis on child labor in domestic work, in Cameroon” produced by national ILO consultant in February 2013. ILO provided technical support for the revision of the List of Hazardous occupations forbidden to children;</p>	<p><b>Done</b></p>
<p><b>Output 1.3.1</b> National Action Plans (NAPs) documents to address child labor and forced labor in target countries</p>	<p>Three tripartite plus civil society organization workshops organized to produce and validate National Action Plan for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor in Cameroon (NAP) (2014-2016)</p>	<p><b>Done</b></p> <p>Validation of NAP by tripartite plus stakeholders during a workshop organized in Yaoundé, Cameroon on March 18-20, 2014.</p> <p>Official validation of NAP by Government is pending. The ILO has requested that the Plan be signed at the level of the Prime Minister’s Office in order to engage the whole government in its implementation.</p>
<p><b>Output 1.3.2</b> Effective and improved national institutions in charge of National Action Plans</p>	<p>Included expert analysis of gaps in existing list and proposed process to update the list.</p> <p>Workshop on the NAP budget framework organized in April 2015.</p>	<p><b>Ongoing with the following outcomes:</b></p> <p>Signature of a Ministerial Order regarding the composition of the National Steering Committee (Décision No. 0354 D/MINTSS/SG/DINCIT/CC T/CEA1 du 14 novembre 2014 constatant la composition du Comité National de Lutte contre le travail des enfants).</p> <p>MINESS reports that resources were allocated for some NAP activities in 2016 budget.</p>

Output	Activities	Output Status
<b>Component 3- Protection of child domestic workers</b>		
<b>Output 3.1.1</b> World Day Against Child Labor on Child Labor (WDACL) in Domestic Work	Small grant given to two NGOs to organize awareness raising activities on child labor in domestic work for WDACL 2013	<b>Done</b>
<b>Output 3.1.5</b> National rapid situational analysis on child domestic work in 12 selected countries	Assessment report “Rapid situational analysis on child domestic work in Cameroun” produced by national ILO consultant in December 2012.  Validation workshop of assessment report organized in October 2014.	<b>Done</b>
<b>Output 3.2.1</b> Reports on review of the national legal framework on child domestic work in 12 target countries	Assessment report “Analysis of the legal framework on child labor and forced labor, with particular emphasis on child labor in domestic work, in Cameroon” produced by national ILO consultant in February 2013.	<b>Done</b>
<b>Output 3.2.2</b> Proposal for addressing gaps in social services for child domestic workers protection in 12 target countries	Consultant engaged to identify gaps in social services and to proposed relevant solutions for the protection of children engaged in domestic work. Report submitted in February 2014.	<b>Done</b>
<b>Output 3.2.3</b> A child domestic workers protective policy framework document available in 12 target countries	Protective policy framework document adopted in October 2014 Workshop. Workshop featured the presentation and discussion of child labor in domestic work situational analysis, legal, regulatory and social services gaps analysis. Workshop “Support for the launch of implementation of the National Action Plan” organized in Yaoundé from April 08-07, 2015. It identified and integrated actions for protecting children in domestic work in the NAP.	<b>Done</b>
<b>Output 3.2.4</b> Protection of child domestic workers concerns mainstreamed into the policy agendas and operational plans of domestic workers' unions with the support of the IUF/IDWN		<b>Pending</b>

#### **4.) National stakeholders perception of project interventions and their results**

*Finding 4: National stakeholders perceived project interventions and their short term results very positively. However, many stakeholders expressed apprehension about whether or not conditions are sufficient for the NAP, including actions to protect children engaged in domestic work, to be implemented after GAP11 support ends.*

The main national stakeholders who were interviewed by the evaluator consider the elaboration of the NAP to be an important accomplishment, reflecting recognition by national decision makers that child labor is a problem in Cameroon and that it is incumbent upon the government, in collaboration with social partners and civil society organizations, to take action against it. Similarly, several cited the creation of the National Steering Committee (NSC) and the convening of its first meeting in April 2015, as a promising initiative of the government following up on the NAP. Several stakeholders also expressed the concern that government ownership of the NAP was not sufficiently strong to guarantee its full implementation. They believed that the ILO was instrumental in progress to date and that without its continued support as well as external funding, the Plan would not be fully implemented.

Several stakeholders thought it was an accomplishment to have mobilized multiple governmental and nongovernmental organizations in addition to the ILO's traditional partners, the MLSS and its social partners, in the formulation of NAP. However, some also felt that more needs to be done to encourage the convergence of efforts of key institutions on child labor. One civil society representative thought that the ILO did not make sufficient efforts to mobilize and raise the awareness of other international donors and international non-governmental organizations concerned with the well-being of marginalized children to support the plan. It is noted that UNICEF participated in the action plan development process but according to those interviewed (which did NOT include UNICEF), it has not expressed strong ownership of the plan. Similarly according to more than one stakeholder, Ministries outside the MLSS were difficult to mobilize, some sending low level representatives to the NAP workshops. On the positive side, a stakeholder from the Ministry for the Economy, Planning and Territorial Improvement (MINEPAT), who made a presentation on the national budgeting process in the April 2015 launch support workshop, said that he had learned a lot about the issue of child labor and was using it in his work.

Several stakeholders also expressed impatience to move from planning to action and in particular to actions to combat child labor and assist its victims at the community level. They feared that the issue would remain at the level of political discourse rather than being translated into actions on the ground. For example, although changing laws to expand the prerogatives of labor inspectors to inspect private residences is cited as progress on the issue of combating child labor in domestic work, more than one stakeholder noted that labor inspection is badly handicapped in Cameroon and that even formal sector enterprises are rarely inspected and penalties for labor law violations are rarely imposed. Several civil society groups and others pointed to the need for awareness raising campaigns on the negative consequences of child labor and improved social services to make progress on the NAP objectives.

Most stakeholders said that project research on the topic of child labor in domestic labor was relevant because it highlighted exploitation and abuse in a common practice. Several stakeholders highlighted the importance of investing in awareness-raising on the problem and on ways to protect children engaged in domestic work since the practice is still thought by many in the general public to be a way of helping children rather than a reason for concern. Indeed, the knowledge and attitudes of more than one government official consulted showed a lack of awareness of the degree of exploitation that characterizes child labor in domestic work in Cameroon.

The main ILO counterparts expressed satisfaction with ILO responsiveness and the technical assistance provided through GAP11 activities. Many also expressed expectations for continued support, whether for training and other forms of capacity building, or for the mobilization of stakeholders to focus efforts on next steps in NAP implementation including fund-raising.

