

# Independent Final Evaluation of “Elimination of Child Labour in Seasonal Agriculture”– Evaluation Report

ILO DC/SYMBOL:	TUR/20/01/EUR
Type of Evaluation:	External
Evaluation timing:	Final
Evaluation nature:	Independent
Project countries:	Türkiye
P&B Outcome(s):	Outcome 7: “Adequate and effective protection at work for all”
P&B 2020-2021 and UNSDCF (2021-2025) in Türkiye.	
SDG(s):	Project contributes to SDG target 8, Specifically 8.7 calling for immediate measures to secure the prohibition and elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour.
ILO Administrative Office:	ILO CO Ankara
ILO Technical Offices:	
Joint evaluation agencies:	N/A
Project duration:	October 2020 – January 2025
Donor and budget:	European Union – 29.726.740,90 EUR
Name of consultants:	Sten Toft Petersen, International Consultant Yesim Mutlu, National Consultant
Name of Evaluation Manager:	Perihan Tawfik
Evaluation Office oversight:	Ricardo Furman
Evaluation budget:	UDS 54,849.22

*Key Words: child labour, agriculture, seasonal work, occupational health and safety, education, groups on risk, accommodation, legislation, emerging good practises*

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgement .....	4
Acronyms.....	5
Executive Summary .....	7
1. Description of the Project .....	14
1.1 Context .....	14
1.2. Background of the Program .....	16
1.2.1 Rationale of the Project.....	17
1.2.2 Particular Added-Value Elements.....	17
1.3 Aim of the Project .....	18
1.4 Project Management.....	19
2. Purpose, scope and clients of the Evaluation .....	20
2.1 Evaluation background.....	20
2.2 Purpose of the evaluation .....	20
2.3 Scope of the Evaluation.....	21
2.4 Evaluation criteria .....	22
2.5 Main evaluation questions:.....	23
2.6 Clients of the evaluation .....	25
3. Methodology and limitations .....	26
3.1 Limitations.....	30
4. Findings .....	31
4.1 Relevance .....	32
4.2 Coherence .....	34
4.3 Effectiveness .....	35
4.4 Efficiency .....	43
4.5 Sustainability and emergent impact .....	46
4.6. Cross cutting issues .....	51
5. Conclusion .....	52
5.1 Recommendations .....	53
5.2 Lessons learned and emerging good practises .....	56
Annex II: Emerging good Practices.....	58
Annex I Indicative Work Plan .....	59
Annex II Groups of informants .....	61
Annex III List of informants .....	63
Annex IV Documents reviewed .....	67
Annex V Overview of Stakeholders, Topics and Data Collection Methodologies.....	68
Annex VI Meeting Schedule (6-23 January 2025) .....	72
Annex VII Main Recommendations of Mid-Term Evaluation .....	78

Annex VIII Guidelines for semi-structured interviews and FGDs .....	80
Annex IX Terms of Reference .....	112
<b>Final independent evaluation of the Project “project “Elimination of.....</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>1. Key facts .....</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>2. Background information .....</b>	<b>114</b>
Background of the Project .....	114
Project Strategies .....	115
Project alignment with the DWCP, P&B, CPO & SDG.....	117
Project Management .....	117
Main Recommendations and Follow Up Actions of Mid-Term Evaluation <sup>1</sup> .....	118
<b>3. Purpose, objectives, and scope of the evaluation.....</b>	<b>120</b>
The Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation .....	120
Scope of Evaluation.....	122
<b>4. Evaluation criteria and questions (including Cross-cutting issues/ issues of special interest to the ILO).....</b>	<b>122</b>
<i>Relevance</i> .....	124
<i>Coherence</i> .....	124
<i>Effectiveness</i> .....	124
<i>Efficiency</i> .....	126
<i>Sustainability and emergent impact</i> .....	126
<i>General</i> .....	127
<b>5. Methodology .....</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>6. Main deliverables .....</b>	<b>129</b>
Workshop: To present the preliminary results to the stakeholders for their feedback .....	130
<b>7. Management arrangements and work plan (including timeframe) .....</b>	<b>132</b>
Place of Work .....	132
Timeframe workday requirements.....	134
<b>8. Profile of the evaluation team.....</b>	<b>134</b>
The final selection of the evaluator(s) will be done by the EVAL/ILO. ....	136

## Acknowledgement

This report was prepared by Sten Toft Petersen; International Consultant, and Yesim Mutlu National Consultant. Perihan Tawfik, the ILO Evaluation Manager, provided excellent support and guidance throughout the process as well as valuable comments for the evaluation report.

The management and program staff in the ILO Country Office, in Ankara, was headed by Country Director, Yasser Ahmed Hassan. The project team was very helpful in providing information and reaching out to stakeholders, and this is highly appreciated. A special thanks go to Fatma Gelir Ünal and Burcu Kabil for their continued support throughout the evaluation.

The evaluator would also like to thank the ILO constituents and its implementing partners. A special thanks is due to the key informants from the Ministry of Labour and Social Security and the Ministry of National Education, who provided insight into the context's challenges and possibilities. The implementing partners were also very helpful in establishing the institutional memory, as concerns the Project and for arranging the extensive field visits.

## Acronyms

CA	Contracting Authority
CLU	Unit of Combating Child Labour
CPO	Country Programme Objectives
CO	Country Office
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DGMM	Directorate General of Migration Management
EESP SOP	Employment, Education and Social Policies Sectoral Operational Programme
e-METIP	Seasonal Agricultural Workers Information System
EO	Employers Organisation
EU	European Union
EUD	European Union Delegation to Türkiye
EVAL	ILO Evaluation Office
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
ILO	International Labour Organisation
ILS	International Labour Standards
ITC ILO	International Training Centre of ILO
İŞKUR	Turkish Employment Agency
LC	Labour Code
METIP	Seasonal Agricultural Workers Project
MoAF	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
MoLSS	Ministry of Labour and Social Security
MoH	Ministry of Health
Mol	Ministry of Interior
MoNE	Ministry of National Education
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee
OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
PD	Project Document
PMT	Project Management Team
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals

SuTP	Syrians Under Temporary Protection
ToR	Terms of Reference
TU	Trade Union
TURKSTAT	Turkish Statistical Institute
UN	United Nations
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNSDCF	United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
VET	Vocational Education and Training
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labour
YLF	Young Life Foundation

## BACKGROUND & CONTEXT

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

Child labour is a problem that many countries still cannot fully solve. The problem is more intensive in developing countries but can also be found in many developed countries. According to global estimates around 160 million children worldwide were engaged in child labour at the start of 2020. When the “Elimination of Child Labour in Seasonal Agriculture” project was designed the number of child workers in the world was 152 million. Child labour accounted for approximately 9.6% of the total child population. More than half of these children, about 73 million, were engaged in hazardous work and made up 4.6% of the world's child population. With the main objective of preventing child labour in Türkiye, the National Program on the Elimination of Child Labour (2017-2023) was developed. This includes comprehensive measures such as eradicating poverty, increasing the quality and accessibility of education, and improving public awareness and sensitivity. In the Action Plan annexed to the National Program, the main policies, strategies and activities to be carried out in 2017-2023 in order to combat child labour were determined.

Within the agriculture sector in Türkiye, the “National Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (2017-2023)” identifies working in mobile and temporary agricultural labour (except for family run farms) as one of the worst forms of child labour. This is because of the nature of seasonal agricultural work, which exposes families to all types of risks to which children are the most vulnerable.

Combating child labour has always been a priority for ILO, ever since its foundation in 1919. The ILO Office for Türkiye has given priority to combatting child labour related activities since 1992 in cooperation with national stakeholders. The ILO’s Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour in Seasonal Agriculture in Türkiye, prepared in line with the priorities of the National Employment Strategy (2014-2023) and National Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (2017-2023), planned to engage in comprehensive work to eliminate child labour in Türkiye. The ILO maintains that it is not possible to achieve the future of work, with decent work and sustainable income for all, without eliminating child labour. The ILO Office for Türkiye uses the Programme of 2021-2025 to focus on quality education as its key strategy to eliminate child labour; including, primarily the worst forms, and it continues to support the national partners with effective enforcement of legislation, expanding social protection and social dialogue.

The Overall Objective of the Project is described as:

- to contribute to elimination of the worst forms of child labour in seasonal agriculture.

With the Specific Objective:

	<p>- to enhance national and local capacity for the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in seasonal agriculture as well as providing services to children at risk and their families.</p> <p>For achieving this objective, the Project was built on five Outcomes each with specific expected Outputs:</p> <p>Outcome 1: Working/at-risk children are withdrawn or prevented from work in seasonal agriculture; families, employers, agriculture intermediaries and village heads abstain from or take action to combat child labour.</p> <p>Outcome 2: MoFLSS, workers' and employers' organizations, gendarmerie, NGOs take coordinated action for policy development and implementation to eliminate the WFCL.</p> <p>Outcome 3: illingness among general public and target groups to eliminate child labour in seasonal agriculture is enhanced.</p> <p>Outcome 4: Advocacy for, formulation, planning and implementation of policies to eliminate child labour in seasonal agriculture is enhanced.</p> <p>Outcome 5: Coordination and cooperation between stakeholders in areas of implementation and management of child labour interventions at national and local level is strengthened.</p>
<b>Present situation of the project</b>	<p>The COVID-19 pandemic and the devastating earthquake that hit Türkiye in 2023 meant that there were some minor changes in the implementation of some of the activities; however, the intervention logic was maintained as per its original intention and the Project Team made the necessary arrangements to meet the Project's implementation plan. In addition to the changes required by these devastating natural disasters, the Project Management Team (PMT) proposed some minor adaptations, which reflected the need to provide support for disaster-affected people in the target regions. These changes had a minor impact on the achievement of the planned targets.</p> <p>The Project adopted a multi-sectoral approach to tackle a multifaceted problem, recognising that child labour in seasonal agriculture is a complex issue that has social, educational, legal and economic dimensions. Geographically, the Project covered a number of cities that hosted and received seasonal migrant workers; namely, Şanlıurfa, Mardin, Adıyaman, Diyarbakır, Adana, Mersin, Hatay, Isparta, İzmir, Manisa, Ankara, Eskişehir, Konya, Malatya, Ordu, Bursa and Düzce.</p> <p>The direct implantation was to a large extent executed by two implementing partners. A project advisory committee with participation of the ILO constituents was established.</p> <p>The project ends in early 2025 and no continuation into a new phase is foreseen.</p>
<b>Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation</b>	<p>The evaluation covered the entire duration of the programme, i.e. since its inception in October 2020 to January 2025. It considered the large number of documents that were linked to the Project. These included the Project document, periodic reports, the results of the MTE and implementation of its recommendations, as well as documents that were produced as outputs of the Project (e.g. knowledge products, policy strategies/briefs, and information, education and communication (IEC) materials, etc.).</p>



	<p>The evaluation covered the Project office in Ankara, as well as a number of other cities that hosted and received seasonal migrant workers; namely Şanlıurfa, Adana, İzmir, Eskişehir and Ordu. The evaluation integrated gender equality, the inclusion of people with disabilities, environmental sustainability, ILS and social dialogue as crosscutting concerns throughout its methodology and deliverables. This is based on EVAL's protocols on cross-cutting issues to ensure stakeholder participation in the evaluation process.</p> <p>The evaluation collected data and information from implementing partners and beneficiaries of the Project, including concerned constituents and relevant CSOs.</p> <p>The evaluation focused not only on what was achieved in terms of results but also specially considered how and why those results were achieved or not.</p> <p>The evaluation covered all of the planned Outputs and Outcomes under the Project to achieve the program goal of the Project. As the Project operated at the national level, with an emphasis on both policy-level engagements and service delivery, due consideration was given to national-level deliveries. Further attention was paid to assessing the sustainability of the Project's investments and to the recommendations for its sustainability as it comes to an end.</p>
<b>Methodology of evaluation</b>	<p>This evaluation complied with the UNEG's evaluation norms and standards, and followed ethical safeguards, as specified in the ILO's evaluation guidelines and procedures. The evaluation was conducted in a participatory manner, by engaging the stakeholders at different levels and ensuring that they had a say in the implementation of the Project, and that they could share their views and contribute to the evaluation as well as participate in the dissemination processes.</p> <p>The evaluation's methodology included examining the logical connect between the levels of results and their alignment with the ILO's strategic objectives and external factors/assumptions. Particular attention was paid to the logical connection between the levels of results and their alignment to the ILO's strategic objectives and outcomes, at the global and national levels, as well as that of the national strategic frameworks with the relevant SDGs and related targets, and other relevant external factors.</p> <p>The evaluation applied a mixed-method approach. Both qualitative and quantitative evaluation approaches were considered for this evaluation. First, the evaluators conducted a desk review of appropriate materials, including the Project document, the Logical Framework, progress reports, the minutes from management meetings and other outputs from the Project and relevant materials from secondary sources. Second, the evaluators collected other relevant data for the evaluation. Individual or group interviews and FGDs were conducted with the main stakeholders.</p>
<b>MAIN FINDINGS &amp; CONCLUSIONS</b>	<p>The project's most significant contribution was its long-term and wide-ranging scope of implementation. Additionally, the Project's monitoring activities, which covered both seasonal agricultural work periods and the return to the originating provinces, positively contributed to enrolling thousands of children into education.</p>

Children who otherwise would be exposed to the worst forms of child labour.

The project managed to develop strong ownership of the Project among government officials and to the fight for elimination of child labour, in general. The evaluation found a strong commitment among government officials. This commitment gives hope for the continuation of some of the activities that were successfully initiated within the Project. Further, officials expressed that they found a clear footprint from the Project and the ILO in the Presidential Circular 2024/5 which sets out a strong outline for the improvement of working and employment conditions for seasonal agricultural workers and, thereby, also for the elimination of child labour. Additionally, the MoNE issue Circular 2024/52 established, in detail, a framework for ending child labour and ensuring that the children attend education. These two documents will guide the work on elimination of child labour and enrolment of all children into education in the years to come. The evaluation finds that this is a major achievement of the Project, even if it was not explicitly foreseen in the Project document.

Although the agricultural workforce in Turkey is largely unorganised and in informal employment relations, the evaluation finds that ILO's experience, of working with social partners, its outreach and direct involvement with trade unions and various employers' associations and chambers, had the potential to enhance the effectiveness of the Project and establish an ownership among constituents. This can be seen as a missed opportunity for strengthening social dialogue.

The project engaged in some one-off activities, e. g., vocational training. The evaluation found that these initiatives were only partially successful, as there was no evidence of increased employability as a result. The evaluation finds that the vocational training for adults would have benefitted from a stronger needs analysis and selection of participants.

The justification for establishment of accommodation facilities with farmers that only invite seasonal workers for 3-4 weeks per year (and sometimes even less) should be further scrutinised, together with local stakeholders, to find the most efficient solution that justifies the investment.

The project contributed significantly to the establishment of one integrated database – the e-METIP – which was developed to include all the accessible information about seasonal agricultural workers and their children. It is expected to become a flagship in the government's efforts to eliminate child labour; but, at the end of the Project it was still facing some challenges and not up and running in full.

## RECOMMENDATIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

### *Recommendation 1*

The ILO and the donor are recommended to consider whether the current project was perhaps too big and would have benefitted from being divided thematically and geographically, to ensure a stronger focus. This Recommendation was suggested by the

stakeholders and the evaluation finds the recommendation well-placed.

*Recommendation 2*

The ILO implements many projects, which have elements of construction activities included in them and often, as in the current project, with relatively large investments. However, there is no in-house capacity/expertise to guide these activities. The implementation of the construction activities builds on external expertise, which might not have full insight of ILO principles. It is recommended that the ILO build up its construction expertise to ensure cost efficiency and quality.

*Recommendation 3*

It is recommended to include an expert in children's rights in all projects involving children. This would ensure that the mechanisms that assure the meaningful participation of children in every action and decision affecting them are made operational and include all children in the Project's activities and while embracing diversity in project planning as well as implementation.

*Recommendation 4*

The current project had limited visibility, except for at the national level. At the local level the Project was, to a large extent, seen as a project belonging to the implementing partners. The evaluation finds it important that the ILO maintains its relevance and shows its presence in all projects being implemented, as this not only strengthens the authority of the Office but also the normative framework that the ILO stands for.

*Recommendation 5*

The ILO is recommended to collaborate with local stakeholders when developing activities to be implemented at the local level. Local stakeholders will have better insight into the needs of beneficiaries and better ways of avoiding potential conflicts between different local groups. Involving local stakeholders, will make it easier to put a "do no harm" approach in place.

*Recommendation 6*

It is generally recognised that the CLU members can play a key role in eliminating child labour, thanks to their outreach to the local communities. The government is recommended to strengthen the capacity and competence of the CLU's members and to ensure that they are credited for the work they do.

*Recommendation 7*

The evaluation understands that an efficient end to child labour can only be put in place, once a critical mass of key stakeholders and the general public accept there is a need to eliminate child labour. It is therefore recommended that a coordinated awareness-raising campaign be initiated that is targeted specifically at the general public and stakeholders.

*Recommendation 8*

It is understood that transportation from the settlements to school is a problem for many seasonal agricultural worker parents who want to send their children to school. Therefore, the government is recommended to consider moving primary schools and kindergartens out to the worker settlements. Including kindergartens would create a culture of learning amongst the

children and thereby make it easier to attract them to school when they come of school age.

*Recommendation 9*

The evaluation understands that amendments to the Labour Code and new regulations for private employment agencies are underway in Türkiye. These amendments would allow agricultural workers to be covered by the Labour Code and the Private Employment Agencies would take over the functions that have been handled by intermediaries until now. The ILO is recommended to offer its full support to both initiatives, which are aimed at eliminating child labour and improving working and employment conditions for seasonal agricultural workers. The ILO has strong capacity in and experience of both issues, so it would be a missed opportunity not to offer full support.

*Recommendation 10*

The Government should establish an “All-Government” approach to child labour, including when it comes to the funding of child labour activities. This approach would be in line with the Presidential Circular 2024/5. It is expected that municipalities would play a major role in financing the activities, therefore it would also be important that they are included in the “All-Government” approach.

*Recommendation 11*

The ILO CO is recommended to raise funds for capacity building, targeted at the social partners, for their internal discussions and policy development on child labour based on which potential joint training could be developed.

*Recommendation 12*

The current project provided vocational training to a group of adults, but there was no assessment of their increased employability. The ILO CO is recommended to conduct a tracer study, among the VET participants, to learn how to prepare for possible future interventions.

*Recommendation 13*

The current project did not have gender disaggregated data in its design. Consequently, reporting did not have fully gender-disaggregated data either. Gender quotas were also not put in place. The implementing partners were not asked to establish gender aggregated data. The evaluation strongly recommends that in future projects such data are requested from the development of the Project document.

**Main lessons learned and good practices**

*Lessons Learned*

Some of the local institutions/organisations that were interviewed during the evaluation particularly emphasised the importance of localisation and collaborating with local organisations. The stakeholders highlighted that local knowledge is crucial for achieving the goals of projects such as the current one. They also see it as important for strengthening local actors. Additionally, having mechanisms to provide feedback from the field is considered critical.

The need for stronger local insight also came to the surface in connection with the VET initiative, undertaken for adult seasonal agriculture workers.

Many stakeholders and beneficiaries find it acceptable for children, aged 14-15 and older, to work; this perception can be seen as an indication of the need for a mindset shift. There was almost no work in the Project specifically targeting this age group.

*Emerging Good Practises*

The Project established strong cooperation with the MoLSS and through this a strong engagement and feeling of ownership among officials from different relevant departments of the Ministry. Field visits are critical as an empowering and capacity-building activity that allows stakeholders to better understand the reality of the issue addressed in the Project.

# 1. Description of the Project

## 1.1 Context

Child labour is a problem that many countries still cannot fully solve. Although the problem is more prevalent in developing countries, it is also found in many developed countries. According to global estimates, around 160 million children worldwide were engaged in child labour at the start of 2020. At the time the “Elimination of Child Labour in Seasonal Agriculture” project was designed, the number of child workers in the world was 152 million, with approximately 9.6% of that total being child labourers. In addition, more than half of those children, about 73 million (or 4.6% of the world's child population<sup>1</sup>), were engaged in hazardous work.

Therefore, the National Program on the Elimination of Child Labour (2017-2023) was developed, with its main objective being the preventing child labour. The program includes comprehensive measures, such as eradicating poverty, increasing the quality and accessibility of education and improving public awareness and sensitivity. The National Program’s annexed Action Plan determined the main policies, strategies and activities, to be carried out between 2017 and 2023, in order to combat child labour.

Within the agriculture sector in Türkiye, the “National Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (2017-2023)” identifies working in mobile and temporary agricultural labour (except for family run farms) as one of the worst forms of child labour. This is because of the nature of seasonal agricultural work, which exposes families to all types of risks to which children are the most vulnerable.

The Employment, Education and Social Policies Sectoral Operational Programme (EESP SOP) also points out that the children of adult seasonal workers usually accompany their parents when moving from place to place for work, for economic and social reasons. As a result, children often work, alongside their parents and other adults, to ensure the subsistence of their household incomes, but in jobs that are not suitable for their age. During peak working periods, children do not attend school regularly (if at all) and fall behind in their classes. Thus, seasonal agricultural work poses a serious threat to children’s physical, psychosocial and educational development, in both the short and long-term.

The most common difficulties that child labour poses, in the agricultural sector, are the interruption of attendance in compulsory primary education and the application of a minimum age. These children most often work seasonally, for 4-7 months, leaving their hometown to work, notably in plant production works, such as weeding, cleaning and harvesting etc. These jobs all pose a high risk of occupational disease and work accidents. Children are also faced with other problems, such as fatigue (caused by working in extremely hot and humid environments) and the dangers provoked by the use of chemical substances (especially pesticides and herbicides), bug bites and back pain that is caused by bending to work for long periods of time. At the same time, their schooling is interrupted. Leaving school prematurely means an inability to receive an adequate education which leads to children’s becoming adults in the low-qualified labour force. Thus, a vicious cycle of poverty is reinforced.

The poor accommodation and working conditions, associated with seasonal migration throughout their childhoods, can also lead to chronic health problems in the children’s

---

<sup>1</sup> Global Estimates of Child Labour, Results and Trends, 2012-2016 – ILO, 2017

subsequent lives.

In 1994, 1999, 2006, 2012 and 2019, TURKSTAT conducted Child Labour Force Surveys, in order to obtain disaggregated data, such as by sector and including social, economic and demographic characteristics, educational status, age groups and sex. According to the results of their 2019 Child Labour Force Survey, 4.4% of children in the age group between 6-17 were working. Out of those 720,000 working children, 146,000 were aged between 6-14 and 574,000 were aged between 15-17. Within the working children, 70.6% or 508,000, were boys and 29.4%, 212,000 individuals, were girls. The number of working children, in the age group of 6-17 in Türkiye, was 16,457,000. As concerned the branches of economic activity, working children were mainly engaged in services (45.5% - 328,000), followed by agriculture (30.8% - 221,000) and industry (23.7% - 171,000).

Working as an agricultural worker or participating in seasonal agricultural migration can also increase a child's vulnerability, in terms of violence, neglect and abuse, thereby negatively affecting his/her emotional and social development.

The mechanisation of agricultural work means that children are exposed to additional risks, such as the hazards that are inherent in the machinery and equipment used, as well as exposure to pesticides, long working hours, exposure to climate conditions (hot and cold), and heavy load lifting and transportation. These physical strains are the reasons that work in agriculture is included within the scope of heavy and hazardous work. It also means that children, working in agriculture, can have accidents, their risk of getting occupational diseases increases, they cannot receive adequate education, and their physical and cognitive development falls behind. However, it is also noted that a large percentage of the children working in agriculture work in family farms, to help the adults of the family. For this reason, work that was performed in family farms was not included in the scope of targeted child labour in agriculture as identified in the National Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (2017-2023).

The National Employment Strategy (2014-2023), which was prepared under the coordination of the MoLSS, aimed to reduce the worst forms of child labour in heavy and hazardous work in industry, when working on the streets and in seasonal agriculture, to less than 2% of child labour.

The Seasonal Agricultural Workers Project (METİP) was also started, with the support of the current project, to be implemented by MoLSS and beginning in 2017, with the aims of eliminating the problems experienced by seasonal agricultural workers and their families and directing their children towards educational and social activities, instead of working. Subsequently, the Seasonal Agricultural Workers Information System (e-METİP) was activated, to monitor and evaluate the Project's activities. This is an electronic system for tracking seasonal agricultural work force mobility, which provides statistical information about seasonal agricultural workers and their children coming to the provinces.

The problem of child labour is multi-dimensional and multifactorial. All the factors that cause child labour are closely related, with poverty and unemployment at the top. Parents' unemployment and insufficient household income cause children to work. However, as a result of child labour, children's health is continuously being affected and children's well-being and human capital accumulation become negative. In the long term, this situation leads to the development of low-qualified individuals and, thus, a transfer of poverty from generation to generation.

Another major problem for the Project was that the administrative records that were held by the institutions engaged in the elimination of child labour had not been collected into a single system and could not be accessed by other relevant parties. Therefore, effective access could not be gained to any information about the current status of seasonal agricultural workers'

families and their children and/or whether they were benefitting from provided public services.

Therefore, it was suggested that there was a need to create a database, by establishing a data transfer mechanism between the relevant institutions that would be supported by the current Project through an improvement of the existing e-METİP system. This improvement would enable data sharing and integrated action among the relevant ministries (such as MoH, MoNE, Mol, and MoAF etc.) and MoLSS departments (ISKUR, SSI, General Directorate of Social Assistance, General Directorate of Family and Community Services etc.) as well as monitoring of the Action Plan of National Program on the Elimination of Child Labour.

The Project also aimed to strengthen the knowledge base on the elimination of child labour in seasonal agriculture through various studies. Baseline studies, in particular, were planned to address the lack of specific, official data on child labour in seasonal agriculture and the collected data was intended to form a basis for focused interventions.

## 1.2. Background of the Program

Combating child labour has always been a priority for ILO, ever since its foundation in 1919. The ILO Office for Türkiye has given priority to combatting child labour related activities since 1992 in cooperation with national stakeholders. The ILO's Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour in Seasonal Agriculture in Türkiye, prepared in line with the priorities of the National Employment Strategy (2014-2023) and National Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (2017-2023), planned to engage in comprehensive work to eliminate child labour in Türkiye. The ILO maintains that it is not possible to achieve the future of work, with decent work and sustainable income for all, without eliminating child labour. The ILO Office for Türkiye uses the Programme of 2021-2025 to focus on quality education as its key strategy to eliminate child labour; including, primarily the worst forms, and it continues to support the national partners with effective enforcement of legislation, expanding social protection and social dialogue.

The United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8 on decent work and economic growth and, specifically, Target 8.7, calls for immediate measures to secure the elimination of child labour in all of its forms, by 2025. Emphasizing that the goal could be reached by leaving no one behind, the United Nations declared 2021 as the "International Year for the Elimination of Child Labour" and initiated global action. The programme developed by the ILO Office for Türkiye aimed to support that global action at a local level and to ensure that the national work would set an international model.

The ILO plays a significant and catalytic role in creating interest, collaboration and coordination among the strategic institutions that act on child labour, and in developing replicable models of direct action, as well as contributing to the national strategy for the elimination of child labour. Given that, the Project aimed to contribute to the elimination of the worst forms of child labour (WFCL) in seasonal agriculture. More specifically, it aimed to enhance the national and local capacities for the elimination of WFCL in seasonal agriculture.

### Alignment with the P&B, CPO and SDG

On an international level, child labour projects contribute to a better implementation of the relevant International Labour Standards (ILS), which lead and guide the world of work. In this respect, the Project supported the implementation of ILO Conventions No.138 Minimum Age and No.182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour, both of which were ratified by Türkiye. It also



contributes to reaching Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8 of the 2030 Agenda on decent work and economic growth, and specifically to meeting target 8.7, which calls for immediate measures to secure the prohibition and elimination of the WFCL, and the end of child labour in all its forms, by 2025. In Alignment with SDG 8.7, the Project also contributed to “Outcome 7: Adequate and effective protection at work for all” of ILO’s Programme and Budget (2021- 2022) and the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (2021-2025) in Türkiye.

### 1.2.1 Rationale of the Project

The ILO is the only UN agency with a tripartite structure, wherein workers and employers participate with governments as equal partners, jointly shaping policies and programmes in the world of work. Child labour has been placed high on the ILO’s agenda since its establishment in 1919. Convention No. 138 on Minimum Age and Convention No.182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour are among the core ILO Conventions. The principles and rights, as embedded in the ILO Constitution and elaborated in ILO Conventions and Recommendations, were recognised in the 1998 Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and incorporated to the Decent Work Agenda. In 1992, the ILO created the “International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour” (IPEC), the largest programme of its kind globally and the biggest single operational programme within the ILO. Türkiye was one of the first six countries to participate in the IPEC. The ILO provided technical assistance to the Government of Türkiye, within the framework of the IPEC, through various programmes/projects in the areas of capacity building, promoting and coordinating partnerships, improving legislation and enforcement, building and using the knowledge base on child labour, awareness raising and social dialogue.

Until the current Project, the ILO CO in Ankara maintained the technical support for stand-alone projects and responded to child labour in seasonal agriculture, and in particular the hazelnut sector, through public-private partnership projects and, since 2012, in collaboration with the MoLSS. The ILO plays a significant and catalytic role in creating interest, collaboration and coordination among the strategic institutions that act on child labour, and in developing replicable models of direct action as well as in contributing to the national strategy on the elimination of child labour. The ILO has gained a high level of credibility among its national counterparts, based on its solid field experience in Türkiye. It was foreseen that the ILO’s comparative advantages in the area of child labour and its close partnership with the government, employers’ and workers’ organisations would allow it to make a coherent contribution to the implementation of the Project, profiting from its accumulated experience and lessons learned.

It was also supposed that the ILO’s unique mandate, to adopt and monitor the implementation of the International Labour Standards on child labour, as well as its extensive experience and high degree of technical competence, specialisation and administrative capacity on the elimination of child labour at national, regional and global levels, would allow the ILO to implement this Project and to provide technical assistance to the main direct beneficiary, the DG Labour of MoLSS.

### 1.2.2 Particular Added-Value Elements

The ILO is the only UN agency that has an equal representation between governments and representatives of employers’ and workers’ organisations, in order to shape standards, policies and programs for the world of work. Moreover, the ILO has significant expertise and

experience in supporting enabling environments that underpin inclusive socio-economic growth and decent work. It also has extensive experience in strengthening labour markets and promoting access to improved working conditions and fundamental rights at work, including through the involvement of its tripartite national constituents.

The ILO's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour aims to equip the ILO's constituents with the knowledge, expertise and necessary capacity to ensure the protection of children from hazardous work as well as facilitating their access to skills' development. It also aims to aid in a formalisation of the informal economy. The ILO's child labour-focused work aims to promote the move towards the formalisation of workplaces by promoting better and more productive work for adults and youth affected by child labour, by facilitating consultations on the transition to formality, and by helping workers to exercise their rights through self- organisation.

Furthermore, social dialogue is of fundamental importance in the promotion of decent work for all. The ILO contributes to the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in seasonal agriculture through consultations and collaboration with social partners. The ILO's tripartite structure ensures that the concerns of all social partners are taken into account equally and that their capacity is built up, the better to respond to the needs of children and to prevent children from working in seasonal agriculture in selected provinces. It also ensures the development of monitoring models and partnerships and, most importantly, broader policy advocacy and awareness raising that aims to develop, implement and monitor effective policies and programmes.

### 1.3 Aim of the Project

The Overall Objective of the Project is described as:

- to contribute to elimination of the worst forms of child labour in seasonal agriculture.

With the Specific Objective:

- to enhance national and local capacity for the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in seasonal agriculture as well as providing services to children at risk and their families.

To achieve this objective, the Project was built on five Outcomes, each with specific expected Outputs:

Outcome 1: Working/at-risk children are withdrawn or prevented from working in seasonal agriculture; families, employers, agriculture intermediaries and village heads abstain from or take action to combat child labour.

Outcome 2: MoFLSS, workers' and employers' organisations, gendarmerie, NGOs take coordinated action for policy development and implementation, to eliminate the WFCL.

Outcome 3: Willingness is enhanced among the general public and the target groups, to eliminate child labour in seasonal agriculture.

Outcome 4: Advocacy is enhanced for the formulation, planning and implementation of policies to eliminate child labour in seasonal agriculture.

Outcome 5: Coordination and cooperation are strengthened between stakeholders in areas of the implementation and management of child labour interventions at national and local levels.

The COVID-19 pandemic and the devastating earthquake that hit Türkiye in 2023 meant that there were some minor changes in the implementation of some of the activities; however, the intervention logic was maintained as per its original intention and the Project Team made the necessary arrangements to meet the Project's implementation plan. In addition to the changes required by these devastating natural disasters, the Project Management Team (PMT) proposed some minor adaptations, which reflected the need to provide support for disaster-affected people in the target regions. These changes had a minor impact on the achievement of the planned targets.

The Project's interventions were planned to be in line with the EESP SOP Activity 1.1; fighting child labour with a specific focus on the elimination of child labour in seasonal agriculture. It aimed to contribute to ensuring the sustainability of the interventions through capacity building at national, provincial, district and local levels; and policy advocacy and awareness raising, in line with the objectives of the EESP SOP, under the Activity 1.1 Promoting Decent Work. The intervention also contributed to the National Program on the Elimination of Child Labour (2017-2023), which included comprehensive measures such as eradicating poverty, increasing the quality and accessibility of education and improving public awareness and sensitivity.

The Project adopted a multi-sectoral approach to tackle a multifaceted problem, recognising that child labour in seasonal agriculture is a complex issue that has social, educational, legal and economic dimensions. Geographically, the Project covered a number of cities that hosted and received seasonal migrant workers; namely, Şanlıurfa, Mardin, Adıyaman, Diyarbakır, Adana, Mersin, Hatay, Isparta, İzmir, Manisa, Ankara, Eskişehir, Konya, Malatya, Ordu, Bursa and Düzce.

When the Project was designed there were no requirements for building the design of an ILO project on a formulated Theory of Change. Neither did the MTE recommend that a ToC should be developed.

## 1.4 Project Management

The ILO established a Project Management Team (PMT) for overall project management in Ankara. Local staff totalled 16 people: a Project Coordinator, a Communications Officer, a Training and Education Officer, a Child Labour Officer, a Governance and Compliance Officer, a Field Support Officer, a Social Support Officer, a Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, a Finance and Procurement Officer, an IT Officer, a Finance Assistant, a Procurement Assistant, an Administrative Assistant, a Social Support Assistant and a Field Support Assistant. Furthermore, there was one international staff member, a Technical Specialist. It was originally foreseen that the PMT would be situated in a rented office, outside the ILO premises (except for the Finance Officer, the Procurement Assistant and the Administrative and Finance Assistants who were based in the ILO premises). However, it was decided to place the full team in the ILO CO.

The Director of the ILO Office for Türkiye acted as the Responsible ILO Official for this Project. As the Head of the PMT, the Project Coordinator reported to the Director and facilitated the regular interaction of project activities and the Project's progress with the MoLSS, the EU Delegation and other relevant project stakeholders. Coordination was ensured through Management Meetings, which were held every two months, except from 2024 onwards; and through Project Steering Committee Meetings, which were held twice a year, except for 2023 and 2024. The members of the PMT provided up-to-date information and data on the Project's implementation and activities, when requested by the MoLSS, as well as the EU Delegation.

## 2. Purpose, scope and clients of the Evaluation

### 2.1 Evaluation background

The ILO considers evaluation an integral part of the implementation of technical cooperation activities. The ILO values evaluation for the purposes of accountability, learning, planning and building knowledge. This current evaluation will be conducted within the context of the criteria and approaches for international development assistance, as established by the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard, and according to the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System.

This evaluation follows the ILO's policy guidelines for results-based evaluation and the ILO's EVAL Policy Guidelines Checklist 4 "Validating methodologies", as well as Checklist 5 "Preparing the evaluation report".

For all practical purposes, the ToR and ILO's Evaluation policies and guidelines define the overall scope of this evaluation. All recommendations, emerging from the evaluation, are strongly linked to the findings of the evaluation and provide guidance to stakeholders on how they might address them.

The findings and recommendations of evaluations ensure accountability and learning to the ILO's constituents and stakeholders and learning for future programming. The findings and recommendations are also to be used as organisational learning, to improve the design and implementation of future relevant projects and programmes.

The independent final evaluation of project TUR/20/01/EUR was guided by the above points and builds on a Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the Project which was conducted in mid-2022. The MTE reviewed the Project's progress, achievements and challenges, and informed the ILO, the Project stakeholders, and the donor about the key lessons learned. It also made recommendations for the improvement and adjustments needed for the remaining project implementation period. It identified (i) gaps to be addressed to fulfil further sustainability of project initiatives beyond the lifetime of the current project; (ii) common gaps within the agriculture sector for broader intervention; and (iii) replicable good practices in the fight against child labour in the agriculture sector.

### 2.2 Purpose of the evaluation

The ILO uses evaluations for accountability and learning and for building knowledge. Therefore, this independent final evaluation reveals the extent to which the Project has achieved its aims and objectives to the ILO, the donor and its partners. Simultaneously, the evaluation ensures accountability to the beneficiary, the donor and the key stakeholders and promotes organisational learning within the ILO and its key stakeholders.

The evaluation identified strengths and weaknesses in the Project's design, strategy and implementation, as well as Lessons learned, Emerging Good Practices, and Recommendations. The lessons learned and recommendations, generated by the evaluation, will be shared with the Project's stakeholders. They might also provide the basis for the design of future intervention models within the country and beyond.

The evaluation considers the Project's relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and contributions to broader developmental impacts. Therefore, the objectives of this independent evaluation were to:

- Assess the relevance and coherence of the Project in addressing the constituents and target groups' needs.
- Assess the extent to which the Project achieved its stated objective and expected results, as concerns the different target groups, while identifying the supporting factors and constraints that led to them, including the implementation modalities chosen.
- Assess the extent to which the Project's partnership arrangements and ILO management contributed to the achievement of the stated objective and expected results.
- Identify any unexpected positive and/or negative results of the Project.
- Assess the extent to which the Project outcomes will be sustainable.
- Assess the integration of the ILO's cross-cutting themes (i.e., gender equality and non-discrimination, international labour standards, social dialogue and just environmental transition) in the Project's strategies and results
- Identify Lessons learned and Emerging Good Practices to inform the key stakeholders (i.e., the tripartite constituents, the national stakeholders, the donor and the ILO) for future, similar interventions.
- Provide Recommendations to project stakeholders, to promote sustainability and to support the further development of the Project outcomes; and
- Provide Recommendations to contribute to further project development towards the elimination of child labour in Türkiye.
- Assess the extent to which the Project addressed the Midterm Evaluation's Recommendations.
- Assess the ILO's cross-cutting criteria (ILS, social dialogue, gender and non-discrimination, disability inclusion and environmental sustainability). In particular, the extent to which gender equality consideration was considered within the design, M&E framework (indicators and data collection), and during the Project's implementation.

The evaluation identified the major challenges that were faced as well as the actions taken to address them, the Lessons Learned and the Emerging Good Practices for both accountability and learning.

The evaluation assessed the alignment of the Project interventions with the ILO's strategic objectives and policy outcomes as well as United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) and other national development frameworks. In particular, the evaluation analysed the Project's contribution to the decent work agenda. Lastly, the evaluation determined the coordination mechanisms with other ILO interventions in the field of child labour.

The evaluation's recommendations were developed considering the above objectives.

## 2.3 Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation covered the entire duration of the programme, i.e. since its inception in October 2020 to January 2025. It considered the large number of documents that were linked to the Project. These included the Project document, periodic reports, the results of the MTE and implementation of its recommendations, as well as documents that were produced as outputs of the Project (e.g. knowledge products, policy strategies/briefs, and information, education and communication (IEC) materials, etc.).

The evaluation covered the Project office in Ankara, as well as a number of other cities that

hosted and received seasonal migrant workers; namely Şanlıurfa, Adana, İzmir, Eskişehir and Ordu. The evaluation integrated gender equality, the inclusion of people with disabilities, environmental sustainability, ILS and social dialogue as crosscutting concerns throughout its methodology and deliverables. This is based on EVAL's protocols on cross-cutting issues to ensure stakeholder participation in the evaluation process.

The evaluation collected data and information from implementing partners and beneficiaries of the Project, including concerned constituents and relevant CSOs.

The evaluation focused not only on what was achieved in terms of results but also specially considered how and why those results were achieved or not.

The evaluation covered the activities, outputs and outcomes of the Project for the period from October 2020 to January 2025. It covered all of the planned Outputs and Outcomes under the Project to achieve the program goal of the Project. As the Project operated at the national level, with an emphasis on both policy-level engagements and service delivery, due consideration was given to national-level deliveries. Further attention was paid to assessing the sustainability of the Project's investments and to the recommendations for its sustainability as it comes to an end.

The evaluation integrated not only gender equality throughout the process but also social inclusion and other non-discrimination issues.

The evaluators reviewed the extent to which the possible data and information was disaggregated by gender and assessed the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improving the lives of women and men. All of this information is included in this report. International Labour Standards (ILS), social dialogues and tripartism, and a value for money approach were integrated throughout the seven evaluation criteria.

In relation to gender equality, and where possible, the evaluation was conducted with gender equality as a mainstreamed approach and concern. This implied (i) applying gender analysis by involving both men and women in consultation and the evaluation's analysis; (ii) the inclusion of data disaggregated by gender in the analysis and justification of project documents; (iii) the formulation and/or analysis of gender-sensitive strategies and objectives and gender-specific indicators; (iv) the inclusion of qualitative methods and the use of a mix of methodologies; and (v) the assessment of outcomes to improve the lives of women and men.

For these reasons, the analysis of gender-related concerns was based on the ILO's Guidance Note 3.1: Integrating Gender Equality in Monitoring and Evaluation, and the Supplementary Guidance Note: integrating gender equality in ILO M&E (Nov. 2023). The evaluation followed the UN's evaluation standards and norms.

## 2.4 Evaluation criteria

This evaluation applied the key criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact potential and apply international approaches for international development assistance that were established by the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard and in line with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). In particular,

- The evaluation addresses the evaluation criteria related to relevance, coherence, project progress/ achievements and effectiveness, efficiency in the use of resources, impact, and sustainability of the Project interventions as defined in the 4<sup>th</sup> edition of the ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation (2020).

- The evaluation adhered to confidentiality and other ethical considerations throughout, following the United Nations Evaluation Group's (UNEG) Ethical Guidelines and Norms and Standards in the UN System. The evaluation process observed confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. To mitigate bias during the data collection process and to ensure maximum freedom of expression from the implementing partners, beneficiaries and other stakeholders, project staff were not present during interviews.
- The core ILO cross-cutting priorities, such as gender equality and non-discrimination, the promotion of international labour standards, tripartism, and constituent capacity development were considered in this evaluation, and throughout the methodology of the evaluation.
- The evaluation assessed the effects of any unexpected factors, such as COVID-19 and an earthquake, on the Project's implementation, and whether the Project addressed them effectively.
- The evaluation addressed all of the questions, detailed below, to the greatest extent possible.

## 2.5 Main evaluation questions:

The evaluation criteria and indicative questions are given below:

### 1. **Relevance**

- 1.1 Were the Project approach and activities relevant to the needs of the constituents (Government of Turkey, employers' and workers' organisations) and the stated objectives?
- 1.2 Was there a fit between the Project design and the direct beneficiaries' needs?
- 1.3 To what extent did the Project address the key relevant components of and contribute to UN Country programme frameworks (UNSDCF), strategic country development documents, and Sustainable Development Goals – especially SDG 8 as well as ILO's strategic and national policy frameworks??
- 1.4 Has the Project reflected on general policies? Does the Project relate to the ILO results framework (including P&B 2022-23) and the ILO mandate and relevant policies, including gender equality and non-discrimination, disability inclusion, international labour standards, social dialogue and just transition on environment?

### 2. **Coherence**

- 2.1 How well did the Project's interventions fit with other interventions of the ILO Office for Türkiye? What synergies were created? How well did the Project's interventions fit with other interventions of the relevant partners?
- 2.2 How well did the Project's design and implementations take into account the national institutions work in child labour elimination that goes with Türkiye have national efforts on elimination of child labour?
- 2.3 Has the Project established partnerships with relevant organisations/institutions at the global and country-level throughout its implementation? What were their roles? What were their expectations? To what extent have these partnerships been useful in the achievement of the intended results?
- 2.4 What was the added value of the ILO's work in terms of comparative advantage(s)?



### **3. Effectiveness**

- 3.1 To what extent were the Project's objectives achieved? Were there any notable successes or innovations? What were the positive factors, and obstacles or barriers, to achieving the Project's results?
- 3.2 Were there any unintended results (positive or negative)?
- 3.3 How effective was the capacity building of national stakeholders' activities, especially those started in the second part of the Project (after the mid-term evaluation)?
- 3.4 To what extent did the Project adapt its approach, to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic and the earthquake crisis, and what were the implications of those on the nature and degree of achievement of the Project and its targets? Did the Project foster the ILO constituents' active involvement throughout the Project, via social dialogue to articulate a response to the immediate effects of the crisis? How were gender considerations mainstreamed throughout the Project cycle (planning, implementation and M&E), including that of the implementation partners?
- 3.5 Was the quality of the outputs satisfactory?
- 3.6 How effective was the monitoring mechanism that was set up, including the regular/periodic meetings between project staff and the beneficiary, the donor and the key partners? Was a suitable monitoring and evaluation framework for accountability, management and learning developed at the outset of the Project and updated regularly?
- 3.7 What mechanisms were put in place to ensure the inclusion of beneficiary feedback in the design and implementation process?
- 3.8 Assess the level of government involvement in the Project and how their involvement with the Project built their capacity to continue further work on future programmes.
- 3.9 How was the implementing agencies and other relevant partners' (at national and local levels) capacity to develop effective action against address child labour enhanced, through programme activities?
- 3.10 How important were the capacity development activities, especially those undertaken following the mid-term evaluation?

### **4. Efficiency**

- 4.1 How efficiently were the Project's resources (time, expertise, funds, knowledge and know-how) used to produce outputs and results? Were resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) allocated strategically to achieve the Project's objectives? Did the Project benefit from complementary resources at the global and country levels that supported the achievement of its intended objectives?
- 4.2 Given the size of the Project, its complexity and challenges, were the existing management structure and technical capacity sufficient and adequate?
- 4.3 Did the Project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from the ILO HQ and Regional Office and its national partners? If not, why not?
- 4.4 To what extent did the Project leverage resources (financial, partnerships, expertise) to promote international labour standards, social dialogue and disability inclusion, gender equality and non-discrimination, and just transition on the environment?
- 4.5 How effective was the communication strategy? Did the Project receive adequate technical and administrative support/response from the ILO's backstopping units?