### **5.) General or specific contextual factors that may have had an impact on project results**

*Finding 5: The enabling environment for GAP11 policy work in Cameroon was positive in terms of the availability of in-country ILO institutional support and national resource persons, and the existence of a number of well-informed, motivated and resourceful national stakeholders/partners, some with experience in past child labor projects. Even so, significant progress is hindered by turnover in government counterpart personnel, the large number of critical issues facing the country that compete for Government attention coupled with insufficient capacity (human and material resources) and insufficient pressure from the public and special interest groups for rapid action on child labor.*

#### **Effective ILO institutional support and national resource persons**

Ground work done by previous ILO/IPEC projects and the presence of ILO personnel in the country were important factors enabling relatively small GAP11 budget allocations to successfully achieve expected outputs:

- GAP11 activities in Cameroon built upon a foundation laid by previous IPEC projects in Cameroon including the West Africa Cocoa/Commercial Agriculture Program (WACAP) and the Fight Against Child Trafficking for Labor Exploitation in West Africa Program (LUTRENA), support for a national child labor survey (2008) and the UCW study “Understanding Children’s Work and Youth Employment” (2011). Most stakeholders credited their involvement in these activities with opening their eyes to the issue of child labor in Cameroon and with expanding their knowledge of the types of policies and programs that were needed to address the problem. The first workshop to initiate the process of developing the NAP coincided with the validation workshop of the UCW report and information/recommendations from the report appear to have been used in NAP formulation.



- Many participants in project activities on the side of the government, social partners and civil society organizations have benefited from ILO capacity building programs in past/other projects, some in the ILO's Turin Training Center<sup>49</sup>, which enabled them to contribute meaningfully to formulating the NAP. Representatives of civil society organizations who were involved in implementing WACAP and/or Lutrena felt that their participation in the NAP working group contributed to making the Plan more realistic. Two parliamentarians, who were beneficiaries of ILO training for West African Parliamentarians in Turin, believed they could play an important role calling for government accountability for NAP commitments and lobbying for resource allocation. They were inspiring individuals and indeed seemed capable of championing the cause but still require support from the ILO.<sup>50</sup>
- The Decent Work Support Team Office for Central Africa, located in Yaoundé, provided on-the-ground assistance to manage GAP11 activities. The ILO Norms Specialist in particular invested significant time and effort to support ILO constituents with NAP formulation and to follow-up on Geneva-based GAP11 personnel actions. Even though the work on the NAP is not an explicit objective of the Decent Work Country Program for Cameroon 2014-2017, the Norms Specialist viewed his work as responding to demand from ILO constituents and therefore a priority. The GAP11 budget covered part of a program assistant's salary for a period of months to assist with implementation but other project management costs were ILO in-kind contributions. In as much as they were not initially part of the office's explicit strategy, Decent Work Support Team efforts were ad hoc, although follow-up support for NAP implementation has been proposed in office plans currently being formalized for the upcoming two years. The project also benefited from support from the Geneva-based ILO desk officer for Cameroon, who participated in some GAP11 supported workshops.
- Project activities benefited from the availability and experience of qualified short-term national consultants who not only contributed through their contract deliverables but as advisors to government officials. For example, the consultant who produced reports on gaps in the current Hazardous List and recommended a process for updating it was called to brief the Minister of Labor and participate in the first meeting of the NSC. The consultant involved in legal and regulatory and social service assessments is also frequently consulted by the Ministry of Labor. The evaluator found the various reports and studies produced by

---

<sup>49</sup> At least three stakeholders interviewed by the evaluator had taken part in a child labor related training programs in Turin : two members of parliament, and a CSO representative. Another stakeholder from the Institute of National Statistics had been invited by the ILO to participate in the Brasilia conference to present his country's experiences on child labor research.

<sup>50</sup> They have requested support for an activity to mobilize parliamentarians from Central Africa, modeling their work on similar work done in West Africa.

GAP11 consultants to be good quality work. One of the consultants also carried out work in Gabon under GAP11 Component 3.

### **Government uptake of GAP11 initiatives**

The relatively slow pace of government action challenged GAP11 for the organization of some activities, obtaining timely formal validation of the NAP, and is affecting NAP implementation. Some factors that contribute to slow government uptake include:

- Turn-over among key staff. A new Minister of Labor was appointed in 2011. The division head of the ILO's main counterpart unit within the Ministry changed at the start of the project, taking with her much of the Ministry's institutional memory on child labor issues. She was eventually brought back and later appointed Interim General Secretary, which facilitated GAP11 work. The current division head is new to the job and will need to be brought up to speed to move NAP work forward.
- Government attention is on other critical issues: One such issue raised in almost every meeting was current instability in the North. Since 2014, Boko Haram has been active in the Extreme North of the country with attacks intensifying in the summer of 2015. More generally, child labor is not at the top of the current government's development agenda; but many related issues are high priority including poverty reduction, improving access to education and expanding employment opportunities for youth and adults.
- National counterpart capacity is limited: The norms and international cooperation unit within the MLSS is responsible for all issues pertaining to international and national labor norms and coordinating international cooperation programs. It does not have personnel dedicated to managing issues related to child labor. Given the large number of actions to be coordinated by the MLSS for the NAP, their capacity is stretched.

Lack of significant pressure on the government to act quickly: Child labor, particularly child labor in domestic work, is still considered normal by large cross sections of the public in Cameroon, which may not be aware of its negative consequences. There are some civil society organizations lobbying the government for support to combat child labor, but otherwise there is no significant demand from citizens for government to act on the issue. Child labor is found most often in informal sector economic activities and with the exception of cocoa, there is not significant pressure from international buyers or international consumers to eliminate child labor.

## **ANNEX 7: Report of GAP11 Field Visit to the Philippines**

---

GAP11 Independent Final Evaluation  
Report on evaluation mission to Philippines  
Undertaken by Peter Matz  
November 1-6, 2015

### **1. Introduction**

This report documents the main findings of the evaluation mission to the Philippines carried from November 1 to 6, 2015 by Peter Matz, an external independent evaluator in the context of the final evaluation of the 2011 Global Action Program on Child Labor (GAP11).

The Project implemented activities under all three components of the GAP11 project in the Philippines:

- Component 1: Capacity Building and Strategic Policy Approach
- Component 2: Research
- Component 3: Protection of child domestic workers

The purpose of the mission was to meet with project stakeholders and assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of project accomplishments to date as well as what remains to be done.