### **5. Sustainability and emergent impact**



- 5.1 Are the results, achieved by the Project so far, likely to be sustainable and to endure beyond the Project (including the e-METIP system as a collaboration and monitoring mechanism? How will the implemented work be institutionalised and used by government institutions to enhance future work on the intended objectives of the Project?
- 5.2 To what extent have the results contributed to advancing sustainable development objectives (as per UNSDCFs, similar UN programming frameworks, national sustainable development plans, and SDGs)?
- 5.3 To what extent did the Project contribute to advancing the ILO's core principles (ILS, tripartism and social dialogue, gender equality and non-discrimination, i.e. gender and people with disabilities and other groups as relevant, and just transition)?
- 5.4 What was the level of the Project's partners and beneficiaries' ownership of project outcomes ?
- 5.5 Assess what contributions the programme made to strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders and to encouraging the partners' ownership of the programme. To what extent did the Project interact with, and possibly influence, national-level policies, debates and the institutions working on child labour.
- 5.6 To what extent can the knowledge that was developed during the Project (research papers, progress reports, manuals and other tools) still be used to inform policies and practitioners after the end of the Project?

## 2.6 Clients of the evaluation

The following are the potential users of the evaluation:

### **Internal:**

Project team

Ankara CO Management

ILO Regional Office

ILO HQ

### **External:**

Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry

Ministry of Labour and Social Security

Ministry of National Education

Ministry of Family and Social Services

TİSK

HAK-İŞ

DİSK

TÜRK-İŞ

Civil Society Organisations

Implementing partners

MoLSS:

Directorate General of Labour

Directorate General of Lifelong Learning

Directorate General of Vocational and Technical Education

Turkish Employment Agency

### 3. Methodology and limitations

This evaluation complied with the UNEG's evaluation norms and standards, and followed ethical safeguards, as specified in the ILO's evaluation guidelines and procedures. The evaluation was conducted in a participatory manner, by engaging the stakeholders at different levels and ensuring that they had a say in the implementation of the Project, and that they could share their views and contribute to the evaluation as well as participate in the dissemination processes.

The evaluation's methodology included examining the logical connect between the levels of results and their alignment with the ILO's strategic objectives and external factors/assumptions. Particular attention was paid to the logical connection between the levels of results and their alignment to the ILO's strategic objectives and outcomes, at the global and national levels, as well as that of the national strategic frameworks with the relevant SDGs and related targets, and other relevant external factors.

The evaluation process was implemented in three phases: (1) *an inception phase*, based on a review of existing documents to produce inception report; (2) *a fieldwork phase*, to collect and analyse primary data; and (3) *a data analysis and reporting phase*, to produce the final evaluation report.

The evaluation applied a mixed-method approach. Both qualitative and quantitative evaluation approaches were considered for this evaluation. First, the evaluators conducted a desk review of appropriate materials, including the Project document, the Logical Framework, progress reports, the minutes from management meetings and other outputs from the Project and relevant materials from secondary sources. Second, the evaluators collected other relevant data for the evaluation. Individual or group interviews were conducted with the main stakeholders.

The Evaluators conducted a participatory, theory-based evaluation to answer the questions raised in the Terms of Reference. A theory-based evaluation implies that the evaluator works with the ILO project team, during the inception phase, to identify any implicit and explicit assumptions that have influenced the likelihood of the intervention's achieving short- and longer-term outcomes and facilitating that key stakeholder use the knowledge and understanding they have gained.

The evaluation identified any assumptions, e.g. about the relevance of the data collected, the stakeholders' data needs and how data informed policy and decision making and then informed the data collection among the Project's stakeholders.

A theory-based evaluation approach asks – and answers – question including, but not limited to:

- What changes, expected and unexpected, did the intervention contribute to and how?
- To what extent is the identified change process a reflection of the original intervention logic/did change happen the way we thought it would?

- To what extent are the assumptions made viable?
- If (some) assumptions were not valid, what could have been changed so that the intervention would have achieved its desired outcomes and objectives and contributed to stronger accountability and decent working conditions?

A comparison of how change was envisaged in the planning stage against 'how change really took or takes place' facilitated learning and contributed to valuable insights about possible adjustments of future programs. At the same time, the approach was well placed to answer questions (raised in the Terms of Reference) about the intervention's design, implementation, outcomes and long-term value.

The evaluator used a mixed method, convergent evaluation design to assess the anticipated link between the data collected. This convergent design contributed to validating findings using different sources of information.

The approach to the final evaluation was interactive, consultative and transparent and used a mix of methods. The evaluation team used a combination of secondary and primary data collection methods, including document reviews, key interviews with the Project stakeholders, observations and a workshop discussion. In line with the specific objectives of the evaluation, the evaluation approach sought to:

- Maximise the use of existing secondary documents and data.
- Undertake carefully structured interviews on the more sensitive issues.
- Facilitate a stakeholder workshop, with project stakeholders, to obtain feedback and validate project, challenge and results.
- Apply a triangulation of sources and techniques.

### **Qualitative data collection**

The evaluation conducted semi-structured interviews with a representative group of stakeholders and focus group/group discussions with beneficiaries, to understand the strengths and limitations of the chosen approach and to explore how this setup might have influenced perceptions and attitudes among the stakeholders.

The evaluation team conducted a validation workshop after the termination of data collection, where key stakeholders participated. The purpose of the validation workshop was to:

- Present the preliminary findings and recommendations.
- Ensure ownership of the evaluation's findings.
- Reflect on the significance of the findings and results in terms of contributing to the initiative's objectives and their long-term value.
- Discuss any opportunities for and limitations to the initiative's scalability.

Quantitative and qualitative data were analysed to identify pertinent results from each data set. These were then compared and triangulated to identify any areas of convergence and possible contradiction(s), before conclusions were drawn.

A list of key informants is attached to this report, as Annex III. The evaluators used surveys, interviews and focus group discussions to collect data from the target groups.

The stakeholders' opinions improved and clarified the quantitative data obtained from the Project documents. The participatory nature of the evaluation contributed to a sense of ownership among the stakeholders.

Different evaluation questions were combined in the interview guidelines. The guidelines were adjusted to fit to each group of informants. The data that was collected by different methods, as per Annex V, for each evaluation question and finding, were triangulated to draw valid and reliable conclusions. Data were disaggregated by gender and other relevant categories during the collection, presentation and analysis of data.

The evaluators followed EVAL's Guidance material on the appropriate methodologies to measure key cross-cutting issues; namely the ILO EVAL [Guidance Note 3.1 on integrating gender equality and non-discrimination](#); and the ILO EVAL [Guidance Note 3.2 on Integrating social dialogue and ILS in monitoring and evaluation of projects](#).

More specifically, and in accordance with ILO Guidance note 3.1: "Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of projects", gender dimension was considered throughout the methodology, deliverables and final evaluation report. The evaluators assessed the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve the lives of women and men. Data were disaggregated by sex where possible and appropriate during the collection, presentation and analysis of data. To the greatest extent possible, data are responsive to and include issues relating to diversity and non-discrimination.

The evaluators visited Ankara, Eskişehir, İzmir, Adana, Şanlıurfa and Ordu. Meetings were scheduled in advance, at the evaluator's requests. The meetings/interviews covered all the different groups, including, local and national level authorities, social partners, implementing partners and beneficiaries (men, women, working children and children at risk, as well as other relevant actors). The data collection aimed to be inclusive to the greatest extent possible. Data from the areas which were not visited by the evaluation were collected from desk review of progress reports and other relevant documents.

Upon completion of the data collection and analysis, the evaluators conducted a stakeholders' workshop, to share the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations. After incorporating input from the stakeholders' workshop, the evaluators shared a draft report with the Evaluation Manager who, after a methodological review, circulated it to the stakeholders for their comments and input.

The working or at risk of working children were identified by staff from the implementing partners. The evaluators visited the communities and interviewed children and their families to understand the impact child labour has on the community, as well as the relationships between the different target groups and any change brought about by the Project.

The following UNICEF principles for interviews were adhered to, when speaking with children:

“

1. Respect the dignity and rights of every child in every circumstance.
2. In interviewing (and reporting on) children, pay special attention to each child's right to privacy and confidentiality, to have their opinions heard, to participate in decisions affecting them and to be protected from harm and retribution.
3. Protect the best interests of each child over any other consideration, including advocacy for children's issues and the promotion of child rights.
4. When trying to determine the best interests of a child, give due weight to the child's right to have their views taken into account in accordance with their age and maturity.
5. Consult those closest to the child's situation and best able to assess it about the political, social and cultural ramifications of any reportage.
6. Do not publish a story or an image that might put the child, their siblings or peers at risk, even when their identities are changed, obscured or not used.

Six guidelines for interviewing children

1. Do no harm to any child; avoid questions, attitudes or comments that are judged mental, insensitive to cultural values, that place a child in danger or expose a child to humiliation, or that reactivate the pain of traumatic events.
2. Do not discriminate in choosing children to interview because of their sex, race, age, religion, status, educational background or physical abilities.
3. No staging: do not ask children to tell a story or take action that is not part of their own history.
4. Ensure that the child or guardian knows they are talking to a reporter. Explain the purpose of the interview and its intended use.
5. Obtain permission from the child and his or her guardian for all interviews, videotaping and, when possible, for documentary photographs. When possible and appropriate, this permission should be in writing. Permission must be obtained in circumstances that ensure that the child and guardian are not coerced in any way and that they understand that they are part of a story that might be disseminated locally and globally. This is usually only ensured if permission is obtained in the child's language and if the decision is made in consultation with an adult the child trusts.
6. Pay attention to where and how the child is interviewed. Limit the number of interviewers and photographers. Try to make certain that children are comfortable and able to tell their story without outside pressure, including from the interviewer. In film, video and radio interviews, consider what the choice of visual or audio background might imply about the child and her or his life and story. Ensure that the child would not be endangered or adversely affected by showing their home, community or general whereabouts."

Detailed guidelines were developed for semi-structured interviews (Annex VIII). Data were collected from different sources, using different methods for each evaluation question and the findings were triangulated to draw valid and reliable conclusions. Data were disaggregated by sex wherever possible and appropriate.

The gender dimension was considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology.

The evaluation included the voices of workers (children), their families, teachers, local authorities, government, social partners, and other key stakeholders regarding their participation throughout the Project. Open and transparent consultation underpins this evaluation.

To remain in line with the proposed methodology and to ensure that the evaluation contributed to a more in-depth understanding of factors (in design and operations) that contributed to or impeded the achievement of results, the evaluator established a sample that included:

- Interview with one (m) member of the HQ staff. The purpose was to explore how, or under which circumstances, the intervention contributed to the desired changes.
- Interviews with CO admin staff and PMT (11, 7f and 4m). The purpose was to understand the extent to which the Country Office was able to integrate the Project's initiatives into its policy development and how the synergies are being realised with other projects.
- Interviews with implementing partners at the national and local levels (6f and 7m, 13 people in total). The purpose was to understand the level of engagement and the perspectives for capacity development and outreach as well as the impact of the intervention.
- 26 Government partner officials (9f and 17m) at national and local levels. The purpose was to understand the level of ownership and commitment within government structures. The interviewees were appointed by the respective institutions.
- Representatives from social partners (4, 1 f and 3 m) from trade unions and one (f) from an employers' organisation were interviewed, to understand the social partners'

involvement in the Project. The informants were appointed by the TU and EO respectively.

- Beneficiary groups – children and their families. In total 30 people (10f and 11m, 4 girls and 5 boys) participated in FGDs. The purpose was to identify changes in the children and their family's lives. The beneficiaries were selected by implementing partner organisations.
- Four interviews (2f and 2m) were conducted with CSOs/development partners. The purpose was to understand the interaction among stakeholders in the field of child labour.
- An interview was conducted with a donor representative (EU Delegation) to understand the donor's motives for supporting this project and their appreciation of the Project's achievements till now.
- Interviews and FGDs with 8 intermediaries (2 f and 6 m) to understand their involvement in a possible solution to the problem. The intermediaries were identified by implementing partner staff.

In total: 5 FGDs, 4 Group Discussions, 52 Interviews - with 115 adults (50 female, 65 male) and 9 children (5 girls, 4 boys) were conducted.

A list of the informants is attached as Annexes II and III.

The above sample is not statistically representative, because this evaluation's methodology used a mainly qualitative approach for data collection. It is a purposive sample, based on criteria that are set out in the description of the purpose, as listed above.

The evaluators ensured that the opinions and perceptions of women, youth and children were equally reflected in the interviews, and that gender-specific questions were included. The evaluation conducted focus group discussions with seasonal agricultural workers (girls and boys, women and men) teachers, producers and agriculture intermediaries, as appropriate. The FGDs contributed to the verification of key assumptions about partner's use of the Project instruments, its added value and possible areas for improvement.

The FGDs had 7-9 participants (minimum 40% women) each. The FGDs were conducted with different target groups. The FGDs were conducted as close to the participants' place of work or living as possible. The FGDs combined quantitative and qualitative data collection methodologies. This included questionnaires/score cards, where workers (for example) were asked to rank how relevant the intervention components were to them, on a scale from 1 to 5. The questionnaires were supplemented with open questions, to further clarify the answers provided. (Annex VIII)

The evaluation interviewed governmental and local officials (men and women), who participated in capacity-building activities, to learn how relevant the training was and to what extent they used their new knowledge and skills their daily work.

Furthermore, the evaluation conducted semi-structured interviews with project staff, including the Project staff of other ILO projects and the ILO staff responsible for financial, administrative and technical backstopping of the Project.

The selection of informants was based on recommendations from project management and the evaluator's suggestions based on the desk review, where priority was given to informants with an expected direct involvement with the Project.

### 3.1 Limitations

Many of the suggested informants had little or no knowledge about the Project. However, they provided a good, broader insight into the challenges that confront seasonal agricultural workers as well as the efforts local authorities made to increase the awareness of child labour.

The evaluation was conducted during the month of January, a month with very little activity in the farms and gardens. For that reason, it was difficult to reach out to seasonal agricultural workers and children in traditional receiving provinces. Therefore, visits were also conducted to sending regions, however the number of end-beneficiaries interviewed was fewer than planned.

The evaluation understands that establishing contact with informants through the Project's implementing partners is problematic; but, under the given circumstances, this was the only way forward and the evaluators did not feel that its independence was questioned.

The evaluation team did not have the technical insight to evaluate the challenges the Project was confronted with in development of the new e-METIP.

In the Project Document/Log Frame, there is no indication of male/female ratio in activities. This is also reflected in part of the reporting, where no gender disaggregated data were available.

However, after the field mission, the PMT provided data based on participants within activities.

## 4. Findings

The below findings are based on review of many project- related documents (Annex IV) and on input from discussions and interviews with key stakeholders as well as discussions that took place during a validation workshop (Annex II and III).

In general, the Project's stated expected outcomes and key targets were met.

However, it was difficult to meet all of the targets in some parameters, because of the earthquake and the COVID-19 pandemic and the delays they caused. Project tenders ran quite smoothly and effectively, with strong cooperation/guidance from the ILO Procurement Department. However, the selection and land allocation procedures for the METIP areas were quite challenging. Throughout the Project's duration, planned works had to be cancelled and areas were reidentified several times, after completion of architectural/engineering projects – and even after the awarding of a contract in one case – because of changed land allocations and disputes between public authorities regarding the use of areas. Periodical changes in the strategic priorities of the MoLSS, and external factors such as the earthquake and pandemic caused certain temporary slowdowns in implementation of the Project; however, compensatory measures were taken by the Project Management Team and MoLSS following these.

One main achievement was the support provided to the implementation of the National Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour 2017-2023.

The Project supported Türkiye, with success, in promoting its status as an "SDG 8.7 Pathfinder Country".

The findings below are categorised as per OECD/DAC criteria and as in the Inception Report agreed criteria:

## 4.1 Relevance

It was noted that providing transportation support and meal opportunities for children, as well as the staff of implementing partners' carrying out monitoring and follow-up activities, addressed the needs of the Ministry of National Education. The evaluation does not have enough statistical data on the children's continuation of education to be able to measure the extent to which the Project met the needs of the children in full.

Additionally, it was observed that the field visits that were organised within the context of the Project areas, where seasonal agricultural workers were located, raised the awareness of the relevant government officials, at different levels, regarding the challenges seasonal agricultural workers are faced with.

Within the scope of the Project, the transport and office supplies' support that was provided to İŞKUR personnel, especially the Unit for Combating Child Labour (CLU) members, was also considered relevant.

The project's activities, targeting families and children (such as the distribution of hygiene kits, the provision of stationery supplies to children and other forms of support), are considered to have addressed their needs. Many families specifically wish for their children to continue their education, but economic hardships make this difficult. Therefore, in-kind support has helped meet those needs in that regard. However, the lack of a fully adopted, rights-based approach to these activities brought certain challenges. For instance, and as highlighted in some interviews, the inability to provide the same support to local children as was given to beneficiary children of the Project, as well as the exclusivity of the activities that were planned solely for project beneficiaries, led to tensions between local children and seasonal agricultural worker children, which was contrary to the best interests of the child. Additionally, the Project did not provide sufficient opportunities for children, aged 14 and above, who are at high risk of dropping out of school and engaging in work. In particular, some local stakeholders emphasised the need for sporting and cultural activities for this age group. In the evaluation's focus group discussions with children, who had an average age of 15, the children expressed their need for services, such as preparatory courses for university exams and study support. The project's MTE report also highlights the importance of educational programs that address the needs of various groups. However, after the MTE, it was not possible to make amendments to the Project's activities in this regard. Lastly, some of the in-kind support provided was deemed unusable, because it did not align with the children's ages or physical characteristics. However, it is important to note that the field staff of the implementing partners reported that in renovated homes, the child and family's view of the home, and even their approach to themselves, was much more positive.

The capacity-building activities that targeted governmental officials, combined with The Presidential Circular No. 2024/5, are considered to have increased the awareness of child labour in seasonal agriculture in Türkiye. However, inter-agency coordination and collaboration still appear to be limited. Additionally, field visits that were organised within the Project activities are noted to have played a significant role in helping government personnel understand the current situation regarding seasonal agricultural labour and child labour in this sector.

On an international level, the Project contributed to the better implementation of the relevant International Labour Standards, which are leading and guiding the world of work where the ILO is a normative UN organisation. In this respect, the Project supported the implementation of ILO Conventions No.138 Minimum Age and No.182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour to which Turkey is a signature; and contributes to reaching SDG 8 of the 2030 Agenda on decent



work and economic growth, and specifically to target 8.7 calling for immediate measures to secure the prohibition and elimination of the WFCL, to end child labour in all its forms, and by 2025. In line with SDG 8.7, the Project also contributed to “Outcome 7: Adequate and effective protection at work for all” of ILO’s Programme and Budget (2020-2021) and United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (2021-2025) in Turkey.

In this context, the Project contributed to one of the specific objectives of EESP SOP Activity I.1, fighting child labour, with its specific focus on the elimination of child labour in seasonal agriculture. The project also ensured the sustainability of the interventions, through capacity building at national and local levels, and policy advocacy and awareness raising in line with the objectives of EESP SOP under the Activity 1.1 Promoting Decent Work.

The project had no specific allocation of resources for gender equality and non-discrimination, disability inclusion, International Labour Standards, social dialogue, and just transition on environment.

The project data did not include specific information on children’s disabilities, as the primary focus was on facilitating schooling and referring children to the appropriate educational services. The multi-staged intervention method that was designed to identify, refer and monitor children and this chain of intervention included addressing the barriers that prevent children’s schooling. Although disabilities can impact children’s access to education, the implementing partners addressed any barriers related to disabilities during their family visits. The staff used rough interviews with the parents and their own observations, to identify the challenges affecting children’s schooling and took the necessary action(s) to ensure school registration or attendance.

Many stakeholders shared that the Project has raised the awareness of child labour, particularly through its capacity-building activities. Prior to the Project’s capacity-building activities, there was limited capacity, particularly as concerns the areas of responsibility and duties. Therefore, the Project can be seen to have been relevant to the main end-beneficiaries (working and at-risk children) and their families.

It was also reported that the implementing partners’ capacity, in the field of child labour, was significantly increased.

Government institutions at all levels that benefited from the Project in general found it relevant. Government institutions’ capacity on child labour has increased and, in general, the Project contributed to increasing the awareness of child labour, especially at the local, district and provincial levels.

The Project contributed to overall policy advocacy and implementation, the expansion of the knowledge base and an improvement of institutional capacity for the elimination of child labour in seasonal agriculture. In this respect, all the planned interventions had a counterpart in the national policy documents and contributed to achieving national objectives on the macro-level.

On the micro-level, the Project strengthened the MoLSS’s national and local capacity for the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in seasonal agriculture, as well as that of local authorities. In addition, the awareness of child labour within the population in general, as well as in families, decision makers, employers, intermediaries, school principals, teachers and the media were raised and policy dialogue for the elimination of child labour in seasonal agriculture was improved.

The accumulated experience, which was acquired from stand-alone projects that targeted the elimination of child labour in seasonal hazelnut harvesting and that have been part of a collaboration between the ILO, the MoLSS and the DG of Labour since 2012, contributed to the design of the Project and strengthened the implementation of activities as concerns capacity building, direct intervention and awareness raising. The project also contributed to paving the way for scaling up efforts and implementation modalities in different provinces and crop groups.

## 4.2 Coherence

For decades, child-labour-related issues have been the key fields of intervention for the ILO's Ankara CO. Currently three projects being implemented: the Elimination of the Worst Forms of the Child Labour in Seasonal Agriculture in Hazelnut Harvesting in Turkey Project, funded by Ferrero; An Integrated Model for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Seasonal Agriculture in Hazelnut Harvesting in Türkiye Project, funded by CAOBISCO; and the current project under evaluation. Those project's management and staff worked closely together and supported each other in their implementations. When possible and relevant, their activities were jointly financed, which helped to optimise the achievements within all three projects.

Even though the two other projects are relatively small, they have managed to flag themselves in the hazelnut industry. This current project did not reach out to the donors of the two other projects to initiate a discussion on value-chain responsibility.

Notwithstanding, child labour intervention has become a flagship topic for the ILO CO Ankara, especially now it has stronger and clearer political support to eliminate child labour in Türkiye and also given the strong international branding of Türkiye as an eradication of child labour Path Finder country.

Furthermore, the activities of the Project are aligned with the 2024/5 Presidential Circular on Seasonal Agricultural Workers and the 2024/52 Ministry of National Education Circular on Access to Education for Children of Seasonal Agricultural Workers and Migrant and Semi-Nomadic Families. It was reported that, over the last months of the Project, these two documents were given a boost in their work on the elimination of child labour in Türkiye.

The project fed into the implementation of the National Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour 2017-2023 on all issues. The National Programme was the main guiding document for the country's interventions in eliminating child labour. The government appreciated the important support that the Project provided. Support, without which it would have been difficult for the government to reach the significant achievements which have been the results of its work over recent years.

The project also contributed to strengthening the government's capacity to satisfy the expectations of an SDG 8.7 Pathfinder Country. Becoming a Path Finder country has stimulated the government's efforts to make further progress and to promote these achievements in international and bilateral fora.

The Project did not establish international partner contacts and there was little exchange, with the exception of study visits to three European countries, the Project did not reach out to the international organisations hereunder: UN agencies (besides UNICEF as described elsewhere in this report), international NGOs, buyers/brands and other international stakeholders.

Conversely, the Project paved the way for the Turkish experiences to be promoted internationally, first and foremost after its role as an SDG 8.7 Pathfinder country was revealed.

The evaluation did not find that the ILO has used its comparative advantage to the full. The ILO's expertise in labour-related issues, hereunder occupational health and safety, and its promotion of ILS created a good basis for a qualitative strengthening of discussions on child labour in Türkiye. However, the Project did not use the ILO tri-partite structures' advantages for promoting the elimination of child labour. The social partners were invited to the Steering Committee meetings and a few of their representatives participated in some capacity-building activities. In total, 53 representatives from 36 different national and local trade union and employer's organisations participated. However, the evaluation finds that it is a missed opportunity by not using the ILO's comparative advantage to a larger extent.

The project developed a very close cooperation with the MoLSS and made its expertise available for the Ministry.

### 4.3 Effectiveness

The Overall Objective of the Project was described as:

- to contribute to elimination of the worst forms of child labour in seasonal agriculture.

With the Specific Objective:

- to enhance national and local capacity for the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in seasonal agriculture as well as providing services to children at risk and their families.

To achieve this objective, the Project was built on five outcomes. The evaluation finds that the Project met these outcomes, as follows:

*Outcome 1: Working/at-risk children are withdrawn or prevented from working in seasonal agriculture; families, employers, agriculture intermediaries and village heads abstain from or take action to combat child labour.*

The project reached out to many children; however, no statistics are available concerning the extent to which the children, who were supported by the Project, remained enrolled in the public school system after their initial year of enrolment. The project staff followed up this with the individual families, through the implementing partners, to understand whether the children were continuing their school attendance or had returned to work.

Several thousands of children were enrolled into formal education, but a systemic change is not visible. Even though some producers and intermediaries state that they do not want to employ children, children still work in their fields.

The project made numerous efforts to encourage parents to send their children to school; however, the underlying economic challenges of child labour and the distorted perceptions of children were the most significant obstacles to this.

*Outcome 2: MoFLSS, workers' and employers' organisations, gendarmerie, NGOs take coordinated action for policy development and implementation, to eliminate the WFCL.*

Neither employers nor worker's organisations took coordinated action for policy development or implementation against child labour. The trade union confederations and agricultural federations did not take any steps to follow up on these, beyond their participation in the Steering Committee and in a few training activities or mentioning the elimination of child labour in their congress and general assembly resolutions. The project also did not reach out to suggest follow-up activities for implementation of the resolutions. This evaluation finds that the Project could have done more to build up capacity and to engage trade unions actively in the elimination of child labour.

The employer's organisation, TISK, was a member of the steering committee, and one person took part in these meetings, as well as in some capacity-building activities. However, beyond these few persons, there was no further involvement of EO representatives.

Overall, the social partners were only involved with the Project to a limited extent. It should be noted that there was no such obligation mentioned in the contracts made with the Implementing Partners, that they should interact with the social partners during the implementation of their assignments. The Implementing Partners had no communication with the social partners.

The gendarmerie was not a part of the policy development initiatives but took action to enforce regulations. The evaluation finds that suggesting their participation in the policy development was an error in the Project's design. The gendarmerie was not reported to have been part of any coordinated actions. The role of the gendarmerie, as concerns child labour in seasonal agriculture, is twofold: i) registration; ii) enforcement of the legislation. A targeted training programme was implemented for efficient registration and for the transfer of information, with respect to service provisioning towards families and children. The training programme was developed and implemented in collaboration with the General Command of Gendarmerie and MoLSS and was targeted at gendarmerie officials in all of the target provinces.

Many NGOs are working in the field of child labour, but they were not involved with policy development and there was no coordinated action for implementation. The Project worked with a few national NGOs, on specific activities, and they were invited to join capacity-building activities.

*Outcome 3: Willingness is enhanced among the general public and the target groups, to eliminate child labour in seasonal agriculture .*

The evaluation did not find any evidence of an increased awareness among the general public. No opinion poles were conducted to understand the opinion and awareness about child labour in the public in general.

The Government has shown increased concern, especially after the Presidential Circular 2024/5.

The social partners are adopting statements as their political outline for combatting child labour, but no follow-up action was reported.

The intermediaries and producers declare that they do not want children in the fields, but no action for preventing their presence is being taken. The project provided awareness-raising activities that were targeted at the two groups, and it appears that they understand that it is problematic that children working and do not attend school. The project's work was mainly aimed towards individual producers and intermediaries rather than their chambers of commerce and associations. Furthermore, it is difficult for an individual producer to refuse to

employ children, when the parents request it and will refuse to work if their children cannot join in. To a certain extent, the same is true for the intermediaries, even if they have more power to stop the malpractice, due to their status in the community. If producers and/or intermediaries took collective action and stopped hiring children, this problem could be solved. However, it is not possible for individuals to stop the practice as the parents would simply go to those employers who accept children at work.

The evaluation finds that the Project could have done more to create a critical mass among stakeholders and the public in general to prepare for joint action.

School principals and teachers are aware of the problem and try to cope with the consequences both in the home and destination areas. However, this is extremely challenging, and the teachers strongly require further empowerment. It is disturbing to the pedagogical process, when many new children join a class in the final part of the school year, in the receiving regions and in the middle of the year in the sending regions. Further to this challenge, it is reported that the incoming children create additional, challenging situations for the teachers, due to their differing hygiene standards (some live in tents with limited facilities), different cultures and, often, they are behind in academical capacity. School principals do not always have the resources required to ensure a smooth integration of the incoming children.

Many efforts were made to make parents aware of their obligation to send their children to school, but beyond those directly in contact with the Project, there is no evidence of changes in the parents' mindsets. The gendarmerie can issue fines, but these are very small and are rarely collected in practice. The project made many efforts to reach out to parents, but it is difficult to change their culture and habits, especially when there an economic parameter also plays a significant role. The parents state that they need to have the children with them, to help meet the daily target that is set up by the producer unilaterally. When wages are calculated on a per-piece rate and the target is not met there is no payment. The project could have used the comparative advantages of the ILO, to find solutions to secure fair and decent payment for the workers, which would allow them to discontinue using their children in the field to help meet daily targets.

*Outcome 4: Advocacy is enhanced for the formulation, planning and implementation of policies to eliminate child labour in seasonal agriculture.*

The project has done much work on supporting the government in implementing the National Program on Elimination of Child Labour (2017-2023). The support that was received from the Project is very much appreciated, especially by MoLSS and MoNE. The Project contributed to a stronger engagement of governmental officials at all levels and the capacity for advocacy was increased through a large number of training and awareness-raising activities. However, as mentioned above, there is still some way to go before there is an understanding among all the stakeholders about the need for ending child labour practices.

During 2024, the formulation of policies took an important and positive turn with the issuing of the Presidential Circular 2024/5. In the short term there will be a need to transform this into detailed policy interventions, as was already done by MoNE in Circular 204/52. In the mid-term, there will be a need to support planning and implementation, but this process will develop after the end of the Project.

The policies are in place, but there is still a lot of work to be done for countrywide implementation.

*Outcome 5: Coordination and cooperation are strengthened between stakeholders in areas of the implementation and management of child labour interventions at national and local levels.*

The evaluation was informed that there was strong cooperation and coordination, at the national level, between the relevant ministries under MoLSS and MoNE and other authorities. Nevertheless, there is space for further improvement at the provincial and district levels. The evaluation understands that the level of engagement very much depends on the priorities in each individual Governorate and the governor's engagement in finding ways to get children out of work and into school.

The evaluation finds that the implementation of policies and programs would benefit from a stronger "All government" approach at all levels, as detailed hereunder, when it comes to budget allocations.

Representatives from the MoNE especially appreciate the Project and find it has been successful. They emphasise the importance of the monitoring activities carried out by the field staff of the implementing partners; following and supporting each individual child to ensure that it continues its enrolment in education. However, there is, no coordination in place among the stakeholders to ensure a continuation of this resource, which demands close monitoring and support for the individual child.

The workshops that were held in the initial years of the Project, by the ILO and Young Life Foundation (YLF), are reported to have helped communicate the shortcomings in the Project's design, leading to positive developments thereafter. However, it was pointed out that communication and coordination within the government and between ministries and other authorities was not fully established within the scope of the Project.

The Child Labour Monitoring and Tracking System is expected to enhance the existing e-METIP system – a database for seasonal agricultural workers and their children. This intervention aims to strengthen the mechanisms for monitoring child labour, by consolidating the existing national and local databases and by establishing the necessary connections for efficient data management.

It was planned that the system would be improved by incorporating new modules into the existing e-METIP to serve the following critical objectives:

1. The establishment of a Child Labour Monitoring and Tracking System: when implemented, the enhanced system will allow the institutions responsible for implementing activities under the Action Plan of the National Program on the Elimination of Child Labour to fulfil their reporting obligations. It will also provide tools for the MoLSS to monitor the Action Plan's implementation effectively.
2. Regular Monthly Reporting: Child Labour Units (CLUs) in 81 provinces will use e-METIP to submit regular reports after the system has been scaled to all provinces. This will enable MoLSS to compile locally entered data into comprehensive reports, ensuring the systematic tracking of child labour issues.
3. System Integration: The upgraded e-METIP system will facilitate the exchange of data between various ministries (e.g., Ministry of Health, Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry) and MoLSS departments (e.g., ISKUR, Social Security Institution, and others). Administrative records from these entities will be consolidated and validated within e-METIP, thereby enhancing inter-ministerial coordination and data-driven decision-making.

The management and administration of the e-METIP system was transferred to the Employment Policies Department of the Directorate General of Labour under MoLSS in January

2020. Ultimately, the improved e-METIP system will help to register more seasonal agricultural workers, to strengthen the delivery of public services to this vulnerable group and will bolster the coordination efforts to combat child labour in seasonal agriculture.

The evaluation finds that, after the system is up and running full-scale, it might contribute to a better coordination between governmental institutions. However, there is still no full clarity about who can access what and who can upload data.

A strong cooperation was established between the three child labour projects being implemented by the ILO CO Ankara. Activities were coordinated when they were working in the same areas. The projects also coordinated when approaching the authorities and efforts were made to be seen as “one ILO”. The two other projects focused on hazelnut production, whereas the current project has a broader target and included various kinds of fruit and vegetables, as well as hazelnuts.

From among the UN agencies, UNICEF would be a natural partner for the ILO on this project. However, the evaluation could not find evidence of any systematic/institutional cooperation and coordination in the country, beyond what is in place at the overall UN level. There have been mutual invitations to bigger events, but as far as daily implementation is concerned, cooperation appears to have been limited. The evaluation finds that the two agencies could maximise the outcomes of their work by working together, using the expertise of the ILO in child labour and UNICEF’s expertise in education.

The project did not reach out to the international NGOs working in Türkiye. The national NGOs were invited to some capacity-building activities, but in daily work, there was limited cooperation apart from with the two implementing partners, both of which are registered as NGOs, but which act more like project implementing institutions with no broader membership, activists or any of the other characteristics of NGOs.

The project’s very detailed Log Frame minimised any unintended results. One negative result, which was overcome by the Project, was the negative reaction of local children when hygiene and stationary kits, clothing and other in-kind support were provided to the incoming children, in front of the local children. This led to bullying and conflicts between the two sets of children. This was solved in one of two ways; either by providing support to all the children or by distributing the support at the living place. After these incidents, the Project’s management became very aware of the importance of having a “do no harm” approach.

On the positive side, one of the most important developments to which the Project contributed turned out to be an unforeseen result, even though the Project only partially contributed to its development. This is the Presidential Circular 2024/5, which is seen to have the potential to become a gamechanger in the eradication of child labour in Türkiye. The stakeholders see the footprint of the ILO in this important document. It is a result of many years of ILO work in the country and materialised during the implementation of the current project.

The project mainly offered two types of capacity building. The first was a two-day training program, built on modules that were specifically developed for each thematic issue. These activities were targeted on trainers, CLU members, NGOs, governmental officials and others. The materials that were prepared for these training sessions were highly welcomed by training’s participants and beyond. The training materials were seen to be of high-quality and were prepared by leading academics in the respective fields of intervention.

The second capacity-building activity consisted of sessions, with a duration of up to two hours. The evaluation finds that these had more of a character of an awareness-raising activity that

targeted family members and local stakeholders. The visual training materials that were prepared for the awareness raising were very much appreciated, both by the trainers and the participants.

Many of the CLU members interviewed noted an increase in awareness, yet there was little improvement reported in terms of actual implementation. Communication and/or coordination was missing among CLU members, and the units themselves did not function properly; nor had other stakeholders not taken any effective steps. Most of the interviewed CLU members found that they had increased their awareness rather than improved their capacity.

It is reported that many “training” sessions that targeted families had a length of two hours or less. The Evaluation does not find that such activities can be categorised as “training”, rather it should be called “awareness raising”. However, such activities are also found to have been important for all beneficiaries. The Project conducted training of trainers (ToT). ToT (Activity No.2.2.6) lasted three days, and consisted of two days of conceptual, legal, and policy-related content and one additional one full day concerning the methodological components of adult education, and communication with vulnerable groups etc.

The COVID-19 pandemic and the earthquake had some impact on the start-up of the Project, in that not all activities could be initiated and ways had to be found to transfer some of the activities to on-line interventions. This caused delays during the first year of implementation, but implementation was accelerated later, and the Project came back on track and was able to implement activities as planned. During the earthquake crisis, the Project immediately and with the consent of the donor, allocated resources to the earthquake-affected areas. Although staff and in-kind support were transferred to these areas, this only had a minor impact on the Project’s implementation in the mid and long term. There was no involvement of the social partners in the Project’s activities in the earthquake areas. The evaluation did not find any evidence that the Project included specific gender aspects during the pandemic and earthquake crisis.

As part of its collaboration with the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, the Project’s goal was to provide training for the staff of the Ministry’s mobile libraries, who were working in the field, on topics such as communication with vulnerable groups and working with children. However, due to the impact of the February 6th earthquakes, it turned out not to be possible to implement this activity.

In general, all stakeholders reported that the printed and visual materials that were produced within the framework of the Project were of good quality. As mentioned above, the training and awareness-raising materials were much appreciated, as were that the research and other materials that were developed by academics. Governmental officials and external consultants/experts appreciated the academical level of the developed background materials.

A major output of the interventions was the construction activities. Needs’ assessments were conducted, in the field, by an implementing partner’s staff, who had no experience of or insight into construction work. The reports from the field were then evaluated by an external construction expert, at the national level. The ILO should consider building up in-house expertise in this field, if it seems there is a trend towards having more interventions that include construction activities. The evaluation found that the quality of the construction work implemented could have been improved in some cases. This was underlined by the fact that it was reported that maintenance was often required (e.g. shifting the roofing) every year, or every second year.



The evaluation finds that the design of the Project could have established criteria concerning who was to receive support for improving the accommodation facilities of the workers. There was a criterion that the owners should not request rent for the facilities, something that was very difficult to monitor, and that they should be "Open to cooperation against child labour" but there were no criteria that they should actually refrain from using child labour.

The established monitoring mechanism had different layers. The most important was the individual monitoring of each child that referred to education. The implementing partners kept in contact, either physically or by phone, and were supported by attendance reports received from the schools. This on-going monitoring was expected to minimise the rate of drop-out from education. However, the Project did not establish an exit strategy or a transfer of the monitoring to governmental institutions. Therefore, it can be expected that the very ambitious monitoring that was established by the Project will be discontinued after the Project comes to an end.

The MoLSS monitored the implementation of the Project closely and conducted field visits regularly, to understand progress at the different levels of intervention. It also chaired the Management and Steering Committees, where stakeholders could review the progress in implementation.

Stakeholders state that the ILO established no mechanism for feedback, beyond the PSC (local stakeholders could hardly be expected to know about the function of the PSC) and no communication channels were provided. In addition, participants, especially those from İŞKUR, stated that they did not see the ILO in field practices and therefore felt that communication with the ILO in the Project was limited.

Furthermore, some local institutions/authorities stated that they were not contacted during the Project design phase, emphasising that this could have strengthened the intervention into taking more meaningful steps, as seasonal agricultural work and its conditions vary significantly between provinces. Local stakeholders found that the policies that were developed for seasonal agricultural workers and their families were implemented with the contribution of local stakeholders, due to factors such as working hours, the characteristics of agricultural products, and other diversities.

The project showed limited consideration of the local differences and specific needs, which affected its effectiveness in addressing context-specific challenges. Working with partners who were not locally based also presented challenges. When the capacity of these external partners was insufficient, it led to inefficiencies or misalignment with local realities. A more collaborative approach that involved local partners, particularly in capacity building and planning, would have improved the Project's ability to meet local needs and to ensure a more effective implementation.

The MoNE found that the Project contributed to strengthening the capacity of its staff members and officials. The evaluation was informed that MoNE is planning to initiate training activities to further strengthen teachers in this field, on the basis of the capacity that was built up during the Project. This demonstrates that the Project has been embraced and has had an impact that will continue after its end.

Many stakeholders believe that after the Project is discontinued, support measures, such as in-kind assistance, school transfers and food aid will not be able to be sustained, due to budget constraints.

MoLSS was a key partner for the ILO, in developing and implementing the Project. It is reported that key officials found that their capacity for and insight into child-labour-related issues was

especially strengthened. It was appreciated that the Project made it possible for officials to conduct field visits, to learn about the reality in which the seasonal agricultural workers and their families live and work. This gave the officials a stronger background for developing initiatives to improve the situation and of finding ways to eliminate child labour.

Those who participated in the study visits abroad very much appreciated the opportunity to learn from other countries, even though the structure of seasonal agricultural work and the way the workers migrate for work is very specific in Türkiye. In Türkiye, workers move with their entire family, whereas in Western Europe, they move without taking the children along.

In general, interviewees were positive about the capacity-building activities. Governmental officials stated that they felt better equipped to handle child labour issues and had gotten a deeper insight into the reality that the children and their parents were confronted with.

The project was in its early stages, at the time the MTE was conducted, with many activities still in their initial phases of implementation. The recommendations from the MTE primarily focused on enhancing collaboration among stakeholders and strengthening capacity-building efforts, aligning with the Project's goals and implementation strategy. The project's activities, including training sessions, workshops and conferences, are designed to foster collaboration and coordination at both local and central levels. These activities were continued throughout the implementation and adapted to the stakeholders' evolving needs. The main capacity-building activities, which were in the planning stages during the MTE, were carried out later.

The MTE recommended developing different training content that was tailored to the needs of various groups of children. As planned in the Project, the implementing partners continued to refer children to educational services that were provided by public institutions, and to offer various training sessions and activities for children. In addition, the MTE recommended that referral planning be made to include children in the 15-18 age group; however, it was not possible to carry out this recommendation. The PMT stated that one of the main reasons for this was the difficulty in convincing families to send children in this age group to school, as they relied on those children's labour.

The evaluation was informed that discussions are ongoing, concerning an amendment to the Labour Code (LC) which will remove the limitation that states that the LC does not apply to agricultural establishments with fewer than 50 employees. If this limitation is removed, it will change the employment conditions for seasonal agricultural workers significantly and will strongly improve the possibilities for eliminating child labour within the sector.

Only a small number of agricultural workers are organised. This might be a result of the aforementioned limitations imposed by the LC, and a lack of tradition for organising workers. The evaluation understands that the sectoral unions' capacity is limited, not least when it comes to mobilising workers against child labour. The project made limited effort only to engage with the sectoral unions and supported them in playing a positive role in the elimination of child labour within the sector. It is understood that it would be easier to solve the problem of child labour in seasonal agricultural work, if the full value chain could be engaged in this work. This is where the agricultural unions could join in and contribute with the support of their international organisations.

The project did reach out to the Chamber of Agriculture, to some extent. Even though a strong alliance with this association could have a positive impact on the Project's outreach to farmers and garden owners, the Chamber is not affiliated with TISK.

No mechanism was planned, within the context of the Project, to ensure child participation in its design. Similarly, during the implementation phase, there was no planning in place that

would have allowed children to provide feedback on the decisions and/or activities that concerned them.

#### 4.4 Efficiency

In the aftermath of the earthquake, the Project quickly reallocated its human and material resources to the earthquake-affected regions. Mobile toilets and showers were set up, and socio-psychological support was provided. This intervention was unforeseen and, therefore, did not have any outputs or results to meet. Nonetheless, it was reported that resources were spent in an efficient manner and the flexibility was shown in reallocating resources, both by donor and by the ILO, which was very much appreciated by the MoLSS. As significant funds (more than 4 million USD – almost 14% of the funds received) remain unspent at the end of the Project, it can be stated that the reallocation of funds to support the earthquake victims did not have any negative impact on the Project's efforts to meet the set-out outcomes and targets.

The evaluation noticed that some research and studies were conducted towards the very end of the Project, even though the Project's implementation could have benefited from the data provided in these documents, if they would have been prepared earlier in the implementation process.

The evaluation finds that the strong and experienced PMT allowed for an efficient allocation of resources. However, it notes that, by the end of the Project, a significant amount of funds is unallocated. The project's implementation was very dependent on two implementing partners; it is understood that the resource allocation followed signed contracts, and no questions were raised by the ILO's financial administration.

This was a very large project both for the ILO, the Ministry and the implementing partners.

The implementing partners worked strictly per ToR of their contracts – no more no less. If the Project had cooperated with the NGOs to a greater extent, it is possible that the output could have been maximised.

Due to delays in the processes related to the contracts of the implementation partners, in 2024, project activities started late, which affected families and children. These delays in contracting had the negative impact that most of the harvest season had passed when the work was ready to start. This meant that less work could be done, and activities were even sped up. However, the lost school days, for both informal and formal education, could not be compensated.

The evaluation finds some of the construction activities need further discussion, especially where it concerns the priorities of establishing improved accommodation facilities with farmers, who hire workers for three-four weeks per year. The rest of the year the facilities are not used, or are used as storage facilities, something they are not intended for. On some cases, the evaluation found the facilities were left with the doors open and windows broken, and then these had to be repaired by the Project before the next harvest season began.

Neither the ILO CO nor the PMT were involved in fundraising activities to increase the volume of the Project. The available funds were found to be sufficient for implementing the planned activities. There was even space to increase the number of participants in some of the capacity and awareness-raising activities.

The Project was led by an experienced management team, which had strong insight into child-labour-related issues. To a large extent, the successes of the Project can be attributed to the PMT and its ability to link with the key staff in the MoLSS, where there was an almost daily contact between the relevant officials.

As noted elsewhere in this report, the social partners only participated in the Project management to a limited extent. Some partners, who were actively involved in the Project, found that the Project could have benefited from being split up into three projects, with each of them being more focused and with a more limited geographical coverage. It was felt that the Project was too large financially, something that the significant amount of non-allocated funds remaining at the end of the Project supports. Likewise, it was felt that the Project was too complex and had too many different activities planned. It was difficult for partners to maintain an overview of the Project.

The implementing partners played a crucial role in monitoring and referring children to education at the local level. However, due to the outsourcing of this part of the Project, referrals were made to two different implementation partners and varying practices developed in the field. From the beginning, there was a need for capacity building in the implementing partners' personnel, particularly concerning rights-based service delivery, as well for ensuring the active participation of beneficiaries and the inclusion of vulnerable groups. Likewise, there was a need to introduce staff to the ILO's principles and mission; hereunder, the decent work agenda and the ILS norms related to child labour. The evaluation found some gaps in the implementing partners' staff's knowledge of the ILO.

The Technical Specialist in the ILO HQ was on standby to provide technical inputs, whenever required, however he was only used to a limited extent. He visited the Project in the middle of the implementation period, beyond which there was only semi-regular contact with the PMT.

The Project received no support from the Regional Office, because of the special status of the Ankara Office.

National partners provided no external technical and administrative support. External consultants were assigned for specific activities, such as the development of training materials, advocacy campaigns and construction-related activities. Local stakeholders emphasised the importance of conducting a needs' analysis, regarding the content of in-kind assistance, if such support is to be provided.

Although it was stated in the PD that the Project would take the needs of children with disabilities into account, no data is available on how many children with disabilities benefited from support under the Project. Additionally, and according to information gathered from the implementing partners' field staff, there were challenges in referring children with disabilities to the relevant institutions/organisations. Moreover, those field staff noted that they encountered children with disabilities, resulting from consanguinity, due to the socio-cultural backgrounds of seasonal agricultural workers. This suggests that special attention should be given to this issue in future project planning.

The project data did not include any specific information about the children's disabilities, as the PMT believed the primary focus was to facilitate schooling and to refer children to the appropriate educational services.

The PMT informed the evaluation that PWD specific reporting was not a donor requirement. However, the evaluation finds that it would have been appropriate to collect these data, even if it was zero in most cases, in order to meet ILO requirements on inclusion.