### **2. Summary of findings**

The study of progress reports, individual interviews and focus group discussions (see Annex 1) confirmed the GAP-11 Project in the Philippines has been relevant, as well as efficient, demonstrated by the fact that all the planned outputs have either been achieved or are in progress, with a view to being achieved before the end of the Project (see overview of outputs in Chapter 3).

In addition, the Project efforts in the Philippines can be considered efficient, as the outputs have been achieved with a total allocated budget of merely US\$ 155,000.

The Project benefitted from the mutual trust and respect generated between the ILO and national stakeholders, in particular the Department of Labour and Employment (DOLE) due to ILO-IPEC's longstanding engagement in the country (since 1995). Consequently, DOLE repeatedly expressed their satisfaction with the ILO's work, including through GAP-11.

Linking GAP-11 with other ILO activities on child labour, namely the TBP 2 and CLEAR project, have contributed have ensured a coherent approach and created positive synergies. In particular, the co-funding of a national staff through GAP-11 and the CLEAR Project has facilitated progress towards achieving project outputs in an efficient manner.

In terms of the Project's impact, progress towards Outcome 1 (improved legislation, enforcement and policy coordination on child labour) has been the most significant. In particular, the legal review of child labour (combining Outputs 1.1.1. and 3.2.1.) was repeatedly cited as an important

means to inform efforts aimed at eliminating child labour and contribute to the protection of child domestic workers.

Regarding Project Outcome 2 (innovative research and monitoring systems to guide policy development and programme design), the evaluation happened too early to judge the Project impact, but interviews suggested that there is indeed a realistic possibility, for example, that the findings on the modular survey on conditional cash transfers may have potential to influence the policy debate on this issue.

Regarding Project Outcome 3 (strengthened protections to children in domestic work), several stakeholders noted that there was still a lack of data and consensus on children in domestic work, and that the discussions around this issue had only just started in the Philippines. Therefore, the evaluation considers it timely that the process started by GAP-11 will be taken further by the CLEAR project.

National stakeholders also confirmed that the Project has been responsive to their needs. This was noted particularly with respect to the revision of the Hazardous Work List for Children, which had emerged earlier as a Government priority and responded to by the Project.

The sustainability of the Project's activities is made likely through the support of a functioning National Child Labour Committee (NCLC), facilitated through the ongoing CLEAR project.

### 3. Overview table of outputs

The following table provides an overview of the planned project outputs and their current status.

<b>Output</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Output Status</b>
<b>Component 1- Capacity building and strategic policy development</b>		
<b>Output 1.1.1</b> Improved legal and regulatory framework to prevent child labour and forced labour	Legal review completed in early 2013. Provision of technical advice for the revision of the Hazardous Work List for Children in 2014.	<b>Done</b>
<b>Output 1.2.1</b> Strengthened enforcement mechanisms in target countries	Training of multi-disciplinary child labour rescue teams (SBM-QAT) in four provinces (July 2013) and development of provincial plans.	<b>Done</b>
<b>Component 2- Research</b>		
<b>Output 2.2.1</b> Survey datasets and reports for modular evaluation survey	Draft of joint ILO/World Bank research study on conditional cash transfers completed.	<b>In progress</b>
<b>Output 2.3.1</b> Country-level situational analyses	Draft completed and integrated as part of a study on child labour and youth employment (Output 2.4.1.)	<b>In progress</b>

Output	Activities	Output Status
<b>Component 3- Protection of child domestic workers</b>		
<b>Output 3.1.1</b> World Day Against Child Labor (WDAKL) on Child Labour in Domestic Work	Carried out in September 2013, to coincide with Red Card against Child Labour campaign.	<b>Done</b>
<b>Output 3.1.5</b> National rapid situational analysis on child domestic work	Completed and published in February 2014.	<b>Done</b>
<b>Output 3.2.1</b> Report on review of the national legal framework on child domestic work	Covered by legal review under Output 1.1.1.	<b>Done</b>
<b>Output 3.2.2</b> Proposal for addressing gaps in social services for child domestic workers protection	Incorporated into rapid situational analysis (Output 3.1.5.)	<b>Done</b>
<b>Output 3.2.3</b> A child domestic workers protective policy framework document available	Roadmap adopted by NCLC during a workshop in January 2015	<b>Done</b>
<b>Output 3.2.4</b> Protection of child domestic workers concerns mainstreamed into the policy agendas and operational plans of domestic workers' unions	Roadmap expected be integrated into the Philippine Program Against Child Labor (PPACL) during a workshop in January 2016	<b>In progress</b>

#### 4. Main activities and findings specific to project components

##### 4.1. Subcomponent 1.1.: Legal and regulatory framework

###### 4.1.1. Summary of main activities

A **legal review** on child labour in the Philippines, which combined (Sub)Components 1.1. and 3, was completed in early 2013. Following the finalization of the review, a Policy Forum was held in July 2013, for which the legal review served as a base document.

Based on a request by DOLE (which stemmed from a recommendation in the Labour and Employment Plan 2011-2016), GAP-11 facilitated the provision of technical advice for the revision of the **Hazardous Work List for Children** in 2014. In particular, a video conference was conducted involving experts from ILO-IPEC Headquarters and technical staff from various units within DOLE units. After the videoconference, the project prepared a guidance note for DOLE.

As part of the strategy to improve prosecution and, eventually, convictions, GAP-11 linked up with the **Inter-Agency Council against Trafficking (IACAT)** in an effort to mainstream child labour issues, as the amended anti-trafficking law approved in 2012 considers all Worst Forms of Child Labour as forms of trafficking.

To date (November 2015), GAP-11 has spent US\$ 6,093 on this subcomponent (out of an allocated US 13,500).<sup>51</sup>

#### **4.1.2. Key evaluation findings**

The relevance and the impact of the **legal review** on child labour were highlighted by several stakeholders. For example, the Director of the Bureau of Workers with Special Concerns in the Department of Labor and Employment noted that DOLE had proposed amendments to the recent Basic Education Law, based on findings of the legal review. Another recommendation from the legal review may lead to the actual institutionalization of the NCLC (which has been in existence since 1995).

Several stakeholders within DOLE praised the Project's support for the revision of the **Hazardous Work List for Children**, for its relevance, usefulness and technical quality. In particular, DOLE stakeholders highlighted that GAP-11 support had built capacity within DOLE on this issue and acted as a catalyst, by helping to bring the concerned departments within DOLE together (which otherwise would have been a challenge). The approval of the List is still pending, because DOLE is still gathering more information and consulting key personnel on whether or not weeding and planting in agriculture should be prohibited.