Irregular status: The inability to register, due to restrictions on settlement areas, affected non-registered children's access to education and health services. To solve this would require collaboration with the Directorate General of Migration Management (DGMM). Additionally, it was reported that difficulties exist in enrolling children in school, especially in cases of short-term seasonal agricultural labour, and specific issues are faced in registering Syrian students under temporary protection. Additionally, the prolonged process of obtaining permits from the DGMM for Syrian seasonal agricultural workers leads to their traveling in an irregular manner. Intermediaries believe that the entire process should be managed by İŞKUR, to streamline and simplify it.

Some adult family members were offered vocational training; however, no tracer study is available for assessing the efficiency of this activity.

The PMT explained that official labour market assessments identify welding as being among the occupations with a high demand for labour in Türkiye, and particularly in the region where our beneficiaries live. The selection of this profession was made based on local labour market data. However, welding is a complicated profession and a difficult occupation, which trainees, are discouraged to continue, if they do not have a natural, technical flair. If a test were conducted, as part of the selection process, the teachers would be able to understand which of the candidates had the required potential. In addition, welding and sanitary systems' maintenance training was delivered in industrial zones, which already had the available training infrastructure. The other courses were organised in more accessible neighbourhoods with available training infrastructure. Thus, and although the Project provided stipends for food and transportation and chose vocations, based on up-to-date local labour market data, travelling to an industrial zone for a difficult job may have discouraged certain trainee groups from completing these courses.

Stipends constitute a strong incentive to vulnerable groups to participate in these kinds of programme. Even though the participants were informed about the promising employment prospects, some dropped out.

This was a pilot project for 200 adults, but with no tracer study having been conducted there is no evidence of any possible increased employability. The rationale of including such a pilot project, within the current project, is questionable, as vocational training interventions normally need a longer-term investment if they are to have any impact.

The project had a large allocation for construction activities. These included the operationalisation of inactive buildings: where the target was seven provinces – and it achieved 10; preparation and refurbishment to operationalise METİP areas: the target was seven provinces – achieved 10; the organisation of new temporary settlement areas: the target was two provinces – achieved one; the conducting of a planning study for the maintenance of existing METİP areas and/or organisation of new potential METİP areas: the target was seven – achieved nine. In addition to this, 145 worker's houses and accommodation facilities were renovated as for 529 garden-owners. It was unusual that an ILO project had such a large allocation for construction activities. If this trend continues, the ILO should consider developing some in-house capacity in this field.

The stakeholder representatives, who attended the capacity-building training sessions particularly noted the effectiveness of the visual materials. A video, showing the life of a child labourer, was an eyeopener for the training participants and was effective in helping them understand the dimensions of the issue.

## 4.5 Sustainability and emergent impact

Although the stakeholders consider the E-METİP system important, the limitations in accessing the data that is entered into the system hinders many of them from using it effectively. Some local officials even doubt that the E-METİP system will remain sustainable, after the Project's completion.

Some supports that were included in the Project, such as transportation and meal programs, are already being implemented in target areas by the MoNE. However, after the closure of the Project it might be a challenge to keep the outreach, it provided, due to budget constraints.

Even though the Project has raised awareness among public institutions, an obvious need still exists for further cooperation, to prevent child labour. According to informants, the mindset among parents, producers and intermediaries must be changed before the problems can be solved. Penalties on parents and bans on child labour cannot solve the problem alone. A long-term sustainable solution can be found, when society finds it unacceptable that children are working rather than attending school.

No figures are available on the drop-out rate among those working children who benefitted from the Project, compared to those who did not (the drop-out rate among those is estimated to be around 40%). These figures would be essential to evaluate the sustainability of the intervention for this group.

In the mid-term, the Project will have had impact on those children who continue their education. Therefore, the Project can be said to have impacted the immediate situation of the direct end-beneficiaries (children and their families).

All close follow-ups of individual students will stop at the end of the Project and straight away there will be no one in place to follow-up, except for the general monitoring mechanism. Local authorities will likely not have the required financial resources to be able to continue the individual follow-up approach as initiated by the Project.

The projects' initiatives, in relation to school enrolment and attendance, might be continued when the Presidential Circular 2024/5 and the Ministry of National Education, General Directorate of Basic Education, Circular 2024/52 are implemented. This will require significant financial allocations, however.

Further action is also required as concerns the intermediaries and employers/producers. The employment of children can be only eliminated in the long-term if their activities are regulated.

Sustained efforts aimed at transforming the mindset of families and other relevant parties regarding children, children's rights, and child labour would enhance the impact of the Project.

Türkiye has become an SDG 8.7 Pathfinder country, and Turkish experiences are being used to advocate for these achievements internationally. The Pathfinder status has encouraged governmental officials to make even greater efforts to minimise child labour and many initiatives are in the pipeline, both when it comes to monitoring and to regulative and legislative frameworks.

The fact that the hygiene kit's contents were planned to meet the menstrual needs of women was received very positively by the beneficiaries, especially considering the conditions, where period poverty is prevalent. However, the overall project planning does not clearly indicate what steps have been taken concerning gender equality. Furthermore, and in regard to children with disabilities, although some cases have been referred to RAM (Rehabilitation and

Research Centres), it is not clear what specific measures the Project took for individuals and children with multiple disadvantages, including those with disabilities and special needs.

The evaluation did not find any evidence that attempts were made to strengthen tripartism and social dialogue. The evaluation finds that this is a missed opportunity, especially in the light of possible amendments to the LC. Tri-partite institutions are in place in Türkiye, but they are reported not to be functioning if full.

The general perception of the Project is that it has been particularly embraced by the families and children, who directly benefitted from it. However, they seldom were aware that this was an ILO project; rather they referred to the implementing partners as the Project owners. The children and their families did not have a deep awareness of child labour, in general rather they focused on their individual situation and the future of their children.

The trade unions did not express any ownership of the Project beyond participation in some Steering Committee meetings and a few training activities. The project did not offer any specific training activities for trade union leaders and activists, to support them in policy development and action on the issue of child labour in seasonal agriculture. There is no tradition of organising seasonal agriculture workers and the Project did not contribute to changing this. The employer's organisations participated in some activities, sending one of two people, they joined some Steering Committee meetings and showed a certain level of ownership of the Project. The sectoral employers, affiliated with the Chambers of Agriculture, had limited knowledge of the Project and no ownership. They also may have had a slightly different view on child labour than that of the ILO policy. However, the Project did not initiate and dialogue to influence the chambers' understanding of child labour.

There was a high level of ownership among government officials at the national level. The MoLSS strongly embraced the Project, and its senior officials had a good insight of the Project's expected outcomes and outputs. This strong ownership created a solid ground for possible continuation of at least a part of the activities initiated under the Project. There was also a good level of ownership among governmental officials at the local level in target areas. This has the potential to influence the allocation of funds to continued activities positively.

There was a very high level of ownership, among the implementing partners. In fact, the Project was often seen as a project of two implementing partners, at the local level, rather than an ILO project.

Representatives from the MoLSS, the primary beneficiaries, found that the Project was very useful for planning the next steps and actions to be taken. They emphasised that the Project was important for identifying both the regulatory changes to be made at the legislative level and the policy-level activities to be carried out. Additionally, they highlighted the Project's contribution in strengthening CLU capacities within its scope.

Although the involvement of the MoLSS, a key stakeholder in ILO Türkiye's initiatives, was significant, it is clear that the Ministry of Family and Social Policies and the MoNE, both of which have closer ties to families on the local level, could have played an even more crucial role within the Project. This perspective was particularly emphasised by members of the Turkish Employment Agency (İŞKUR) CLU. The consensus about CLUs is that these units have not yet become sufficiently active, and even the CLUs that were interviewed shared this view. One of the most significant affecting factors is that CLU membership is considered a "voluntary", additional job. CLU members expressed that they view the fight against child labour as a secondary task and stated that their working conditions do not allow enough focus on this issue. They find that if child labour is to be taken more seriously within their departments/institutions, both the capacity of the management and staff should be

strengthened and work on the elimination of child labour should not remain a side job. Additionally, it appears that CLU members, except for those from İŞKUR, are less involved in the activities of their units. According to the training facilitators, it was noticed that CLU members were the least prepared group in the capacity-building training that was provided within the Project's scope. In conclusion, İŞKUR personnel believe that having CLU as a separate unit would be more effective in the fight against child labour.

Further, it is expected that the role of intermediaries will be phased out and replaced with a regulation for private employment agencies, allowing them to take over the recruitment of agriculture workers in line with ILO Conventions, Recommendations and Guidelines. A study is being conducted to find the best options for these important changes to the regulative framework for seasonal agricultural workers. It will be important to have an inclusive approach when developing the new regulative documents. The expected reform could be a gamechanger in the struggle to eliminate child labour within the sector.

The project's most significant contribution was its long-term and wide-ranging scope of implementation. Additionally, the Project's monitoring activities, which covered both seasonal agricultural work periods and the return to the originating provinces, positively contributed to the data collection process concerning children involved in seasonal agricultural work. Moreover, the involvement of an international organisation, such as ILO, ensured that the Project was approached with great seriousness, particularly in terms of capacity-building activities and stakeholder participation in project events.

In addition, it was emphasised that the presence of the ILO project team, on the ground, and especially at the beginning of the Project, would have been important for increasing the visibility and recognition of the ILO.

The close follow-ups of individual students will stop at the end of the Project, and no one is in place to do this, except for the general monitoring mechanism. The projects' initiatives, in relation to school enrolment and attendance, might be continued when the Presidential Circular 2024/5 and the Ministry of National Education, General Directorate of Basic Education, Circular 2024/52 are implemented.

However, further action is required concerning intermediaries and employers/producers. The employment of children can only be solved in the long-term, if their activities are regulated.

Sustained efforts aimed at transforming the mindsets of families and other relevant parties, regarding children, children's rights and child labour will enhance the Project's impact.

The modular training program that was developed within the scope of the Project is a significant resource that can be used in future work on the elimination of child labour. This, after the issuing of circulars and other related changes, that need to be made following the training program, due to its broad scope and the framework it provided regarding child labour in seasonal agriculture. Additionally, the ToT sessions have the potential to strengthen capacity and to increase the multiplier effect of the training, if the trainers are given the possibility to use the skills and knowledge gained through the training.

Another project activity, the baseline study, involved research on child labour with families and other relevant stakeholders in the field. It was particularly important for illustrating the root causes of child labour in seasonal agriculture and the underlying mindset, culture and traditions associated with this phenomenon. The data collected in the baseline study has the potential to serve as a guiding tool for steps that could be taken towards policy development. For example, in response to the question "If someone from your usual place of residence could take care of them (your children), would you prefer them to stay at home?" was asked during



the study, and 72% of families answered "No." This response data highlights the importance of finding solutions that ensure the realisation of children's rights, such as education, while enabling them to stay with their families, in the context of seasonal agricultural work. Additionally, the data highlights the importance of providing safe spaces for children. Moreover, efforts should be made to develop appropriate tools to create space for the participation of children, who are the direct stakeholders. Incorporating their perspectives could contribute to achieving effective outcomes from the policies to be implemented.

In the immediate future, it will be crucial for sustainability to activate and continue monitoring the mechanisms across all areas in the fight against child labour. The field experiences of the implementing partners show that unaccompanied children are being involved in seasonal agricultural work, separately from their caregivers. This highlights the importance of establishing child protection and monitoring mechanisms.

The evaluation finds that, in the future, efforts should be made to establish safe, child-friendly spaces within the living areas of children, and that experts should be involved in their design as part of a pilot project. One of the main reasons families bring their children to work sites is their unwillingness to leave them alone, particularly in remote tent areas, due to security concerns. To ensure the spaces are effective, a thorough assessment should be conducted beforehand, and feedback gathered from both children and families. The planning process should consider factors, such as, the children's age, special needs, gender, status and other relevant circumstances, while ensuring social inclusion throughout.

The informants, who were deemed important for the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, should take a more active role in the studies to be carried out on seasonal agricultural work. Agricultural intermediaries indicated that it would be more efficient for the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, particularly within the Provincial and District Directorates, to take on more responsibility as concerns the issues related to seasonal agricultural work.

The evaluation finds that it is important to conduct studies with all the stakeholders, aimed at changing the perception of children and the mentality towards child labour. Although the main reason for child labour – especially those over the age of 14-15 – is economic challenges, seeing children not as children but as subjects who can work and contribute to the family economy emerges as the one mindset that paves the way for children to work. Not all intermediaries were aware that those children could be enrolled in school. The project contributed well to meaningful progress in this direction, by informing village heads (muhtars) and intermediaries and taking positive steps towards directing children to education through their cooperation. The agricultural intermediaries stated that some families did not want to work with them if they did not accept their children as workers.

Activities within the Project, aimed at empowering teachers and resident children, appeared to be limited. Teachers reported that the students enrolled in schools faced academic challenges and the children of seasonal agricultural workers struggled to adapt to school culture and to meet the hygiene requirements. As a result, they were subjected to peer bullying by the resident students. These experiences highlighted the importance of incorporating inclusive and empowering steps for all stakeholders.

Agricultural intermediaries and İŞKUR personnel informed the evaluation that efforts, and regulations aimed at standardizing the wages of seasonal agricultural workers, could be an important step in preventing child labour. Intermediaries believe that cooperatives could provide a solution to issues related to standardizing wages. Considering the power of intermediaries in the field, it appears that taking steps through consultation would be a workable solution.

Many stakeholders and beneficiaries find it acceptable for children aged 14-15 and older to work. This perception can be seen as an indication of the need for a mindset shift. Additionally, it appears that there were very limited activities within the framework of the Project that specifically targeted this age group. It is crucial that age-appropriate interventions are developed for this group, which faces a high risk of school dropout and child labour. The children in this age group, who were interviewed, informed the evaluation that preparatory courses for university entrance exams would be particularly beneficial for them.

The evaluation finds that the Project could have made more effort to inform children and young people about their rights. Children often believe that being employed with their families is beneficial for them. They are not aware of the consequences of the Worst Forms of Child Labor (WFCL) and the ensuing risk of drop-out from education. Young people, interviewed during the evaluation, shared the opinion that inspections should be stricter. They pointed out that when children go to the fields, landowners do nothing about it, and even if the gendarmerie arrives, employers simply send the children away.

Many stakeholders stated that there was no need to change the existing legislation, saying that the problem was more about its implementation at the local level.

The necessity of ensuring that social policies are accessible to everyone was emphasised by many stakeholders. It is a problem the Project paid some attention to, and which is closely linked to the formalisation of employment relations. Most stakeholders agree that the root cause is economic. For this reason, they believe that the situation has become more difficult, and that eliminating child labour is not possible within the current situation.

While many stakeholders emphasised the importance of strengthening inspection mechanisms, they also underlined the need for agricultural intermediaries to be involved in inspections. The dissemination of good practice examples and the sharing of success stories from local initiatives may have a positive impact in this regard.

Female FGD participants voiced a demand for support through various courses, training and opportunities, such as handicrafts during the periods when they were settled in their hometowns. It was found that such income-generating activities could be particularly effective in empowering women. Conducting market research, addressing women's demands, and establishing a market for these products could make these initiatives more empowering for women. However, such activities were not within the scope of the Project.

The MoLSS views the mobilisation of municipalities' financial and other resources as an important step. Other stakeholders also consider the involvement of municipalities as significant. Therefore, establishing collaboration with local governments emerges as a necessary step for future projects.

Among the stakeholders interviewed, some expressed interest in learning about good practices, stating that this would be empowering. In this regard, spreading such initiatives appears to be important. The field visits that were conducted within the Project were a valuable learning experience for the staff from various institutions. Additionally, it was suggested that field visits might have been important for academics, as well. It was also suggested that incorporating a FAQ section into the online platforms for training materials would have been empowering for the field staff.

The gendarmerie plays a critical role in preventing child labour in seasonal agriculture. However, when they make inspections, they report that children are hidden, or if they conduct road checks, intermediaries alert each other, enabling children to get off the vehicles and walk. Additionally, a perception that was shared by one gendarme was that "chasing children doesn't

suit the uniform". This is significant as it reflects certain mindset patterns. The gendarmerie generally believes that they could address the child labour issue in seasonal agriculture if they had more capacity, but they mention their heavy workload and their reluctance to impose fines on already poor families. All of this highlights the importance of working more closely with law enforcement.

#### 4.6. Cross cutting issues

- **Strengthening tripartism and social dialogue**  
Promotion of social dialogue and tripartism are at the centre of the ILO's projects and programmes as cross-cutting issues. The ILO globally promotes social dialogue, at all levels, in the current project while prioritising the increased capacity of the social partners and relevant public institutions and awareness raising on social dialogue. It was also foreseen that it would establish a constructive dialogue with the private sector concerning awareness-raising of responsible business practices. The project was intended to bring together representatives from government and employers and workers' organisations to become involved in collective action on the elimination of child labour in Türkiye. However, this did not materialise and efforts to achieve the set-out outcomes were limited. The evaluation recognises that it can be challenging to convince social partners to allocate resources for dealing with child labour in seasonal agriculture. However, it also finds that more effort could have been made to meet those set-out objectives. Both parties could have been supported in developing policies in the field of child labour.
- **Promoting international labour standards**  
An improved implementation of International Labour Standards was ratified by Türkiye and, in particular, the core Conventions No. 138 on Minimum Age and No.182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour was to be promoted and supported. Technical assistance and guidance were to be provided to the constituents for the effective application of International Labour Standards during the Project's implementation. The evaluation found limited reference to the ILS beyond those strictly related to WFCL. Here, government officials were the only ones referring to the conventions.
- **Promoting safe workplaces**  
The issue of OSH is a priority area of the ILO CO Ankara. It provided technical assistance to its constituents to facilitate tripartite dialogue on the development of a policy framework on the issue, including the implementation of the ILO's Conventions on OSH, and to contribute to the development of a broader OSH culture through raising awareness among the relevant partners. The project contributed to improving the living conditions of seasonal agricultural workers. The Project implemented some activities to increase the awareness of -related issues. The OSH "training" that was provided consisted of a session that lasted a maximum of two hours, but often less. The evaluation finds that these had the character of awareness-raising sessions rather than "training" activities. Due to the informality of employment relations, no statistics are available concerning the number of accidents and professional diseases among seasonal agricultural workers. Neither is any data available on the eventual child victims of hazardous working conditions.
- **Gender equality**  
The project planned to consider the implementation of activities to create equal opportunities for women and men. Those activities should have contributed to strengthening women's empowerment and to the inclusion of women at all stages of the implementation, while considering the social and cultural barriers rural women face in

Türkiye. The Project did not only actively seek to address the specific needs and opportunities for girls and women, but care was also taken to ensure that the activities provided were easily accessed, and that they considered the possible social limitations faced by girls and women.

female FGD participants voiced a demand for support through various courses, training and opportunities, such as handicrafts during the periods when they were settled in their hometowns. It was found that such income-generating activities could be particularly effective in empowering women. Conducting market research, addressing women's demands, and establishing a market for these products could make these initiatives more empowering for women.

- **Social cohesion and inclusion of vulnerable groups**  
Direct support activities were targeted at working and at-risk children, as well as their families who were engaging in seasonal agricultural work. They tried to serve for methods for bridging social differences, overcoming preconceptions and breaking down communication barriers for these vulnerable groups. However, this turned out to be a bigger challenge than expected. Children with special needs (i.e. disabled and children with chronic illness, etc.) and child refugees would also be taken into consideration, as mentioned above. Language facilitation was provided for refugees when needed, and the organisation and refurbishment of settlement areas and worker compounds for seasonal agricultural workers was made, whereas accessibility issues for people with disabilities were not addressed in full.

## 5. Conclusion

The most project's most significant contribution was its long-term and wide-ranging scope of implementation. Additionally, the Project's monitoring activities, which covered both seasonal agricultural work periods and the return to the originating provinces, positively contributed to enrolling thousands of children into education. Children who otherwise would be exposed to the worst forms of child labour.

The project managed to develop strong ownership of the Project among government officials and to the fight for elimination of child labour, in general. The evaluation found a strong commitment among government officials. This commitment gives hope for the continuation of some of the activities that were successfully initiated within the Project. Further, officials expressed that they found a clear footprint from the Project and the ILO in the Presidential Circular 2024/5 which sets out a strong outline for the improvement of working and employment conditions for seasonal agricultural workers and, thereby, also for the elimination of child labour. Additionally, the MoNE issue Circular 2024/52 established, in detail, a framework for ending child labour and ensuring that the children attend education. These two documents will guide the work on elimination of child labour and enrolment of all children into education in the years to come. The evaluation finds that this is a major achievement of the Project, even if it was not explicitly foreseen in the Project document.

Although the agricultural workforce in Turkey is largely unorganised and in informal employment relations, the evaluation finds that ILO's experience, of working with social partners, its outreach and direct involvement with trade unions and various employers' associations and chambers, had the potential to enhance the effectiveness of the Project and

establish an ownership among constituents. This can be seen as a missed opportunity for strengthening social dialogue.

The project engaged in some one-off activities, e. g., vocational training. The evaluation found that these initiatives were only partially successful, as there was no evidence of increased employability as a result. The evaluation finds that the vocational training for adults would have benefitted from a stronger needs analysis and selection of participants.

The justification for establishment of accommodation facilities with farmers that only invite seasonal workers for 3-4 weeks per year (and sometimes even less) should be further scrutinised, together with local stakeholders, to find the most efficient solution that justifies the investment.

The project contributed significantly to the establishment of one integrated database – the e-METIP – which was developed to include all the accessible information about seasonal agricultural workers and their children. It is expected to become a flagship in the government's efforts to eliminate child labour; but, at the end of the Project it was still facing some challenges and not up and running in full.