Since **IACAT** now has the mandate, resources and the case management system to handle and resolve cases, mainstreaming child labour issues through this institution can be regarded as an effective strategic move, which should facilitate the sustainability of the Project's efforts.

### **4.2. Subcomponent 1.2.: Monitoring and enforcement**

#### **4.2.1. Summary of main activities**

In July 2013, GAP-11 carried out training of **multi-disciplinary child labour rescue teams (SBM-QAT)** from the four provinces in which TBP2 was active in. The objectives of the training were to improve the capacity of SBM-QAT in the conduct rescue operations of child labourers and to strengthen the enforcement of child labour laws at the local level. After the training, all four provinces developed provincial plans for SBM-QAT implementation, under the supervision of the Provincial Child Labour Committees (PCLCs). The SBM-QATs are composed of DOLE, Provincial Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), Philippine National Police or National Bureau of Investigation, and the Department of Justice.

Moreover, the project has been actively supporting the idea of strengthening enforcement of anti-child labour legislation through a **telephone hotline** that children could call, which would be under the supervision of NCLC.

To date (November 2015), the Project has spent US\$ 12,918 (out of an allocated US\$ 18,000) on this subcomponent.

---

<sup>51</sup> Savings have been achieved, in part, through cost-sharing the legal review with Component 3.

#### **4.2.2. Key evaluation findings**

Regarding the **SBM-QAT**, a focus group interview (FGI) with provincial government officials, including the Provincial Director of DOLE, in Quezon province confirmed that 12 children from this province were rescued from hazardous child labour in the neighbouring province of Patangas by members of the Quezon province QAT in early 2015. However, the discussion revealed that this had been the only rescue operation since the training, and the Provincial Director admitted that it would have been carried out even without the training.

The FGI further revealed that no significant follow-up action had been carried out in Quezon province after the training, due to a lack of resources, and the status of SBM-QAT as a sub-committee of the PCLC as rather theoretical. Whether the child labourers discovered and rescued in 2015 had been an isolated incidence or whether there was an actual need for more rescue operations remained an open question during the FGI, as the capacity of CLM was deemed insufficient, especially when it came to trafficking or migration across provincial borders.

As for the SBM-QATs from the other three provinces, Masbate province has been able to conduct two operations, while neither Bukidnon province nor Northern Samar province have been able to conduct any activities, because of political or emergency-related circumstances.

Regarding the **telephone hotline**, negotiations are still ongoing with the telephone company Globecom, who is interested in sponsoring such a hotline. However, the Chair or the Knowledge Management Sub-Committee of the NCLC said that the finalization of the agreement with Globecom was not expected before early 2016, with the formal launch of the hotline foreseen in August 2016. No funds from GAP-11 (or any other ILO project) will be required.

#### **4.3. Subcomponent 2.2.: Modular evaluation survey**

##### **4.3.1. Summary of main activities**

GAP-11 undertook a **modular evaluation survey of the conditional cash transfer (CCT) programme** in the Philippines. To this end, the Project approached the World Bank in Manila and negotiated a co-funding arrangement for the analysis of available data from a large Government programme, which started in late 2014.

A draft of the study has been completed and is currently undergoing an internal review within the World Bank.

##### **4.3.2. Key evaluation findings**

Ms. Posarac, World Bank Program Leader, characterized the collaboration with the Project as an “easy case”, facilitated by the availability of good data as well as a good timing.

Moreover, she affirmed that she considered the study a “high-quality research work, with interesting conclusions and good recommendations”. In particular, the study made a strong case for increasing the value of CCT grants in the country.

According to Ms. Posarac, the report will likely be submitted for a peer-reviewed journal and/or published as a working paper. Furthermore, it could be used for orienting future policy dialogue.

#### **4.4. Subcomponent 2.3.: Situational analysis and study on child labour and youth employment**

##### **4.4.1. Summary of main activities**

Consultations on the **situational analysis of child labour and youth employment** were held in December 2014 with relevant national counterparts, including UNICEF, the World Bank, the Statistical Office, and the NCLC-Knowledge Management Sub-Committees.

With the support of the Statistical Office (now Philippines Statistical Authority, PSA), relevant data was gathered analysed, primarily stemming from the 2011 Survey on Children (SOC) and on the 2013 Labour Force Survey. A consultant was hired to conduct a detailed review of policies and programmes with a bearing with child labour and youth employment. Consequently, a draft of the study entitled “Understanding children’s work and youth employment outcomes in the Philippines” has been completed and is currently being circulated among relevant stakeholders.

The total amount allocated for Component 2 (combining subcomponents 2.2. and 2.3., as well as mission travel) was US\$ 75,800.

##### **4.4.2. Key evaluation findings**

According to GAP 11 staff, the study had gone smoothly, which was in part due to the fact that both UNICEF and World Bank had taken a genuine interest and that PSA had collaborated in sharing the relevant data.

Whether or not national stakeholders’ capacity has been built (which would be a welcome side effect of the study) will become apparent only after the current round of input and comments to be collected, according to the activity manager.

The publication of the study is foreseen for January 2016.

#### **4.5. Component 3: Child domestic work**

##### **4.5.1. Summary of main activities**

In 2013, ILO-IPEC shared **World Day against Child Labour (WDACL)** key messages and other materials with relevant national authorities. Although a proposal was prepared to provide direct support for specific WDACL 2013 activities in the Philippines through GAP-11, this option was not further pursued.



A **Policy Forum on the Strengthening of Enforcement of Child Labour Laws** was held in 2013, for which the legal review (see Component 1.1.) served as a base document. During a subsequent stakeholder workshop in January 2015,<sup>52</sup> the “**Rapid Situational Analysis** on Child Domestic Work”, written by an ILO consultant, was presented. It included a proposal assessing and addressing gaps in social services, as well as relevant solutions for child domestic workers’ protection in the Philippines.

At the same venue, a **protective policy framework** document was adopted by the NCLC, entitled “Roadmap document towards strengthening the institutional and legislative response for the elimination of child labour in domestic work and the protection of young domestic workers in The Philippines”. The workshop was organized jointly with the CLEAR Project.

Total expenditure to date (November 2015) US\$ 19,753 (out of an allocated US\$ 47,533).

#### **4.5.2. Key evaluation findings**

Mr. Soledad explained that the main reason that project funds had not been used for the **WDACL** was that in 2013, the commemoration of WDACL had been pushed back until the fall of that year, in order to coincide with the launch of the Red Card against Child Labour campaign. Interviews with other stakeholders confirmed that this had been a sensible decision in order to maximise impact.

National stakeholders gathered in a focus group discussion on child domestic work praised the relevance of the **conceptual framework** on child labour in domestic work, provided by GAP-11, as well as the **legal review** of child labour (see Component 1.1.). Moreover, they noted that the Roadmap had already been useful in informing the list of hazardous forms of child labour (see Component 1.1.).

However, the civil society participants of the FGD also noted that the **Roadmap** needed to be further improved, to be more systematic and concrete. Overall, there was consensus among all the participants that work on developing a coherent policy framework on child domestic work was still in the early stages. Therefore, it is timely GAP-11 activities have created significant synergies with the CLEAR Project on this issue.

Mr. Soledad explained that the Roadmap would be integrated into the Philippine Program Against Child Labor (PPACL), i.e. the country’s NAP. This would likely happen when the PPACL is set to be updated in a workshop in January 2016.

---

<sup>52</sup> The workshop was delayed in order to accommodate the schedules of DOLE and CLEAR.

## **ANNEX 8: Report of GAP11 Field Visit to Haiti**

---

GAP11 Independent Final Evaluation  
Report on evaluation mission to Haiti  
Undertaken by Sandy Wark  
November 16-21, 2015

### **1.) Overview of Evaluation Mission**

This report documents the main findings and conclusions of the evaluation mission to Haiti of the 2011 Global Action Program on Child Labor (GAP11), which was carried by Sandy Wark, an external independent evaluator. The mission took place in Port-au-Prince from November 16-21, 2015. The list of persons interviewed is included at the end of this report.

The ILO implemented activities under two components of the GAP11 project in Haiti:

Component 1: Capacity Building and Strategic Policy Approach and Component 3: Protection of child domestic workers. The purpose of the mission was to meet with project stakeholders and assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of project accomplishments to date as well as what remains to be done.

### **2.) GAP11 Achievements and Sustainability**

*Finding 1: It is unlikely that GAP11 activities in Haiti to improve the legal and regulatory framework will produce significant results in the near term. The political conjuncture in Haiti makes reforms that require formal validation by the Parliament extremely difficult and the capacity of the Labor Inspectorate and other law enforcement agents is currently weak. It is too early to tell whether or not the project's collaboration with UNICEF and 29 other organizations to understand and propose a framework for actions on child labor in domestic work will lead to lasting results but there are some promising signs.*

#### **Legal and Regulatory Improvements**

At the time of the evaluation, there was no significant forward momentum on project supported legal and regulatory reforms. ILO national office stakeholders reported that GAP11 contributed to national capacity to combat child labor in 2014. The National Steering Committee (NSC) was reformed and met several times. With support from GAP11, the first Hazardous List was developed through tripartite workshops, was validated by the NSC and handed over to Minister of Labor to be proposed to Parliament for its official adoption. However, the Parliament was dissolved in January 2015 and the Minister has since changed, so no additional progress has been made. The NSC likewise did not meet in 2015 until November when the ILO called meetings to plan a workshop to validate a National Roadmap on Child Labor). They met twice but the planned workshop was postponed because of political unrest.

In regards to the relevance of reforming laws and regulations on child labor, the consultant that produced the report on the legal framework said that the biggest problem in Haiti is that not enough resources are put into the application of the law including into the police and the judiciary. Other stakeholders noted that the labor inspectorate is weak and requires capacity building, in particular in regions outside Port au Prince. Another stakeholder argued that there were so few jobs for anyone outside the informal sector that labor law and regulations were not a real priority at all unless it could contribute to creating jobs or making informal sector work more “decent.”

The ILO Country Coordinator for Haiti agreed that for legal reform to be effective and sustainable at reducing the prevalence of child labor, more needed to be done. He thought that “everything needed to be pushed at the same time” adding that “it is impossible to resolve child labor if everything else stays the same.” He believed that, in particular, more needed to be done to strengthen organizations that are intermediaries between the government and affected children and their households including vocational training institutions, cooperatives and inspectors. Since the country office is working on these issues, he believes given a longer timeframe (5-10 years), GAP11 contributions to the legal and regulatory framework may be developed and sustained.

#### Strengthening Protections for Child Domestic Workers

National stakeholder interviewed during the evaluation field visit thought that bringing together a large group of relevant organizations to discuss and debate national responses to child labor in domestic work was an extraordinary contribution of GAP11. The issue of the “*restaveks*,” the name given to children in Haiti who are sent by their parents to work for a host household as domestic servants, has garnered significant attention in the media, often being described as a version of modern day slavery. Even so, the practice only became more common in the wake of the 2010 earthquake near Port au Prince. In 2013, the ILO, UNICEF, IOM and several large, international NGOs came together and agreed to support in-depth research to update information about the magnitude and characteristics of the practice.

There are several good practices associated with the multi-stakeholder working group that merit highlighting. The first is coordinated action among NGOs, International Organizations and Government representatives in a country like Haiti which is highly dependent on aid but which does not have a strong central government that is able to adequately coordinate the actions of its partners. In these situations, it is often left up to organizations to coordinate themselves but this seldom is done effectively. In the case of the multi stakeholder working group on “*domesticité*”<sup>53</sup> the research project brought together more than 30 organizations to debate and eventually to agree on the main recommendations coming out of the research. Stakeholders in Haiti are very hopeful this will lead to more effective and coordinated work on the issue.

Secondly, the findings of the research were interesting because it brought about a more nuanced

---

<sup>53</sup> *Domesticité* is the French term used in Haiti to describe child labor in domestic work.

appreciation of the situation that children engaged in domestic work in Haiti find themselves which should lead to more relevant interventions that respond to the full gamut of needs and opportunities to improve the welfare of the children involved. . UNICEF is also considering how to follow up on the study in its 2017-2021 strategy. It has a particular interest in strengthening the national agency in charge of child protection which is complementary to the current ILO work on youth employment. During the evaluation visit, it was announced that that a new UN Development Action Framework was to be developed in 2016; UNICEF was going to explore how to integrate child protection issues into the framework.

In addition, it would be useful for members of the working group to explore some form of joint action. Because of the large numbers of organizations engaged in child protection, one potential follow-on intervention is to develop mechanisms and related tools for improving information sharing and a system for making referrals among service providers. While in Port-au-Prince, the evaluator cited two examples from Morocco. The first is an online portal for NGOs and their partners (see [www.tanmia.ma](http://www.tanmia.ma)) and another is an online database of social service providers (see [www.khadamatfes.ma](http://www.khadamatfes.ma)).