## 5.1 Recommendations

### Recommendation 1

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO/Donor	Low	Long-term	None

*The ILO and the donor are recommended to consider whether the current project was perhaps too big and would have benefited from being divided thematically and geographically, to ensure a stronger focus. This Recommendation was suggested by the stakeholders and the evaluation finds the recommendation well-placed.*

### Recommendation 2

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO	Medium	Long-term	Medium

*The ILO implements many projects, which have elements of construction activities included in them and often, as in the current project, with relatively large investments. However, there is no in-house capacity/expertise to guide these activities. The implementation of the construction activities builds on external expertise, which might not have full insight of ILO principles. It is recommended that the ILO build up its construction expertise to ensure cost efficiency and quality.*

### Recommendation 3

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO	High	Long-term	Low

*It is recommended to include an expert in children's rights in all projects involving children. This would ensure that the mechanisms that assure the meaningful participation of children in every action and decision affecting them are made operational and include all children in the Project's activities and while embracing diversity in project planning as well as implementation.*

### Recommendation 4

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO CO	Medium	Long-term	None

*The current project had limited visibility, except for at the national level. At the local level the Project was, to a large extent, seen as a project belonging to the implementing partners. The evaluation finds it important that the ILO maintains its relevance and shows its presence in all projects being implemented, as this not only strengthens the authority of the Office but also the normative framework that the ILO stands for.*

#### Recommendation 5

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO/implementing partners	High	Short-term	None

*The ILO is recommended to collaborate with local stakeholders when developing activities to be implemented at the local level. Local stakeholders will have better insight into the needs of beneficiaries and better ways of avoiding potential conflicts between different local groups. Involving local stakeholders, will make it easier to put a “do no harm” approach in place.*

#### Recommendation 6

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
Government	High	Long-term	High

*It is generally recognised that the CLU members can play a key role in eliminating child labour, thanks to their outreach to the local communities. The government is recommended to strengthen the capacity and competence of the CLU’s members and to ensure that they are credited for the work they do.*

#### Recommendation 7

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
All stakeholders	High	Long-term	Medium

*The evaluation understands that an efficient end to child labour can only be put in place, once a critical mass of key stakeholders and the general public accept there is a need to eliminate child labour. It is therefore recommended that a coordinated awareness-raising campaign be initiated that is targeted specifically at the general public and stakeholders.*

#### Recommendation 8

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
Government	High	Long-term	High

*It is understood that transportation from the settlements to school is a problem for many seasonal agricultural worker parents who want to send their children to school. Therefore, the government is recommended to consider moving primary schools and kindergartens out to the worker settlements. Including kindergartens would create a culture of learning amongst the children and thereby make it easier to attract them to school when they come of school age.*

#### Recommendation 9

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO CO and HQ	High	Long-term	Low

*The evaluation understands that amendments to the Labour Code and new regulations for private employment agencies are underway in Türkiye. These amendments would allow agricultural workers to be covered by the Labour Code and the Private Employment Agencies would take over the functions that have been handled by intermediaries until now. The ILO is*

*recommended to offer its full support to both initiatives, which are aimed at eliminating child labour and improving working and employment conditions for seasonal agricultural workers. The ILO has strong capacity in and experience of both issues, so it would be a missed opportunity not to offer full support.*

#### Recommendation 10

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
Government	High	Long-term	None

*The Government should establish an “All-Government” approach to child labour, including when it comes to the funding of child labour activities. This approach would be in line with the Presidential Circular 2024/5. It is expected that municipalities would play a major role in financing the activities, therefore it would also be important that they are included in the “All-Government” approach.*

#### Recommendation 11

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO CO	High	Long-term	Medium

*The ILO CO is recommended to raise funds for capacity building, targeted at the social partners, for their internal discussions and policy development on child labour based on which potential joint training could be developed.*

#### Recommendation 12

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO CO	Medium	Short-term	Low

*The current project provided vocational training to a group of adults, but there was no assessment of their increased employability. The ILO CO is recommended to conduct a tracer study, among the VET participants, to learn how to prepare for possible future interventions.*

#### Recommendation 13

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO CO	High	Long-term	None

*The current project did not have gender disaggregated data in its design. Consequently, reporting did not have fully gender-disaggregated data either. Gender quotas were also not put in place. The implementing partners were not asked to establish gender aggregated data. The evaluation strongly recommends that in future projects such data are requested from the development of the Project document.*



### 5.2 Lessons learned and emerging good practises

## Elimination of Child Labour in Seasonal Agriculture

DC/Symbol: TUR/20/01/EUR

Name of Evaluators: Sten Toft Petersen and Yesim Mutlu

Date: January 2025.

LESSON LEARNED ELEMENT	TEXT
<b>Brief description of lessons learned</b> (link to specific action or task)	Some of the local institutions/organisations that were interviewed during the evaluation particularly emphasised the importance of localisation and collaborating with local organisations. The stakeholders highlighted that local knowledge is crucial for achieving the goals of projects such as the current one. They also see it as important for strengthening local actors. Additionally, having mechanisms to provide feedback from the field is considered critical. The need for stronger local insight also came to the surface in connection with the VET initiative, undertaken for adult seasonal agriculture workers.
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	During the implementation of the Project some cases were developed where the in-kind assistance (hygiene kits, clothes and footwear) provided was not exactly what was most needed by end-beneficiaries.
<b>Targeted users /Beneficiaries</b>	Seasonal agricultural workers and their working/and at-risk children. Adults interested in
<b>Challenges /negative lessons -Causal factors</b>	Conflicts developed between local and the children of seasonal agricultural workers, after the children of seasonal agricultural workers received in-kind support and were invited for summer camp activities and the local children were not. This added to the other negative relationships, which arose from different cultures, languages, hygiene and academic challenges, which were faced by the children of seasonal agricultural workers.
<b>Success / Positive Issues -Causal factors</b>	A local solution to this was found, and in-kind support was distributed at the place of accommodation rather than in the school. In some cases, the local children were invited to join in summer camps at the recommendation of the teachers. The evaluation finds that giving the children this joined cultural or sportive experience potentially will minimise the risk of conflicts when they return to school.
<b>ILO Administrative Issues</b> (staff, resources, design, implementation)	In any possible, future projects, the local beneficiaries should be consulted to a greater extent, before new initiatives are launched. This will create a higher level of local ownership.





# Elimination of Child Labour in Seasonal Agriculture

DC/Symbol: TUR/20/01/EUR

Name of Evaluators: Sten Toft Petersen and Yesim Mutlu

Date: January 2025.

*The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.*

LESSON LEARNED ELEMENT	TEXT
<b>Brief description of lessons learned</b> (link to specific action or task)	Many stakeholders and beneficiaries find it acceptable for children, aged 14-15 and older, to work; this perception can be seen as an indication of the need for a mindset shift. There was almost no work in the Project specifically targeting this age group.
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	It is crucial that age-appropriate interventions be planned in collaboration with children in this age group, which faces a high risk of school dropout and child labour and incorporated into the Project. The children in this age group, who were interviewed, informed the evaluation that preparatory courses for university entrance exams would be particularly beneficial for them. This indicates a not realised potential.
<b>Targeted users /Beneficiaries</b>	The target group is working children and children at-risk aged 14 and older.
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	This group of children are at high risk of dropping out of school (the drop-out rate is estimated to be 40%). Although boys start to work, the girls are either tasked with looking after their smaller brothers and sisters or early/forcedly married.
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	In possible future projects more attention should be paid to this problem.
<b>ILO Administrative Issues</b> (staff, resources, design, implementation)	The resources needed would be moderate.



### Annex II: Emerging good Practices

## Elimination of Child Labour in Seasonal Agriculture

DC/Symbol: TUR/20/01/EUR

Name of Evaluators: Sten Toft Petersen and Yesim Mutlu

Date: January 2025.

*The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.*

GOOD PRACTICE ELEMENT	TEXT
<b>Brief summary of the good practice</b> (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	The Project established strong cooperation with the MoLSS and through this a strong engagement and feeling of ownership among officials from different relevant departments of the Ministry. Field visits are critical as an empowering and capacity-building activity that allows stakeholders to better understand the reality of the issue addressed in the Project.
<b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>	Close cooperation requires strong commitment from all parties involved, as well as the allocation of sufficient human resources to ensure its success. It is likewise important that there is a stable group of officials which can carry on the institutional commitment.
<b>Establish a clear cause- effect relationship</b>	The possibility for governmental officials to visit the beneficiaries in the field in their own environment gives the officials a new perspective of the problems they prior mainly have known from a theoretical perspective, this can lead to better decisions in the future. Decisions build on an insight in real problems.
<b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>	The impact will be seen in better targeted initiatives from both governmental institutions at national level in relation to possible future interventions.
<b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>	The chosen approach can be replicated by all projects which work with constituents and their members/clients/citizens especially those in remote areas where officials have seldom or never the possibility to visit.
<b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals</b> (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	The close cooperation in one field e.g. child labour can have a positive effect on the implementation of other parts of a given Country Programme.
<b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>	N/A

## Annex I Indicative Work Plan

### Revised workplan 03.12.24

Tasks	Dates	Team Leader - Number of working days	Evaluation Team member - Number of working days	Deliverables and Deadlines
Signing of contract	03.12.24			
Kick-off meeting	05.12			
i. Desk review of project related documents; Online briefing with Evaluation Manager and project team. ii. Prepare inception report including interview questions and questionnaires for project stakeholders	06-19.12	10.5	9.5	Submission of Draft Inception Report (19. December)
iii. Evaluation Manager (EM) and Project Management commenting on Inception Report	20-24.12			Consolidated comments to Inception Report (25. December)
iv. Inclusion of comments and providing final report	26.12			Final draft (26. December)
v. Approval of Inception Report	27.12			Final Report (27. December)
vi. Project Team contact to informants and planning of logistics for field mission with National Consultant	30.12-03.01			
i. Conduct interviews, and surveys with relevant project staff, stakeholders, and beneficiaries ii. Presentation of preliminary results to the stakeholders in a workshop.	06-23.01	14	10.5	

Analysis of data based on desk review, field research, interviews /questionnaires with stakeholders; draft report	24.01-06.02	10	3	Submission of Draft Evaluation Report (06 February)
Team and stakeholder comments to draft report	07-13.02			Consolidated comments to draft report (14. February)
Revise and finalise the report	17-18.02	2	0	Submission of Final Evaluation Report (18. February)
<b>Total</b>		<b>36.5</b>	<b>23</b>	

## Annex II Groups of informants

Institution	Number of Interviews	Gender		Type
		Female	Male	
ILO	6 (12 participants)	7	5	Onsite
Implementing Partner (Pikolo and GHV)	10 (13 participants)	6	7	Online/Onsite
External Consultants	4	2	2	Online
Donor (EU)	1		1	Onsite
Ministry of Labour and Social Security	3 (4 participants)	2	2	Online
Ministry of National Education	4 (5 participants)	1	4	Onsite
Ministry of Family and Social Services	1		1	Onsite
Ministry of Culture and Tourism	1 (4 participants)	3	1	Online
İŞKUR	4 (5 participants)	1	4	Onsite
Governorates	4	1	3	Onsite
CSOs	4	2	2	Onsite
Employer's Organisations	1	1		Onsite
Trade Unions	4	2	2	Onsite
Gendarmerie	2	1	1	Onsite
School Principal	1		1	Onsite
Garden Owner	1		1	Onsite
Mukhtar	1		1	Onsite
TOTAL		29	38	

# Focus Group Discussions (FGD) & Group Discussions (GD)

Group	Type	Number of Focus Group/ Group Discussions	Number of Participants	Gender		Average Age (Estimated)	Location
				Female	Male		
Teachers	FGD	1	7	6	1	48	Eskişehir (Seyitgazi)
Families	FGD	1	5	4	1	45	Şanlıurfa (Haliliye)
Children	FGD	1	9	4	5	15	Şanlıurfa(Haliliye)
Producers	FGD	1	6		6	50	İzmir (Torbalı)
Agricultural Intermediaries	FGD	1	7	1	6	55	Şanlıurfa (Haliliye)
Families	GD	1	16	6	10	45	Adana (Karataş)
Agricultural Intermediary & Seasonal Workers	GD	1	7	4	3	50	İzmir (Torbalı)
TOTAL		7	57	25	32		

### Annex III List of informants

NAME	INSTITUTION	TITLE	Duty Station
<b>Government</b>			
	DG of Labour / MoLSS		Ankara
	DG of Basic Education/ Ministry of National Education	Teacher & Teacher	Ankara
	Ministry of Culture and Tourism		Ankara
	MoFSS General Directorate of Child Services		Ankara
	DG for Foreign Relations and European Union/MoLSS		Ankara
	DG of Labour/MoLSS		Ankara
	Eskişehir Seyitgazi District National Education Directorate		Eskişehir (Seyitgazi)
	İŞKUR (Turkish Employment Agency)		Eskişehir
	İŞKUR (Turkish Employment Agency)	CLU Member	İzmir
	İzmir Governorate		İzmir
	Adana Governorate		Adana
	Adana Provincial Gendarmerie Command		Adana
	İŞKUR (Turkish Employment Agency)	CLU Member	Şanlıurfa
	Şanlıurfa Provincial Directorate of National Education		Şanlıurfa
	Ordu Governorate		Ordu
	Altınordu Provincial Gendarmerie Command		Ordu
	İŞKUR (Turkish Employment Agency)		Ordu
<b>Donor</b>			
	EU Delegation to Türkiye		Ankara

<b>Trade unions etc.</b>			
	DİSK		Ankara
	HAK-İŞ	Senior Expert	Ankara
	DİSK Eskişehir Regional Representative		Eskişehir
	Izmir Branch of the Agricultural-Labour Union		İzmir
<b>Employer's organisation</b>			
	TİSK	Senior Expert	Ankara
<b>External Consultants</b>			
	Independent	Team Leader for Capacity Development Training	Ankara
	Independent	Consultant / Education Expert for Capacity Development Training	İstanbul
	Independent	Academician/ Social Services Expert for Capacity Development	İzmir
	Contract	Civil Engineer	Diyarbakır
<b>Implementing partners</b>			
	Young Life Foundation	Field Officer	Eskişehir (Seyitgazi)
	Young Life Foundation		Eskişehir (Seyitgazi)
	Young Life Foundation		Eskişehir (Seyitgazi)
	Young Life Foundation		İzmir (Torbalı)
	Young Life Foundation		İzmir (Torbalı)
	Young Life Foundation		İstanbul
	Pikolo Association		Adana (Karataş)
	Pikolo Association		Adana (Karataş)
	Pikolo Association		İstanbul



	Pikolo Association		Ordu
<b>ILO CO</b>			
	ILO	Project Team (Administrative)	Ankara
	ILO	Project Team (Technical)	Ankara
	ILO	Senior Programme Manager	Ankara
	ILO	Senior Project Coordinator	Ankara
	ILO		Ankara
	ILO	Technical Specialist	Geneva
<b>Field Visit</b>			
7 Participants (FGD)		Teachers	Eskişehir (Seyitgazi)
	Karataş Primary School		Adana (Karataş)
	Karataş District National Education Directorate		Adana (Karataş)
			Ordu (Perşembe)
Yaşar Bey	Altınordu District Governorate Social Assistance and Solidarity Fund		Ordu
<b>Employers/garden owners</b>			
6 Participants (FGD)		Producers	İzmir (Torbalı)
		Garden Owner	Ordu (Perşembe)
<b>Beneficiaries</b>			
7 Participants (Group Discussion)		Agricultural Intermediary & Seasonal Workers	İzmir (Torbalı)

16 Participants (Group Discussion)		Families	Adana (Karataş)
7 Participants (FGD)		Agricultural Intermediaries	Şanlıurfa
5 Participants (FGD)		Families	Şanlıurfa
9 Participants (FGD)		Children	Şanlıurfa
<b>CSOs</b>			
	Chamber of Agriculture		Adana (Karataş)
	Association for Monitoring and Preventing Child Labor		Adana
	Şanlıurfa Bar Association		Şanlıurfa
	Chamber of Agriculture		Şanlıurfa (Haliliye)

## Annex IV Documents reviewed

- ILO Policy Guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 4th ed (2020) 3rd ed.  
[http://www.ilo.ch/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS\\_571339/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.ch/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm)
- [http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_206205/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206205/lang--en/index.htm)
- Checklist No. 3: Writing the inception report  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165972/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165972/lang--en/index.htm)
- Checklist 5: preparing the evaluation report  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165967/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang--en/index.htm)
- Checklist 6: rating the quality of evaluation report  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165968/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang--en/index.htm)
- Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_206158/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206158/lang--en/index.htm)  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_206159/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206159/lang--en/index.htm)
- Guidance note 7: Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation h  
[https://www.ilo.org/global/docs/WCMS\\_165982/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/global/docs/WCMS_165982/lang--en/index.htm)
- Guidance note 4: Integrating gender equality in the monitoring and evaluation of Projects h  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165986/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm)
- UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation  
<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/548>
- ILO, Programme and Budget for the Biennium 2022-2023
- ILO's Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour in Türkiye 2021-2025
- Mid-Term Evaluation Report (2022)
- Minutes from Steering Committee Meetings 1-5
- Project Log Frame
- Grant Application/Project Document
- Yearly Progress Report 1-3
- Minutes from Management Committee Meetings 1-16

## Annex V Overview of Stakeholders, Topics and Data Collection Methodologies

Social actors interviewed	Issues to be explored	Proposed activities
<b>ILO staff at HQ, RO and CO</b>	<p>Changes (outcomes) experienced related to the intervention e.g. with respect to child labour</p> <p>Relevance and contribution of the intervention to changes identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ In what way has the situation for working and at risk of working children changed over recent years</li> <li>➤ What would it take to make the governments interventions even more relevant</li> <li>➤ Barriers and drivers related to the context, government officials and local authorities</li> <li>➤ Actions taken to ensure participation of girls, boys, refugee children, youth and young people living with disabilities</li> <li>➤ Extend to which government officials use their new knowledge to create change and implement the policies developed</li> </ul>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>Group meetings with project staff</p>
<b>Working and at risk of working children and their families</b>	<p>Changes (outcomes) experienced related to the intervention and workers' own attitude, knowledge, skills, behaviour, relations to TUs, other workers and employers</p> <p>Relevance and contribution of the intervention to changes identified:</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Focus group discussions with children and workers (women and men)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ In what way has the situation for working and at risk of working children changed over recent years</li> <li>➤ What would it take to make the governments interventions even more relevant</li> <li>➤ Barriers and drivers related to the context, working and at risk of working children themselves or the intervention for using information provided through the project</li> </ul>	Mini survey
<b>Governmental Officials</b>	<p>Changes (outcomes) experienced related to the intervention e.g. with respect to implementation of the project.</p> <p>Relevance and contribution of the intervention to changes identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Added value of ILO being lead</li> <li>➤ Experiences cooperating with the project and its partners</li> <li>➤ Usefulness of tri-partite social dialogue in relation to child labour</li> <li>➤ Experiences engaging with CSOs working on child labour</li> <li>➤ Barriers and opportunities for engaging working and at risk of working children and their families, employers and CSOs</li> <li>➤ How to sustain achievements</li> <li>➤ Post project transfer situation</li> </ul>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>Focus group discussions with officials directly involved with the labour migrants and returnees</p>
<b>Trade Unions leaders</b>	<p>Changes (outcomes) experienced related to the intervention e.g. with respect to engagement of TU representatives' capabilities (attitude, knowledge, skills, relations) to handle child labour related issues</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>

	<p>Relevance and efficiency of the intervention to changes identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Reasons to cooperate with ILO and the social partners on child labour</li> <li>➤ Relevance of the project to trade unions</li> <li>➤ What would it take to make the capacity building and information provided even more relevant</li> <li>➤ Barriers and drivers related to the context, workers themselves, government officials and trade unions</li> </ul>	
<b>Employers and their associations</b>	<p>Changes (outcomes) experienced related to the intervention e.g. with respect to employers' attitude, knowledge, or relations to make use of child labour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Relevance and efficiency of the intervention</li> <li>➤ Reasons to cooperate with ILO</li> <li>➤ Relevance of the project to employers</li> <li>➤ What would it take to make the capacity building and information provided even more relevant</li> <li>➤ Barriers and drivers related to the context, employers themselves or the intervention for using information provided through the project.</li> </ul>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>
Civil Society Organisations working on elimination of	<p>Relevance or contribution of the intervention to changes observed with CSOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To what extent is the intervention known in the CSO community</li> </ul>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>

child labour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ In what way was the project relevant to CSOs</li> <li>➤ What would it take to make it even more relevant for small as well as big agencies</li> </ul>	Focus group discussions with agency workers/local agents
Other stakeholders	<p>Relevance or contribution of the intervention to changes observed by other stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The projects contribution to eliminating WFCL in the agriculture sector</li> <li>➤ Interaction with other stakeholders</li> <li>➤ Improvements in conditions for working and at risk of working children</li> </ul>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>

## Annex VI Meeting Schedule (6-23 January 2025)

Date	Time	Evaluator	Organisation, Institution, Agency, Project	Name	Position	Type: on-line, face-to-face, FGD other
06.01	09.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Project team			Face to face
	12.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Project team			Face to face
	16.00	Sten Toft Petersen	Independent			Online
	16.00	Yeşim Mutlu	DG of Basic Education/ Ministry of National Education			Face to face
07.01	09.30	Sten Toft Petersen	EU Delegation to Türkiye			Face to face
	11.30	Sten Toft Petersen	DG for Foreign Relations and European Union/MoLSS			Face to face
	14.00	Sten Toft Petersen	DG of Labour/MoLSS			Face to face
	16.00	Sten Toft Petersen	TİSK			Face to face
08.01	10.30	Sten Toft Petersen	MoFSS General Directorate of Child Services			Face to face
	12.15	Sten Toft Petersen	DİSK			Face to face
	14.15	Sten Toft Petersen	HAK-İŞ			Face to face



	16.50	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Travel from Ankara to Eskişehir			
09.01	10.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Field Visit to Seyitgazi			
	11.00	Sten Toft Petersen	Implementing Partner (GHV)			Face to face
	11.00	Yeşim Mutlu	Implementing Partner (GHV)			Face to face
	13.30	Yeşim Mutlu	Teachers			Face to face FGD
	15.00	Yeşim Mutlu	Seyitgazi District National Education Directorate			Face to face
	15.00	Sten Toft Petersen	Implementing Partner (GHV)			Face to face
10.01	11.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Disk Eskişehir			Face to face
	14.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	İŞKUR & MoFSS			Face to face
	17.07	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Travel from Eskişehir to Ankara			
11.01	11.10		Travel from Ankara to İzmir			
12.01	10.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Field visit to Torbalı			
	11.00	Sten Toft Petersen	Implementing Partner (GHV)			Face to face
	11.00	Yeşim Mutlu	Implementing Partner (GHV)			Face to face

	12.30	Yeşim Mutlu	Producer			Face to face
	12.30	Sten Toft Petersen	Group discussion			Face to face
						Face to face
13.01	11.00	Sten Toft Petersen	Agricultural Labor Union Izmir Branch			Face to face
	11.00	Yeşim Mutlu	İŞKUR			Face to face
	14.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	İzmir Governorate			Face to face
	20.30	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Travel from İzmir to Adana			
14.01	09.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Field Visit to Karataş			
	10.00	Sten Toft Petersen	Chamber of Agriculture			Face to face
	10.00	Yeşim Mutlu	Implementing Partner (PIKOLO)			Face to face
	12.00	Sten Toft Petersen	School			Face to face
	12.00	Yeşim Mutlu	Families			Face to face FGD
	14.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Implementing Partner (PIKOLO)			Face to face
	15.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Karataş District National Education Directorate			Face to face
15.01	09.00	Yeşim Mutlu	Adana Governorate			Face to face
	10.00	Sten Toft Petersen	Implementing Partner (PIKOLO)			Online

	11.00	Yeşim Mutlu	Association for Monitoring and Preventing Child Labor			Face to face
	14.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Adana Provincial Gendarmerie Command			Face to face
	15.30	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Travel from Adana to Şanlıurfa			
16.01	09.00	Sten Toft Petersen	İŞKUR			Face to face
	10.00	Yeşim Mutlu	Agricultural Intermediaries			Face to face FGD
	11.30	Yeşim Mutlu	Families			Face to face FGD
	15.30	Yeşim Mutlu	Children			Face to face FGD
	16.00	Sten Toft Petersen	Implementing Partner (GHF)			Online
17.01	10.00	Sten Toft Petersen	ILO			Online
	13.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Şanlıurfa Provincial Directorate of National Education			Face to face
	15.00	Yeşim Mutlu	Şanlıurfa Bar Association			Face to face
	15.00	Sten Toft Petersen	Şanlıurfa Haliliye Chamber of Agriculture			Face to face
	21.40	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Travel from Şanlıurfa to Ankara			
18.01			No program			

19.01	17:55	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Travel from Ankara to Ordu			
20.01	09.30	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Field Visit to Renovation Area (Perşembe District)			
	11.00	Sten Toft Petersen	Garden Owner			Face to face
	11.00	Yeşim Mutlu	Mukhtar			Face to face
	13.00	Yeşim Mutlu	Ordu Governorate			Face to face
	14.00	Yeşim Mutlu	Altınordu District Governorate Social Assistance and Solidarity Fund			Face to face
	14.00	Sten Toft Petersen	Pikolo Association			Face to face
	15.30	Sten Toft Petersen	İŞKUR			Face to face
	15.30	Yeşim Mutlu	Altınordu District Gendarmerie Command			Face to face
	19.45	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Travel from Ordu to Ankara			
21.01	09.00	Sten Toft Petersen	ILO Team (Other Child Labor Projects)			Online
	11.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Ministry of Culture and Tourism			Face to face
	14.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	DG of Labour/MoLSS			Face to face
	16.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	EU Delegation to Türkiye			Face to face
22.01	09.00	Sten Toft Petersen	Independent Consultant			Online