### 3.) GAP11 in Haiti – activities and status of outputs

*Finding 2: Progress has been made on all planned GAP11 outputs in Haiti.*

The table below shows the expected GAP11 outputs, summarizes the main activities and indicates the current output status.

Output	Activities	Output Status
<b>Component 1- Capacity Building and Strategic Policy Development</b>		
<b>Output 1.1.1</b> Improved legal and regulatory framework to prevent child labor and forced labor	Assessment report “Analysis of the legal framework on child labor, with particular emphasis on child labor in domestic work, in Haiti” produced by national ILO consultant in June 2014.  Several meetings/workshops were organized in 2014 to develop the Hazardous List.	<b>Done</b>
<b>Component 3- Protection of child domestic workers</b>		
<b>Output 3.1.5</b> National rapid situational analysis on child domestic work in 12 selected countries	The situation analysis of child domestic workers is included in the report: Child Domestic Workers in Haiti 2014: Analytical Report.  The final draft of this report was produced in August 2015. The French translation has been prepared. Both reports shall be finalized before December 2015 when a multi-stakeholder launch workshop is planned.	<b>In Progress</b>

<b>Output</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Output Status</b>
<b>Output 3.2.1</b> Reports on review of the national legal framework on child domestic work in 12 target countries	Assessment report “Analysis of the legal framework on child labor, with particular emphasis on child labor in domestic work, in Haiti” produced by national ILO consultant in June 2014. (Combined with Component 1)	<b>Done</b>
<b>Output 3.2.2</b> Proposal for addressing gaps in social services for child domestic workers protection in 12 target countries	Same as Output 3.1.5.	<b>In progress</b>
<b>Output 3.2.3</b> A child domestic workers protective policy framework document available in 12 target countries	Same as Output 3.1.5. Multiple meetings of the multi-stakeholder working group were organized in 2014 and 2015 to finalize the draft report which contains recommendations that form a proposed protective policy framework. The report along with the framework will be formally launched in December 2015.	<b>In progress</b>
<b>Output 3.2.4</b> Protection of child domestic workers concerns mainstreamed into the policy agendas and operational plans of domestic workers' unions with the support of the IUF/IDWN	Activities that fall under this output are planned before GAP11 is closed. The ILO office in Haiti applied for and received a grant to launch a communication campaign on Child Domestic Work based on the study findings which will be implemented in 2016	<b>Not started</b>

#### **4.) National stakeholders perception of project interventions and their results**

*Finding 3: National stakeholders were generally positive about their cooperation with the ILO on GAP11 interventions and related activities in Haiti.*

Representatives from the ILO constituents had mostly positive things to say about their collaboration with the organization. Among those interviewed were several stakeholders who had benefited from capacity building activities sponsored by the ILO for which they were very grateful. However, National stakeholders on the NSC indicated that there are issues with the committee that require ILO support to resolve. For example, there are currently no employers’ representatives on the committee, although ILO Haiti indicated that it is taking steps to resolve this issue. NSC members also said that the committee does not benefit from the same level of recognition as other national committees dealing with labor issues and that their expectations for ILO material assistance to the committee had not been met. One member felt that the committee was not adequately involved in guiding and coordinating ILO initiatives on child labor.

UNICEF expressed appreciation for the role played by the ILO in the multi-stakeholder working group on child domestic labor in Haiti. The UNICEF consultant responsible for managing the study

indicated in particular that ILO technical assistance was important for establishing the study terms of reference and for clarifying international labor frameworks as they related to the context in Haiti.

#### **5.) General or specific contextual factors that may have had an incidence on project results**

*Finding 4: The availability and interest of ILO staff for GAP11 work on child labor in Haiti were positive factors for implementing project activities. However, the larger context of development work in the country was not favorable for much of the project's period of performance.*

The ILO Haiti office has implemented child labor projects in the past funded by the Government of Brazil and is currently implementing a \$2 million Norwegian funded program on Youth Employment that focuses on marginalized youth including children engaged in child labor. As a result, there were qualified staff persons available to help implement GAP11 activities including one of senior national staff person with extensive experience on the issue child labor and the Norwegian project CTA.

Another favorable ILO contribution to the enabling environment in Haiti was its support for South South exchanges involving national stakeholders from the island. Haiti recently joined a regional Latin America and Caribbean initiative to accelerate effort toward the elimination of child labor. The Director of Labor of the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labor is taking part in regional meetings and other related online exchanges related to the initiative, which has increased his knowledge and sense of engagement on the issue.

Several factors beyond the project's control affected project implementation and impact. The start of GAP11 came on the heels of the devastating earthquake that hit the Haiti in 2010 which put the country into a prolonged crisis mode. In January 2015, the Parliament dissolved which eventually led to a several months of elections starting at the local levels and leading up to Presidential elections. At the time of the evaluation field visit, Haiti was in the final phase of its Presidential elections. There were daily demonstrations and related unrest driven by various political factions. Project management likewise reported frequent changes within its counterpart Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, with there being three successive changes of Minister in the last year. None of these factors were positive for advancing legal reform initiatives.

## ANNEX 9: Report of GAP11 Stakeholder Online Survey

---

### 1. Respondents' country and institutional affiliation

As of 27 November, 50 responses from 22 countries were received. More than one third of the respondents were Government counterparts (Table 1). The most country responses were received from Indonesia (8), Azerbaijan, Mongolia, Panama and Togo (4 each) (Table 2).

**Table 1: Institutional affiliation**

ILO national staff	8
Government Counterpart	19
Trade Union Representative	5
Employers' Association Representative	2
NGO representative	8
Staff of university or research institution	8

**Table 2: Country of residence**

Azerbaijan	4
Brazil	1
Burkina Faso	1
Comoros	1
Ecuador	3
Gabon	1
India	1
Indonesia	8
Kenya	2
Laos PDR	1
Mali	3
Mexico	1
Mongolia	4
Panama	4
Paraguay	2
Rwanda	2
Sierra Leone	1
South Africa	1
South Sudan	0
Timor Leste	3

Togo	4
Turkey	1
Ukraine	1

## 2. Summary of responses to technical questions

### 2.1. Output 1: Legal and policy environment

Respondents found GAP-11 assistance to assess and identify priority actions to update the legal framework on child labour and/or forced labour to be useful (81% marked either “4” or “5”). However, only half of the respondents said that their country was indeed far advanced in implementing the priority actions regarding the legal framework; the rest marked either medium/low (“2”) or medium (“3”). Likewise, a similar percentage of respondents expects significant progress within the next 12 months.

A large majority of respondents also considered GAP-11 support for strengthening the capacity of national institutions to enforce legal provisions on child labour and/or forced labour very useful (72% marking either “4” or “5”). Similarly, most respondents expect that the tools and skills contributed by the Project will be applied in law enforcement activities (72% marking either “4” or “5”).

More than half of the relevant respondents claimed that the assistance that their institution received to formulate and/or implement the National Action Plan (NAP) was very useful: 50% marked “5”, and the rest was evenly distributed between “3” and “4”. At the same time, respondents were only moderately optimistic regarding the availability of sufficient resources for implementing the NAP, with 78% marking either “3” or “4”. Two thirds of the respondents considered the Project successful in involving a variety of stakeholders in the development of the NAP (72% marking “4” or “5”).

Nearly three quarters of respondents (71%) thought that GAP-11 has been successful in mainstreaming child labour and/or forced labour in other sectors (sector (agriculture, social protection, education, or local economic development). The only respondent to consider this effort unsuccessful was a stakeholder from Rwanda.

### 2.2. Output 2: Research

57% of the respondents considered the recent SIMPOC survey either useful or very useful for increasing their institution's understanding of child labour and/or forced labour. The same percentage says that the Project’s collaboration has built their capacity to carry out future surveys, and claims that the findings of the survey will influence policies and/or programmes on child labour or forced labour.

Seven respondents gave a mark on the usefulness of the recent UCW research and policy appraisal for increasing their institutions’ understanding of child labour and/or forced labour – five of them



responded by marking either “4” or “5”. Similarly, five respondents considered it very likely that the findings of the research will influence policies and/or programmes.

GAP-11 support has also promoted the place of child labour within academic institutions’ research agendas, as indicated by more than two thirds of the participants who provided a mark on this question. This support is likely sustainable, as more than 76% say that future research on child labour is likely even in the absence of donor funding. For example, the supported research institution in Turkey, which is trying to tackle a variety of questions in applied economics noted that “without the Project’s support and funding, child labor would have slipped lower in our research agenda”. Collaboration with UCW had helped focus our attention on this continuing problem.

### **2.3. Output 3: Child domestic work**

Two thirds of the knowledgeable respondents say that the Project’s support around WDAFL has helped raise awareness on child labour (while one third marked “3”). Moreover, GAP-11 support has built at least some capacity for raising awareness and conducting advocacy: Nearly half of the respondents marked “4” on this question.

Responses to the question to what extent GAP-11 support had influenced priorities for improving policies and programmes on child labour in domestic work were somewhat mixed: While 67% clearly thought so (marking “4” or “5”), while the other respondents were more reluctant.

Just over half of the knowledgeable respondents thought that their country was advanced in implementing the recommendations set forth in the Protective Policy Framework on child labour in domestic work, and even fewer (42%) expect major progress over the next 12 months, in this regard.

## **3. Summary of respondents’ overall assessment**

### **3.1. Responsiveness of support to countries’ needs and priorities**

Responses show that the support extended by the Project has been overall responsive to national needs and priorities. For example, a Government counterpart from Azerbaijan noted that “all the requests and inquiries from the Ministry of Labor were addressed adequately and timely.” In Timor Leste, one of the key incidences of GAP-11 response to country needs was the national survey on child and forced labour as a result of the Government request for numbers on both issues.

Likewise, a Government counterpart from Lao PDR confirmed that the Project had contributed to the achievement of some of the country's needs and priorities, especially the 8th Five-Year National Socio-Economic Development Plan as a whole and the 3rd Five-Year Labour and Social Welfare Development Plan of the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, while an ILO national staff from Paraguay stated GAP-11 had been in close alignment with national policy and the national strategy against child labour.

### **3.2. Satisfaction with GAP-11's communication and cooperation**

Overall, respondents were also very satisfied with the way in which the Project communicated and cooperated with national stakeholders. For example, a Government counterpart from Rwanda called the Project “very cooperative”, and the ILO was characterized a “key partner of the Government of Rwanda in combatting child labour in terms of a policy on elimination of child labour dissemination and laws enforcement on child labour since 2011”. A Government counterpart from Lao PDR expressed his/her satisfaction with the support from ILO in terms of financial and technical supports on the protection and elimination of child labour.

In Azerbaijan, GAP-11 reportedly had close cooperation and involvement of all its social partners and the Ministry of Labor in the framework of implementing child labor. Meanwhile, a respondent from an academic institution in Brazil confirmed that the Project had worked very closely with the Ministry of Social Development promoting discussions and actions against child labor.

Respondents expressed their specific appreciation of the Project's support for the NAP, as well as capacity building provided to the government, social partners and civil society groups.

According to a Government counterpart from Kenya, the Project has been “very efficient in communicating various issues concerning child labour”, while the communication with stakeholders was characterized by an NGO representative from Mali as “direct at all levels and via various channels (telephone, email, personal interaction) and on all aspects of the collaboration”, including immediate feedback. One NGO representative from Indonesia praised the fact that the Project had not only focused on the fulfilment of specific target, “but also understood the process happening in the field, listening and being responsive to our difficulties, and providing the consultations needed for searching for a solution.” A Government counterpart from Ecuador noted that the Project has been “strengthening conversation bridges and carrying out an implementation that is close to the ground.”

A respondent from an academic institution in Turkey said that in the context of the Project, UCW had been very responsive in their collaboration, with good communication via emails and Skype chats. Moreover, the researchers have reportedly “been able to receive feedback, though sometimes a little late, and the feedback has always been helpful.”

Only three slightly critical points were raised by the respondents:

- “The collaboration with the ILO should be deeper and more sustainable (Azerbaijan).”
- “Insufficient collaboration with technical services at regional and local level (Mali).”
- “The relationship with the Secretariat of State for Vocational Training and Employment Policy (SEPFOPE) is currently fragile and there is no direct communication between ILO and this Government institution (Timor Leste).”

### **3.3. Satisfaction with the results of GAP-11 activities**

The overwhelming majority of respondents said that they were very satisfied with the results achieved by the Project, particularly in the areas of awareness-raising, knowledge base, capacity-building, and legal reform.

For example, a respondent from Mongolia said that the activities had “always been successful and sustained” and had brought about “many positive changes and attitudes”. In particular, methodological tools and knowledge had been established, and the legal environment had improved. Moreover, the activities of the National Authority for Children as well as Ministry of Labour activities towards the implementation of NAP had started to improve as a direct result of ILO support.