	14.00	Yeşim Mutlu	İzmir Katip Çelebi University			Online
23.01	10.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	Validation workshop			Face to face
	14.00	Sten Toft Petersen and Yeşim Mutlu	ILO CO for Türkiye			Face to face
31.01	10.00	Sten Toft Petersen	Technical Specialist ILO HQ			Online

## Annex VII Main Recommendations of Mid-Term Evaluation

### Recommendations

1. For the remaining time of the project, focus on critical needs in terms of the institutional capacity of MoLSS and ISKUR CLU employees as well as other public institutions partners and start up the exit strategy with a gradual transition of project responsibilities to active local partners/governors and promote the use of E-METIP: The implementing partners play a critical role in referring children to social support centres and mobilizing public resources for project activities. Main capacity-building activities (in form of training) were about to be started at the end of the evaluation. CLU structure and eventually their employees are given important roles in the existing policy framework, however not always interpreted in the same way. In this context, the project should ideally dedicate its focus to capacity-building activities, and also piloting in the remaining time. It is worth noting that both implementing partners have extensive past experience working with seasonal migrant workers. Such expertise may take time to build among public authorities. Yet, the ownership in certain provinces is reassuring and the interest level of the local authorities to carry out the intervention is promising. To ensure a smooth exit, it is advised to plan a gradual transition of project activities to active local partners/governors before the project comes to an end. This may be done by selecting one pilot region and providing direct access to human and financial resources for public authorities/local governance (e.g., in the form of grant management based on TOR and/or direct contracting). In this context, the efficient use of the E-METIP system may significantly decrease the resources needed to identify children.
2. Enhance cooperation and communication among different provinces and regions and disseminate knowledge by encouraging peer learning among ISKUR-CLU employees, and public institutions and systematically share good examples and guidance: The project has a large geographical scope, and there exist differences in terms of capacities and interpretation of the existing policy framework among different ISKUR CLU employees and directors. Over the remaining time of the project, the project may consider enhancing communication and cooperation among different provinces as well as between central and local governance by facilitating the organisation of country-wide meetings, and workshops. Peer learning can be also encouraged by matching active ISKUR CLU employees with other provinces in Türkiye. Good examples and active participation from selected ISKUR CLU's can be documented and shared country-wide in the form of case studies and short guidance. Given the changing location of the local governors and civil servants, such peer learning exercises, and documentation of case studies may provide a considerable opportunity for the replication of the project in other regions and promote consistent understanding and interpretation of the existing policy framework.
3. Continue promoting and supporting the implementation of a direct intervention model for seasonal migrant workers' children through public authorities and identify windows of opportunity for tailoring approaches for the withdrawal of children in high-risk age groups: Many stakeholders recognised the project's success in terms of providing a safe space for children during the harvest season. The project nearly reached its target numbers and was successful in identifying and referring children. Yet the seasonal migrant workers children also have diverse profiles and the needs of children in terms of social inclusion, language skills and social development may vary. In this frame, the project may consider adapting the training program or adding additional modules for certain provinces. In addition, stakeholders also noted limitations of the intervention model keeping children between the ages of 14 to 18 at social support centres. Factors such as monetary and multidimensional poverty highly influence the prevalence of child labour in this age group, as it is one way for families to manage poverty and deprivation risk. School feeding and in-kind programmes may have limited effect in reducing children's engagement in work.
4. Facilitate involvement of municipalities and other public authorities in the improvement of temporary settlement areas and accommodation facilities and continue supporting renovation activities: The conditions of the temporary settlement areas and accommodation facilities are one of the subjects that was highlighted as

critical by both direct beneficiaries and other informants. In this context, challenges are manifold (e.g., lack of officially recognised areas, changing times of the harvest, lack of resources). Given the importance of the subject, and based on the feedback from the stakeholders, the following points may be taken into consideration: sustainability of the material used, energy efficiency, safety measures for emergencies and disasters, and promoting engagement with users/beneficiaries. Mapping unused buildings and areas can be also considered to provide more stable conditions for workers.

5. Promote cross-ministerial cooperation and data sharing on seasonal migrant workers and children: The project is considered as unique for Türkiye's context in terms of bringing many stakeholders together and targeting WFCL in seasonal agriculture from various angles (promoting education, enforcing policy framework, The role of social protection in the elimination of child labour, building capacity among public authorities and supporting livelihood of workers). Child labour is a complex issue and indirectly, other issues such as child protection, safety, poverty alleviation and promoting education, fall under the responsibility of various ministries. In addition, all relevant ministries have their own data collection mechanisms in place. In this context, the project success is evident in terms of ensuring involvement of relevant ministries. It has also great potential to encourage collaboration in terms of data sharing and action planning.

6. Continue strengthening child monitoring activities in the city of origin and enhancing cooperation with district commissions of MoNE: The project is successful in keeping and monitoring the data of children who directly benefit from the intervention; the long-term impact of the project is highly dependent on how children will be kept in education through monitoring activities at the city of their origin. The project's monitoring activities are often done through telephone calls, the household, and school visits. The Ministry of National Education has also district commissions in place to monitor seasonal agriculture workers' children. In this context, child monitoring efforts could be strengthened and cooperation between different public authorities can be enhanced.

7. Create a knowledge and data management model, document lessons learned and good practices addressing different groups' needs and disseminate knowledge among public institutions, private sectors and other civil society organisations in the process: Although the project has only completed its first two years, the evaluators noted that field staff, teachers, school principals and local authorities (who have more experience on implementing such measures/interventions) have valuable knowledge about their regions/intervention areas. These field experiences may be of great value to new implementers (including other civil society organisations and private sector). Furthermore, the project has also strong data and research component with baselines, therefore development of a knowledge and data management model and documenting lessons learned will increase the sustainability of the project and its potential to be replicated in other regions of Türkiye.

8. Continue promoting decent work conditions for seasonal migrant workers through awareness-raising, capacity-building, and policy development support: Working conditions of the seasonal migrant workers indirectly affect their decision about their children working. In particular, measures on compensation, working hours and occupational health and safety are crucial. In this context, the project has already been successful in raising awareness about the elimination of child labour, therefore this momentum can be also used to bring attention to the connection between workers' working conditions, decent work and legal gaps in the existing national framework.

9. Consider cooperating with other initiatives on livelihood solutions and poverty alleviation solutions for seasonal migrant workers: Livelihood solutions including vocational trainings address the root causes of the problem. Yet given the limited time of the project, its focus on elimination of child labour and further synergies can be explored with existing and/or long-term livelihood initiatives/programmes targeting vulnerable groups in skills development and employment.

10. Consider no-cost extension: The capacity-building activities were heavily impacted by the high number of beneficiaries, public staff, and long bureaucratic processes. Required ownership and capacity building for public authorities may necessitate longer intervention. A no-cost extension for one year might be a logical option allowing the project to duly complete the remaining activities and fully utilise the project's resources.

## Guide for Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with families

### Background information

- 1) Date of FGD: \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) Province: \_\_\_\_\_
- 3) Type of work: \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Number of participants: Adults \_\_\_\_\_
  - 4a) Union members: \_\_\_\_\_ Not Union members: \_\_\_\_\_
  - 4b) Male: \_\_\_\_\_ Female: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Average age (estimate): Adults \_\_\_\_\_
- 6) Month of latest school program provided by the project \_\_\_\_\_

### Relevance and contributions of the project

- Do you know the ILO project? Do you know the name of it?
- What types of trainings and supports did you get?
- What are major focuses of trainings and supports?
- Are the trainings and supports relevant?
- What are limitations of trainings and supports?
- What are main challenges of the children and families?
- Which challenges have been solved due to the project and which ones are not solved?
- Did the training/project address your gender specific needs?
- If you had a magic wand, what would you do to stop children from working? Or if you were in charge, what would you do to prevent children from working?

### Handout for participants in FGD (Families)



	Stron gly disag ree	Disagr ee	Agr ee	Strongly agree	D o n' t k n o w
1. The training was relevant.					
2. I feel more self-confident after the training.					
3. .I am now aware of the benefit of children going to school instead of working.					
4. Children work because of low salary of parents.					
5. The training I got inspired me to seek opportunities for my child to continue his/ education.					
6. I have used the information to raise a discussion in my family/community about children working vs. going to school.					
7. After the trainings, I have participated in discussions with parents/family about the need for education.					
8. The discussion has stimulated a dialogue in the community.					

## Guide for Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with working children/children at risk of working

### Background information

- 1) Date of FGD: \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) Province: \_\_\_\_\_
- 3) Type of work (if relevant): \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Number of participants: Children \_\_\_\_\_
- 4a) Union members: \_\_\_\_\_ Not Union members: \_\_\_\_\_
- 4b) Male: \_\_\_\_\_ Female: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Average age (estimate): Children \_\_\_\_\_
- 6) Month of latest school/activity program provided by the project \_\_\_\_\_

### Relevance and contributions of the project

- Do you know the ILO project? Do you know the name of it?
- What types of trainings and supports do/did you get?
- the trainings and supports relevant to your age, gender and needs? What did/do you like most and least about the trainings and/or supports?
- What are main challenges of the children and families working in seasonal agriculture?
- Do you think these challenges addressed/solved with the project? Which challenges have been solved/addressed and which ones are not solved/addressed?
- If you had a magic wand, what would you do to stop children from working? Or if you were in charge, what would you do to prevent children from working?

### II. Handout for participants in FGD (Children)

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
1. The trainings were relevant.					
2. I feel more self-confident after the trainings/activities.					
3. It is in the best interest of the children to not work and to continue their education.					
4. Children should never work.					
5. The education I received and the activities I attended have motivated me to seek more knowledge on continuing my education.					
6. After the trainings/activities, I have participated in discussions with parents/family about the need for education					
7. I would always like to participate in such trainings.					
8. I will share what I have learned from this project with my friends who could not participate in it.					

**Things I want to add:** .....

### Background information

- 1) Date of FGD: \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) Province \_\_\_\_\_
- 3) Number of participants: \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Average age (estimate) \_\_\_\_\_
- 6) Month of latest training/information/work provided by the program \_\_\_\_\_
- 7) Type of activity you participated in: \_\_\_\_\_
- 8) FGD Group:

### Relevance and contributions of the project

- Do you know the ILO program? Do you know the name of it?
- Do you know why you were selected for training/activity?
- What types of supports did you get from the project?
- What are major focuses of trainings and supports?
- Are the trainings and supports relevant?
- What are limitations of trainings and supports?
- What are main challenges of Government officials/teachers/intermediaries/CLU members in dealing with child labour (hereunder women and girls and other vulnerable groups)?
- Which challenges have been solved thanks to the program and which ones are not solved?
- Did the training/project address your specific needs? What are your major challenges?
- Did the participation in the project lead to changes in your work on child labour?
- Will you be able to continue the activities after project ends??

**Handout for participants in FGD (to be translated into local language)**

	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
1. The training was relevant.					
2. I now have better opportunities for doing my work.					
3. I feel more self-confident after the training.					
4. I now have better understanding of the issues workers and their children are confronted with.					
5. Now (thanks to the project) more working children go regularly to school.					
6. I feel proud of the improvement made by our department/office/school/community.					
7. After the training/work I have participated in discussions with other colleagues on how we can improve our work.					
8. The program has stimulated a dialogue in our department/office/school/community about child labour.					
9. The training include information about children's rights.					

10. The project has contributed to improve coordination among government institutions on child labour.					
11. My department/office/school/community is now in a stronger position on handling child labour.					
12. I am convinced that the initiatives will continue after project.					

## **Guide for Semi-structured interviews with:**

### **Project management and ILO Country Director and other relevant ILO staff**

#### **1. Relevance**

1.1 Were the project approach and activities relevant to the needs of the constituents (Government of Turkey, employers' and workers' organisations) and the stated objectives?

1.2 Was there a fit between the project design and the direct beneficiaries' needs?

1.3 To what extent did the project address key relevant components of and contribute to UN Country programme frameworks (UNSDCF), strategic country development documents, and Sustainable Development Goals – especially SDG 8 as well as ILO's strategic and national policy frameworks??

1.4 Has the project reflection on general policies? Does the project relate to ILO results framework (including P&B 2022-23), the ILO mandate and relevant policies, including gender equality and non-discrimination, disability inclusion, international labour standards, social dialogue, just transition on environment?

#### **2. Coherence**

2.1 How well did the interventions of the project fit with other interventions of the ILO Office for Türkiye? What synergies were created? How well did the interventions of the project fit with other interventions of the relevant partners?

2.2 How well did the design and implementation of Project take into account the national institutions work on child labour elimination that contributes to Türkiye's national efforts on elimination of child labour?

2.3 Has the project established partnerships with relevant organisations/institutions at the global and country-level throughout its implementation? What were their roles? And what were their expectations? To what extent have these partnerships been useful in the achievement of the intended results?

2.4 What was the added value of the ILO work in terms of comparative advantage?

#### **3. Effectiveness**

3.1 To what extent were the project objectives achieved? Were there any notable successes or innovations? Which were the positive factors and obstacles or barriers to achieve the project results?

3.2 Were there any unintended results (positive or negative)?

3.3 How effective have been the capacity building of national stakeholders' activities, especially those started in the second part of the project (after the mid-term evaluation)

3.4 To what extent did the project adapt its approach to respond to the COVID-19 and the earthquake crisis and what were the implications on the nature and degree of achievement of the project and project targets after those? Did the project foster ILO constituents' active involvement through social dialogue through the project in articulating a response to the immediate effects of the crisis? How gender considerations were mainstreamed throughout the project cycle (, planning, implementation, M&E), including that of implementation partners?

3.5 Was the quality of outputs satisfactory?

3.6 How effective was the monitoring mechanism set up, including the regular/periodic meetings among project staff and with the beneficiary, donor and key partners? Was there a suitable monitoring and evaluation framework for accountability, management and learning developed at the outset of the project and updated regularly?

3.7 What mechanisms were in place to ensure the inclusion of beneficiary feedback in the design and implementation process?

3.8 Assess the level of government involvement in the project and how their involvement with the project has built their capacity to continue further work on future programmes.

3.9 How has the capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners (at national and local levels) to develop effective action against address child labour been enhanced as a result of programme activities?

3.10 How important was the capacity development activities, especially the activities undertaken after the mid-term evaluation?

#### **4. Efficiency**

4.1 How efficiently were the resources of the project (time, expertise, funds, knowledge and know-how) used to produce outputs and results? Were resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) allocated strategically to achieve the project objectives? Did the project benefit from complementary resources at the global and country levels that supported the achievement of its intended objectives?

4.2 Given the size of the project, its complexity and challenges, were the existing management structure and technical capacity sufficient and adequate?

4.3 Did the project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from the ILO HQ and Regional Office and its national partners? If not, why?

4.4 To what extent did the project leverage resources (financial, partnerships, expertise) to promote international labour standards, social dialogue and disability inclusion Gender equality and non-discrimination and just transition on the environment?

4.5 How effective was the communication strategy? Did the project receive adequate technical and administrative support/response from the ILO backstopping units?

#### **5. Sustainability and emergent impact**

5.1 Are the results achieved by the project so far likely to be sustainable and last beyond the project (including the e-METIP system as a collaboration and monitoring mechanism? How will the implemented work be institutionalised and used by government institutions to enhance future work on the intended objectives of the project?

5.2 To what extent have results contributed to advance sustainable development objectives (as per UNSDCF, similar UN programming frameworks, national sustainable development plans, and SDGs)?

5.3 To what extent did the project contribute to advancing the ILO's core principles (ILS, tripartism and social dialogue, gender equality and non-discrimination -i.e. Gender and people with disabilities and other groups as relevant- and just transition)?

5.4 What was the level of ownership of the project outcomes by partners and beneficiaries?



5.5 Assess what contributions the programme has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders and to encourage ownership of the programme to partners. How far the Projects interacted and possibly influenced national level policies, debates and institutions working on child labour.

5.6 To what extent knowledge developed throughout the project (research papers, progress reports, manuals, and other tools) can still be utilised after the end of the project to inform policies and practitioners?

## **6. Additional questions**

6.1 To what extent the project addressed the mid-term evaluation recommendations?

6.2 Identify lessons learnt and potential good practices of intervention that could inform future projects and partners and stakeholders could incorporate into policy and practice.

6.4 Would it be to expect that public employees would know rules and regulations (and policies) on child labour?

6.5 Any initiatives to include agriculture (less than 50 employees) under the LC when it comes to children?

6.7 Were similar (to those introduced by the current project) activities already earlier implemented by implementing partners or others?

6.8 What efforts were made to engage the sectoral (agro) trade unions and employer's organisation in the project?

6.9 Was meaningful participation of children ensured at any stage of the project?

Guide for Semi-structured interviews with:  
National and local government officials/staff

### **1. Relevance**

- 1.1 Were the project approach and activities relevant to the needs of the constituents (Government of Turkey, employers' and workers' organisations) and the stated objectives?
- 1.2 Was there a fit between the project design and the direct beneficiaries' needs?

### **2. Coherence**

- 2.2 How well did the design and implementation of Project take into account the national institutions work on child labour elimination that contributes to Türkiye's national efforts on elimination of child labour?
- 2.3 Has the project established partnerships with relevant organisations/institutions at the global and country-level throughout its implementation? What were their roles? And what were their expectations? To what extent have these partnerships been useful in the achievement of the intended results?
- 2.4 What was the added value of the ILO work in terms of comparative advantage?

### **3. Effectiveness**

- 3.1 To what extent were the project objectives achieved? Were there any notable successes or innovations? Which were the positive factors and obstacles or barriers to achieve the project results?
- 3.2 Were there any unintended results (positive or negative)?
- 3.3 How effective have been the capacity building of national stakeholders' activities, especially those started in the second part of the project (after the mid-term evaluation)
- 3.5 Was the quality of outputs satisfactory?
- 3.6 How effective was the monitoring mechanism set up, including the regular/periodic meetings among project staff and with the beneficiary, donor and key partners? Was there a suitable monitoring and evaluation framework for accountability, management and learning developed at the outset of the project and updated regularly?
- 3.7 What mechanisms were in place to ensure the inclusion of beneficiary feedback in the design and implementation process?
- 3.8 Assess the level of government involvement in the project and how their involvement with the project has built their capacity to continue further work on future programmes.
- 3.9 How has the capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners (at national and local levels) to develop effective action against address child labour been enhanced as a result of programme activities?
- 3.10 How important was the capacity development activities especially the activities undertaken after the mid-term evaluation?

### **4. Efficiency**

4.1 How efficiently were the resources of the project (time, expertise, funds, knowledge and know-how) used to produce outputs and results? Were resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) allocated strategically to achieve the project objectives? Did the project benefit from complementary resources at the global and country levels that supported the achievement of its intended objectives?

4.2 Given the size of the project, its complexity and challenges, were the existing management structure and technical capacity sufficient and adequate?

4.4 To what extent did the project leverage resources (financial, partnerships, expertise) to promote international labour standards, social dialogue and disability inclusion Gender equality and non-discrimination and just transition on the environment?

4.5 How effective was the communication strategy? Did the project receive adequate technical and administrative support/response from the ILO backstopping units?

## **5. Sustainability and emergent impact**

5.1 Are the results achieved by the project so far likely to be sustainable and last beyond the project (including the e-METIP system as a collaboration and monitoring mechanism? How will the implemented work be institutionalised and used by government institutions to enhance future work on the intended objectives of the project?

5.2 To what extent have results contributed to advance sustainable development objectives (as per UNSDCF, similar UN programming frameworks, national sustainable development plans, and SDGs)?

5.3 To what extent did the project contribute to advancing the ILO's core principles (ILS, tripartism and social dialogue, gender equality and non-discrimination -i.e. Gender and people with disabilities and other groups as relevant- and just transition)?

5.4 What was the level of ownership of the project outcomes by partners and beneficiaries?

5.5 Assess what contributions the programme has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders and to encourage ownership of the programme to partners. How far the Projects interacted and possibly influenced national level policies, debates and institutions working on child labour.

5.6 To what extent knowledge developed throughout the project (research papers, progress reports, manuals, and other tools) can still be utilised after the end of the project to inform policies and practitioners?

## **6. Additional questions**

6.1 To what extent the project addressed the mid-term evaluation recommendations?

6.2 Identify lessons learnt and potential good practices of intervention that could inform future projects and partners and stakeholders could incorporate into policy and practice.

6.3 Are you aware of the legal limitations for children's participation in agricultural work? If you are aware, did you get this awareness from the activities of the current project?

6.4 Would it be to expect that public employees would know rules and regulations (and policies) on child labour?

6.5 Any initiatives to include agriculture (less than 50 employees) under the LC when it comes to children?

6.6 In your view what are the root causes for CL in agriculture and did the project address these?

6.7 Were similar (to those introduced by the current project) activities already earlier implemented by implementing partners or others?

**Guide for Semi-structured interviews with:  
Employers' federations/associations**

**1. Relevance**

- 1.1 Were the project approach and activities relevant to the needs of the constituents (Government of Türkiye, employers' and workers' organisations) and the stated objectives?
- 1.2 Was there a fit between the project design and the direct beneficiaries' needs?
- 1.3 To what extent did the project address key relevant components of and contribute to ILO's strategic and national policy frameworks??
- 1.4 Has the project reflection on general policies? Does the project relate to ILO results framework (including P&B 2022-23), the ILO mandate and relevant policies, including gender equality and non-discrimination, disability inclusion, international labour standards, social dialogue, just transition on environment?

**2. Coherence**

- 2.1 How well did the interventions of the project fit with other interventions of the ILO Office for Türkiye? What synergies were created? How well did the interventions of the project fit with other interventions of the relevant partners?
- 2.2 How well did the design and implementation of Project take into account the national institutions work on child labour elimination that contributes to Türkiye's national efforts on elimination of child labour?
- 2.3 Has the project established partnerships with relevant organisations/institutions at the global and country-level throughout its implementation? What were their roles? And what were their expectations? To what extent have these partnerships been useful in the achievement of the intended results?
- 2.4 What was the added value of the ILO work in terms of comparative advantage?

**3. Effectiveness**

- 3.1 To what extent were the project objectives achieved? Were there any notable successes or innovations? Which were the positive factors and obstacles or barriers to achieve the project results?
- 3.2 Were there any unintended results (positive or negative)?
- 3.3 How effective have been the capacity building of national stakeholders' activities, especially those started in the second part of the project (after the mid-term evaluation)
- 3.4 To what extent did the project adapt its approach to respond to the COVID-19 and the earthquake crisis and what were the implications on the nature and degree of achievement of the project and project targets after those? Did the project foster ILO constituents' active involvement through social dialogue through the project in articulating a response to the immediate effects of the crisis? How gender considerations were

mainstreamed throughout the project cycle (, planning, implementation, M&E), including that of implementation partners?

3.5 Was the quality of outputs satisfactory?

3.6 How effective was the monitoring mechanism set up, including the regular/periodic meetings among project staff and with the beneficiary, donor and key partners? Was there a suitable monitoring and evaluation framework for accountability, management and learning developed at the outset of the project and updated regularly?

3.8 Assess the level of government involvement in the project and how their involvement with the project has built their capacity to continue further work on future programmes.

3.9 How has the capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners (at national and local levels) to develop effective action against address child labour been enhanced as a result of programme activities?

3.10 How important was the capacity development activities, especially the activities undertaken after the mid-term evaluation?

#### **4. Efficiency**

4.1 How efficiently were the resources of the project (time, expertise, funds, knowledge and know-how) used to produce outputs and results? Were resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) allocated strategically to achieve the project objectives?

4.2 Given the size of the project, its complexity and challenges, were the existing management structure and technical capacity sufficient and adequate?