A Government counterpart from Azerbaijan expressed his appreciation for the support and contribution of the Project in child labor prevention and elimination. In particular, capacity building, developing materials in Azeri, and organization of study visits had been “useful in building our potential within the ministry”.

Another expression of satisfaction came from a Government counterpart from Sierra Leone who said that “results are encouraging since much awareness has been created among key enforcement partners” and that some of the partners were currently engaged in child labour monitoring activities.

In contrast, a few respondents said that the results of the Project were not yet known, and one said that still more was expected in terms of capacity building, experience sharing and awareness raising.

A trade union representative from Paraguay said that the ILO “could have had a bigger role” and “could have achieved more and better results”, particularly with regard to supporting the development of a NAP on forced labour, while a staff member of an academic institution in the Ukraine remarked that the causes and connections around child labour were still not yet known (despite a child labour survey that was carried out).

### **3.4. Problems and obstacles**

Roughly one third of the respondents reported that there had been no major problems or obstacles. The others mentioned obstacles related to (a) the political and/or social context, (b) administrative problems, (c) technical issues, (d) financial resources, (e) cooperation, and (f) sustainability.

#### **(a) Political/social context**

This category received the most comments from respondents, who complained about lack of political will, prevalence of political instability, tardiness of legal reforms, or prevailing social barriers to tackling child labour in their countries.

### **(b) Administrative problems**

Three respondents lamented the short duration of the Project, while three others mentioned delays in the implementation, completion of the contract, or disbursement of funds.

### **(c) Technical issues**

Some respondents mentioned specific technical problems that arose during the implementation, such as:

- Inadequate logistical support for child labour monitoring activities in the informal sector (Sierra Leone).
- Lack of guidance to publish the research studies (Brazil).
- Lack of capacity building for social partners (Azerbaijan)
- Lack of capacity building for MoL administration on international standards in combatting child labour and on legal compliance (Rwanda)
- Surveying advantaged households, and surveying children in the presence of parents (Mali)

### **(d) Financial resources**

Seven respondents highlighted a lack of financial resources for child labour activities. One of them particularly mentioned a lack of funds for monitoring and evaluation of the activities, while another complained that the limited resources did not allow for visiting the rural areas.

### **(e) Cooperation**

A few respondents criticized the lack of international sharing of experiences in the context of the project. For example, a trade union representative from Paraguay said that an exchange with Brazil would have been useful for the development of the NAP on forced labour. A representative from an academic institution requested an annual international conference of child labour researchers to be organized by the Project.

Moreover, one respondent mentioned the lack of consultation of local stakeholders in the conception phase of the project, while another regretted the lack of collaboration with technical services at regional and local level.

### **(f) Follow-up and sustainability**

One respondent (Government counterpart from Togo) was concerned about the lack of follow-up at the national level, and two respondents (Government counterparts from Comoros and Gabon) worried generally about the problem of sustainability after the closure of the project.

### **3.5. Significant achievements**

According to the respondents, GAP-11's greatest achievements are (a) enhanced capacity of key stakeholders, (b) heightened public awareness of child labour and/or forced labour, (c) Political, legal and institutional reform, (d) an improved knowledge base, and (e) better coordination among key actors. In this regard, the first three areas (a) to (c) received almost equal attention.

#### **(a) Enhanced capacity**

Several respondents emphasized the important contribution towards building the capacity of Ministry of Labour staff, including labour inspectors, for child labour monitoring. Specifically, some respondents affirmed that law enforcement at district and local level had been strengthened, and that labour inspection had become more effective. An ILO national staff from Togo noted the mainstreaming of child labour issues into the curriculum at the National School of Administration of Labour Inspection as a particular achievement.

The development of specific tools for labour inspection in certain sectors with a high prevalence of the worst forms of child labour (e.g. cotton or informal sector) was also appreciated by several respondents.

Social partners commended the enhancement of their institutional capacity, e.g. through a National Action Plan by their organization and training of member organizations.<sup>54</sup>

Two respondents mentioned the improved capacity for research, e.g. through the use of a data collection tool for partners in child labour activities.

#### **(b) Heightened awareness**

The Project's efforts have led to an increased awareness and visibility of child labour and/or forced labour in many countries, according to the respondents. As a result, more attention was paid to these issues at national, district, and local levels.

One respondent (Government counterpart from Mali) specifically noted the positive effect of this on the agricultural sector, where farmers now took child labour issues into consideration during the planning of their activities. An NGO representative from Indonesia heralded the impact on child domestic work, saying that "Continuing socialization about child domestic workers including a campaign not to employ children as domestic workers has affected community members. Many of them stopped employing children and began employing adult ones. As a result, the number of children employed as child domestic workers decreased significantly."

---

<sup>54</sup> Regarding training provided by the Project, a Government counterpart from Gabon praised the quality of the experts sent by the ILO, who "share their knowledge on various issues with a sound pedagogy, simplicity, and good humour", and "whose messages are well received."

The activities around WDACL have played a crucial role in this regard, according to at least two respondents.

In at least one country (Rwanda), the heightened awareness had reportedly indirectly affected the national labour law, according to a Government counterpart

### **(c) Policy, legal and institutional reform**

Significant achievements in the areas of policy, legal and institutional reform include the elaboration of a national policy or National Action Plan in several countries, as highlighted by the respondents. Other respondents specifically mentioned the establishment of National Commission on Child Labour, the adoption of a Roadmap against child labour in domestic work, and the revision of the legal code to include child labour issues.

Respondents from several countries emphasized the development of a list of hazardous work (and, in the case of Kenya, of light work) for children as a major achievement.

### **(d) Improved knowledge base**

Various aspects of an improved knowledge base regarding child labour and/or forced labour were mentioned by the respondents. For example, an ILO national staff from Togo underlined the importance of the enhanced knowledge on strategies for promoting decent work for young people in domestic work.

As a result of GAP-11 support in Turkey, the partner institution funded a research paper on school-to-work transition, commenting that “as far as we know, it is the only research paper done on this topic. The results are being presented in various national and international conferences.” Moreover, the same partner agency announced that they were currently funding a research paper on the detrimental effects of having worked as a child on adult outcomes.

Several respondents drew attention to the fact that good practices were now documented and available in their countries, thanks to GAP-11 support. Two of them also stressed the usefulness of international sharing of these good practices.

### **(e) Coordination**

An ILO national staff from Azerbaijan mentioned an “improvement of inter-agency coordination in child labor”.