4.4 To what extent did the project leverage resources (financial, partnerships, expertise) to promote international labour standards, social dialogue and disability inclusion Gender equality and non-discrimination and just transition on the environment?

4.5 How effective was the communication strategy?

#### **5. Sustainability and emergent impact**

5.1 Are the results achieved by the project so far likely to be sustainable and last beyond the project (including the e-METIP system as a collaboration and monitoring mechanism? How will the implemented work be institutionalised and used by government institutions to enhance future work on the intended objectives of the project?

5.3 To what extent did the project contribute to advancing the ILO's core principles (ILS, tripartism and social dialogue, gender equality and non-discrimination -i.e. Gender and people with disabilities and other groups as relevant- and just transition)?

5.4 What was the level of ownership of the project outcomes by partners and beneficiaries?

5.5 Assess what contributions the programme has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders and to encourage ownership of the programme to partners. How far the Projects interacted and possibly influenced national level policies, debates and institutions working on child labour.

5.6 To what extent knowledge developed throughout the project (research papers, progress reports, manuals, and other tools) can still be utilised after the end of the project to inform policies and practitioners?

## **6. Additional questions**

6.1 To what extent the project addressed the mid-term evaluation recommendations?

6.2 Identify lessons learnt and potential good practices of intervention that could inform future projects and partners and stakeholders could incorporate into policy and practice.

6.4 Would it be to expect that public employees would know rules and regulations (and policies) on child labour?

6.5 Any initiatives to include agriculture (less than 50 employees) under the LC when it comes to children?

6.6 In your view what are the root causes for CL in agriculture and did the project address these?

6.7 Were similar (to those introduced by the current project) activities already earlier implemented by implementing partners or others?

6.8 What efforts were made to engage the sectoral (agro) trade unions and employer's organisation in the project?

6.10 As employer organisations, do you think you have a role in preventing child labour in seasonal agriculture? If so, how?

## **Guide for Semi-structured interviews with:**

### **Trade Union federations/confederations/local branch**

#### **1. Relevance**

- 1.1 Were the project approach and activities relevant to the needs of the constituents (Government of Turkey, employers' and workers' organisations) and the stated objectives?
- 1.2 Was there a fit between the project design and the direct beneficiaries' needs?
- 1.3 To what extent did the project address key relevant components of and contribute to ILO's strategic and national policy frameworks??
- 1.4 Has the project reflection on general policies? Does the project relate to ILO results framework (including P&B 2022-23), the ILO mandate and relevant policies, including gender equality and non-discrimination, disability inclusion, international labour standards, social dialogue, just transition on environment?

#### **2. Coherence**

- 2.1 How well did the interventions of the project fit with other interventions of the ILO Office for Türkiye? What synergies were created? How well did the interventions of the project fit with other interventions of the relevant partners?
- 2.2 How well did the design and implementation of Project take into account the national institutions work on child labour elimination that contributes to Türkiye's national efforts on elimination of child labour?
- 2.3 Has the project established partnerships with relevant organisations/institutions at the global and country-level throughout its implementation? What were their roles? And what were their expectations? To what extent have these partnerships been useful in the achievement of the intended results?
- 2.4 What was the added value of the ILO work in terms of comparative advantage?

#### **3. Effectiveness**

- 3.1 To what extent were the project objectives achieved? Were there any notable successes or innovations? Which were the positive factors and obstacles or barriers to achieve the project results?
- 3.2 Were there any unintended results (positive or negative)?
- 3.3 How effective have been the capacity building of national stakeholders' activities, especially those started in the second part of the project (after the mid-term evaluation)
- 3.4 Did the project foster ILO constituents' active involvement through social dialogue through the project in articulating a response to the immediate effects of the crisis? How gender considerations were mainstreamed throughout the project cycle (, planning, implementation, M&E), including that of implementation partners?



3.5 Was the quality of outputs satisfactory?

3.6 How effective was the monitoring mechanism set up, including the regular/periodic meetings among project staff and with the beneficiary, donor and key partners? Was there a suitable monitoring and evaluation framework for accountability, management and learning developed at the outset of the project and updated regularly?

3.7 What mechanisms were in place to ensure the inclusion of beneficiary feedback in the design and implementation process?

3.8 Assess the level of government involvement in the project and how their involvement with the project has built their capacity to continue further work on future programmes.

3.9 How has the capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners (at national and local levels) to develop effective action against address child labour been enhanced as a result of programme activities?

3.10 How important was the capacity development activities especially the activities undertaken after the mid-term evaluation?

#### **4. Efficiency**

4.1 How efficiently were the resources of the project (time, expertise, funds, knowledge and know-how) used to produce outputs and results? Were resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) allocated strategically to achieve the project objectives? Did the project benefit from complementary resources at the global and country levels that supported the achievement of its intended objectives?

4.2 Given the size of the project, its complexity and challenges, were the existing management structure and technical capacity sufficient and adequate?

4.4 To what extent did the project leverage resources (financial, partnerships, expertise) to promote international labour standards, social dialogue and disability inclusion Gender equality and non-discrimination and just transition on the environment?

4.5 How effective was the communication strategy?

#### **5. Sustainability and emergent impact**

5.1 Are the results achieved by the project so far likely to be sustainable and last beyond the project (including the e-METIP system as a collaboration and monitoring mechanism)?

5.3 To what extent did the project contribute to advancing the ILO's core principles (ILS, tripartism and social dialogue, gender equality and non-discrimination -i.e. Gender and people with disabilities and other groups as relevant- and just transition)?

5.4 What was the level of ownership of the project outcomes by partners and beneficiaries?

5.5 Assess what contributions the programme has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders and to encourage ownership of the programme to partners. How far the Projects interacted and possibly influenced national level policies, debates and institutions working on child labour.

5.6 To what extent knowledge developed throughout the project (research papers, progress reports, manuals, and other tools) can still be utilised after the end of the project to inform policies and practitioners?

## **6. Additional questions**

6.1 To what extent the project addressed the mid-term evaluation recommendations?

6.2 Identify lessons learnt and potential good practices of intervention that could inform future projects and partners and stakeholders could incorporate into policy and practice.

6.4 Would it be to expect that public employees would know rules and regulations (and policies) on child labour?

6.5 Any initiatives to include agriculture (less than 50 employees) under the LC when it comes to children?

6.6 In your view what are the root causes for CL in agriculture and did the project address these?

6.7 Were similar (to those introduced by the current project) activities already earlier implemented by implementing partners or others?

6.8 What efforts were made to engage the sectoral (agro) trade unions and employer's organisation in the project?

6.11 As trade unions, do you think you have a role in preventing child labour in seasonal agriculture? If so, how?

## **Guide for Semi-structured interviews with:**

### **External Consultants and implementing partners**

#### **1. Relevance**

1.1 Were the project approach and activities relevant to the needs of the constituents (Government of Turkey, employers' and workers' organisations) and the stated objectives?

1.2 Was there a fit between the project design and the direct beneficiaries' needs?

#### **2. Coherence**

2.2 How well did the design and implementation of Project take into account the national institutions work on child labour elimination that contributes to Türkiye's national efforts on elimination of child labour?

2.3 Has the project established partnerships with relevant organisations/institutions at the global and country-level throughout its implementation? What were their roles? And what were their expectations? To what extent have these partnerships been useful in the achievement of the intended results?

2.4 What was the added value of the ILO work in terms of comparative advantage?

#### **3. Effectiveness**

3.1 To what extent were the project objectives achieved? Were there any notable successes or innovations? Which were the positive factors and obstacles or barriers to achieve the project results?

3.2 Were there any unintended results (positive or negative)?

3.3 How effective have been the capacity building of national stakeholders' activities, especially those started in the second part of the project (after the mid-term evaluation)

3.5 Was the quality of outputs satisfactory?

3.6 How effective was the monitoring mechanism set up, including the regular/periodic meetings among project staff and with the beneficiary, donor and key partners? Was there a suitable monitoring and evaluation framework for accountability, management and learning developed at the outset of the project and updated regularly?

3.7 What mechanisms were in place to ensure the inclusion of beneficiary feedback in the design and implementation process?

3.8 Assess the level of government involvement in the project and how their involvement with the project has built their capacity to continue further work on future programmes.

3.9 How has the capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners (at national and local levels) to develop effective action against address child labour been enhanced as a result of programme activities?

3.10 How important was the capacity development activities especially the activities undertaken after the mid-term evaluation?

#### **4. Efficiency**

4.5 How effective was the communication strategy? Did the project receive adequate technical and administrative support/response from the ILO backstopping units?

#### **5. Sustainability and emergent impact**

5.1 Are the results achieved by the project so far likely to be sustainable and last beyond the project (including the e-METIP system as a collaboration and monitoring mechanism? How will the implemented work be institutionalised and used by government institutions to enhance future work on the intended objectives of the project?

5.3 To what extent did the project contribute to advancing the ILO's core principles (ILS, tripartism and social dialogue, gender equality and non-discrimination -i.e. Gender and people with disabilities and other groups as relevant- and just transition)?

5.4 What was the level of ownership of the project outcomes by partners and beneficiaries?

5.5 Assess what contributions the programme has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders and to encourage ownership of the programme to partners. How far the Projects interacted and possibly influenced national level policies, debates and institutions working on child labour.

5.6 To what extent knowledge developed throughout the project (research papers, progress reports, manuals, and other tools) can still be utilised after the end of the project to inform policies and practitioners?

#### **6. Additional questions**

6.1 To what extent the project addressed the mid-term evaluation recommendations?

6.2 Identify lessons learnt and potential good practices of intervention that could inform future projects and partners and stakeholders could incorporate into policy and practice.

6.4 Would it be to expect that public employees would know rules and regulations (and policies) on child labour?

6.5 Any initiatives to include agriculture (less than 50 employees) under the LC when it comes to children?

6.6 In your view what are the root causes for CL in agriculture and did the project address these?

6.7 Were similar (to those introduced by the current project) activities already earlier implemented by implementing partners or others?

6.8 What efforts were made to engage the sectoral (agro) trade unions and employer's organisation in the project?

6.12 Can you share your observations on whether the earthquakes of February 6th had any impact on child labour?

6.13 Was meaningful participation of children ensured at any stage of the project?

## **Guide for Semi-structured interviews with:**

### **Children and their families directly involved with the project**

#### **1. Relevance**

1.2 Was there a fit between the project design and the direct beneficiaries' needs?

1.4 Has the project reflection on general policies? Does the project relate to ILO results framework (including P&B 2022-23), the ILO mandate and relevant policies, including gender equality and non-discrimination, disability inclusion, international labour standards, social dialogue, just transition on environment?

#### **2. Coherence**

2.1 How well did the interventions of the project fit with other interventions of the relevant partners?

2.2 How well did the design and implementation of Project take into account the national institutions work on child labour elimination that contributes to Türkiye's national efforts on elimination of child labour?

2.3 Has the project established partnerships with relevant organisations/institutions at the global and country-level throughout its implementation? What were their roles? And what were their expectations? To what extent have these partnerships been useful in the achievement of the intended results?

#### **3. Effectiveness**

3.1 To what extent were the project objectives achieved? Were there any notable successes or innovations? Which were the positive factors and obstacles or barriers to achieve the project results?

3.2 Were there any unintended results (positive or negative)?

3.3 How effective have been the capacity building of national stakeholders' activities, especially those started in the second part of the project (after the mid-term evaluation)

3.4 To what extent did the project adapt its approach to respond to the COVID-19 and the earthquake crisis and what were the implications on the nature and degree of achievement of the project and project targets after those? How gender considerations were mainstreamed throughout the project cycle, planning, implementation, M&E), including that of implementation partners?

3.5 Was the quality of outputs satisfactory?

3.7 What mechanisms were in place to ensure the inclusion of beneficiary feedback in the design and implementation process?

3.9 How has the capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners (at national and local levels) to develop effective action against address child labour been enhanced as a result of programme activities?

3.10 How important was the capacity development activities especially the activities undertaken after the mid-term evaluation?

#### **4. Efficiency**

4.1 How efficiently were the resources of the project (time, expertise, funds, knowledge and know-how) used to produce outputs and results? Were resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) allocated strategically to achieve the project objectives? Did the project benefit from complementary resources at the global and country levels that supported the achievement of its intended objectives?

4.4 To what extent did the project leverage resources (financial, partnerships, expertise) to promote international labour standards, social dialogue and disability inclusion Gender equality and non-discrimination and just transition on the environment?

4.5 How effective was the communication strategy? Did the project receive adequate technical and administrative support/response from the ILO backstopping units?

## **5. Sustainability and emergent impact**

5.1 Are the results achieved by the project so far likely to be sustainable and last beyond the project (including the e-METIP system as a collaboration and monitoring mechanism? How will the implemented work be institutionalised and used by government institutions to enhance future work on the intended objectives of the project?

5.3 To what extent did the project contribute to advancing the ILO's core principles (ILS, tripartism and social dialogue, gender equality and non-discrimination -i.e. Gender and people with disabilities and other groups as relevant- and just transition)?

5.4 What was the level of ownership of the project outcomes by partners and beneficiaries?

## **6. Additional questions**

6.2 Identify lessons learnt and potential good practices of intervention that could inform future projects and partners and stakeholders could incorporate into policy and practice.

6.3 Are you aware of the legal limitations for children's participation in agricultural work? If you are aware, did you get this awareness from the activities of the current project?

6.6 In your view what are the root causes for CL in agriculture and did the project address these?

## **Guide for Semi-structured interviews with:**

### **Donor, UN agencies and others**

#### **1. Relevance**

1.1 Were the project approach and activities relevant to the needs of the constituents (Government of Turkey, employers' and workers' organisations) and the stated objectives?

1.2 Was there a fit between the project design and the direct beneficiaries' needs?

1.3 To what extent did the project address key relevant components of and contribute to UN Country programme frameworks (UNSDCF), strategic country development documents, and Sustainable Development Goals – especially SDG 8 as well as ILO's strategic and national policy frameworks??

#### **2. Coherence**

2.2 How well did the design and implementation of Project take into account the national institutions work on child labour elimination that contributes to Türkiye's national efforts on elimination of child labour?

2.3 Has the project established partnerships with relevant organisations/institutions at the global and country-level throughout its implementation? What were their roles? And what were their expectations? To what extent have these partnerships been useful in the achievement of the intended results?

2.4 What was the added value of the ILO work in terms of comparative advantage?

#### **3. Effectiveness**

3.1 To what extent were the project objectives achieved? Were there any notable successes or innovations? Which were the positive factors and obstacles or barriers to achieve the project results?

3.2 Were there any unintended results (positive or negative)?

3.3 How effective has been the capacity building of national stakeholders' activities, especially those started in the second part of the project (after the mid-term evaluation)?

3.5 Was the quality of outputs satisfactory?

3.6 How effective was the monitoring mechanism set up, including the regular/periodic meetings among project staff and with the beneficiary, donor and key partners? Was there a suitable monitoring and evaluation framework for accountability, management and learning developed at the outset of the project and updated regularly?

3.7 What mechanisms were in place to ensure the inclusion of beneficiary feedback in the design and implementation process?

3.8 Assess the level of government involvement in the project and how their involvement with the project has built their capacity to continue further work on future programmes.

3.9 How has the capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners (at national and local levels) to develop effective action against address child labour been enhanced as a result of programme activities?

3.10 How important was the capacity development activities, especially the activities undertaken after the mid-term evaluation?

#### **4. Efficiency**

4.1 How efficiently were the resources of the project (time, expertise, funds, knowledge and know-how) used to produce outputs and results? Were resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) allocated strategically to achieve the project objectives? Did the project benefit from complementary resources at the global and country levels that supported the achievement of its intended objectives?

4.2 Given the size of the project, its complexity and challenges, were the existing management structure and technical capacity sufficient and adequate?

4.3 Did the project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from the ILO HQ and Regional Office and its national partners? If not, why?

4.4 To what extent did the project leverage resources (financial, partnerships, expertise) to promote international labour standards, social dialogue and disability inclusion Gender equality and non-discrimination and just transition on the environment?

4.5 How effective was the communication strategy? Did the project receive adequate technical and administrative support/response from the ILO backstopping units?

#### **5. Sustainability and emergent impact**

5.1 Are the results achieved by the project so far likely to be sustainable and last beyond the project (including the e-METIP system as a collaboration and monitoring mechanism? How will the implemented work be institutionalised and used by government institutions to enhance future work on the intended objectives of the project?

5.2 To what extent have results contributed to advance sustainable development objectives (as per UNSDCFs, similar UN programming frameworks, national sustainable development plans, and SDGs)?

5.3 To what extent did the project contribute to advancing the ILO's core principles (ILS, tripartism and social dialogue, gender equality and non-discrimination -i.e. Gender and people with disabilities and other groups as relevant- and just transition)?

5.4 What was the level of ownership of the project outcomes by partners and beneficiaries?

5.5 Assess what contributions the programme has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders and to encourage ownership of the programme to partners. How far the Projects interacted and possibly influenced national level policies, debates and institutions working on child labour.

5.6 To what extent knowledge developed throughout the project (research papers, progress reports, manuals, and other tools) can still be utilised after the end of the project to inform policies and practitioners?



## **6. Additional questions**

6.1 To what extent the project addressed the mid-term evaluation recommendations?

6.2 Identify lessons learnt and potential good practices of intervention that could inform future projects and partners and stakeholders could incorporate into policy and practice.

6.4 Would it not be to expect that public employees would know rules and regulations (and policies) on child labour?

6.5 Any initiatives to include agriculture (less than 50 employees) under the LC when it comes to children?

6.6 In your view what are the root causes for CL in agriculture and did the project address these?

6.7 Were similar (to those introduced by the current project) activities already earlier implemented by implementing partners or others?

6.8 What efforts were made to engage the sectoral (agro) trade unions and employer's organisation in the project?

## **Guide for Semi-structured interviews with:**

### **Partners, CSOs and others**

#### **1. Relevance**

1.1 Were the project approach and activities relevant to the needs of the constituents (Government of Turkey, employers' and workers' organisations) and the stated objectives?

1.2 Was there a fit between the project design and the direct beneficiaries' needs?

#### **2. Coherence**

2.1 How well did the interventions of the project fit with other interventions of the ILO Office for Türkiye? What synergies were created? How well did the interventions of the project fit with other interventions of the relevant partners?

2.2 How well did the design and implementation of Project take into account the national institutions work on child labour elimination that contributes to Türkiye's national efforts on elimination of child labour?

2.3 Has the project established partnerships with relevant organisations/institutions at the global and country-level throughout its implementation? What were their roles? And what were their expectations? To what extent have these partnerships been useful in the achievement of the intended results?

2.4 What was the added value of the ILO work in terms of comparative advantage?

#### **3. Effectiveness**

3.4 To what extent did the project adapt its approach to respond to the COVID-19 and the earthquake crisis and what were the implications on the nature and degree of achievement of the project and project targets after those? Did the project foster ILO constituents' active involvement through social dialogue through the project in articulating a response to the immediate effects of the crisis? How gender considerations were mainstreamed throughout the project cycle (, planning, implementation, M&E), including that of implementation partners?

3.8 Assess the level of government involvement in the project and how their involvement with the project has built their capacity to continue further work on future programmes.

3.9 How has the capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners (at national and local levels) to develop effective action against address child labour been enhanced as a result of programme activities?

3.10 How important was the capacity development activities especially the activities undertaken after the mid-term evaluation?

#### **4. Efficiency**

4.4 To what extent did the project leverage resources (financial, partnerships, expertise) to promote international labour standards, social dialogue and disability inclusion Gender equality and non-discrimination and just transition on the environment?

4.5 How effective was the communication strategy? Did the project receive adequate technical and administrative support/response from the ILO backstopping units?

#### **5. Sustainability and emergent impact**

5.1 Are the results achieved by the project so far likely to be sustainable and last beyond the project (including the e-METIP system as a collaboration and monitoring mechanism? How will the implemented work be institutionalised and used by government institutions to enhance future work on the intended objectives of the project?

5.2 To what extent have results contributed to advance sustainable development objectives (as per UNSDCF, similar UN programming frameworks, national sustainable development plans, and SDGs)?

5.3 To what extent did the project contribute to advancing the ILO's core principles (ILS, tripartism and social dialogue, gender equality and non-discrimination -i.e. Gender and people with disabilities and other groups as relevant- and just transition)?

5.4 What was the level of ownership of the project outcomes by partners and beneficiaries?

5.5 Assess what contributions the programme has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders and to encourage ownership of the programme to partners. How far the Projects interacted and possibly influenced national level policies, debates and institutions working on child labour.

5.6 To what extent knowledge developed throughout the project (research papers, progress reports, manuals, and other tools) can still be utilised after the end of the project to inform policies and practitioners?

## **6. Additional questions**

6.2 Identify lessons learnt and potential good practices of intervention that could inform future projects and partners and stakeholders could incorporate into policy and practice.

6.3 Are you aware of the legal limitations for children's participation in agricultural work? If you are aware, did you get this awareness from the activities of the current project?

6.5 Any initiatives to include agriculture (less than 50 employees) under the LC when it comes to children?

6.6 In your view what are the root causes for CL in agriculture and did the project address these?

6.7 Were similar (to those introduced by the current project) activities already earlier implemented by implementing partners or others?

6.12 Can you share your observations on whether the earthquakes of February 6th had any impact on child labour?

## **Guide for Semi-structured interviews with:**

Intermediaries in the agro sector

### **1. Relevance**

1.2 Was there a fit between the project design and the direct beneficiaries' needs?

### **2. Coherence**

2.1 How well did the interventions of the project fit with other interventions of the ILO Office for Türkiye? What synergies were created? How well did the interventions of the project fit with other interventions of the relevant partners?

2.2 How well did the design and implementation of Project take into account the national institutions work on child labour elimination that contributes to Türkiye's national efforts on elimination of child labour?

2.3 Has the project established partnerships with relevant organisations/institutions at the global and country-level throughout its implementation? What were their roles? And what were their expectations? To what extent have these partnerships been useful in the achievement of the intended results?

2.4 What was the added value of the ILO work in terms of comparative advantage?

### **3. Effectiveness**

3.1 To what extent were the project objectives achieved? Were there any notable successes or innovations? Which were the positive factors and obstacles or barriers to achieve the project results?

3.3 How effective have been the capacity building of national stakeholders' activities, especially those started in the second part of the project (after the mid-term evaluation)

3.4 To what extent did the project adapt its approach to respond to the COVID-19 and the earthquake crisis and what were the implications on the nature and degree of achievement of the project and project targets after those? Did the project foster ILO constituents' active involvement through social dialogue through the project in articulating a response to the immediate effects of the crisis? How gender considerations were mainstreamed throughout the project cycle (, planning, implementation, M&E), including that of implementation partners?

3.5 Was the quality of outputs satisfactory?

3.6 How effective was the monitoring mechanism set up, including the regular/periodic meetings among project staff and with the beneficiary, donor and key partners? Was there a suitable monitoring and evaluation framework for accountability, management and learning developed at the outset of the project and updated regularly?

3.7 What mechanisms were in place to ensure the inclusion of beneficiary feedback in the design and implementation process?

3.9 How has the capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners (at national and local levels) to develop effective action against address child labour been enhanced as a result of programme activities?

3.10 How important was the capacity development activities especially the activities undertaken after the mid-term evaluation?

#### **4. Efficiency**

4.1 How efficiently were the resources of the project (time, expertise, funds, knowledge and know-how) used to produce outputs and results? Were resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) allocated strategically to achieve the project objectives? Did the project benefit from complementary resources at the global and country levels that supported the achievement of its intended objectives?

4.5 How effective was the communication strategy? Did the project receive adequate technical and administrative support/response from the ILO backstopping units?

#### **5. Sustainability and emergent impact**

5.1 Are the results achieved by the project so far likely to be sustainable and last beyond the project (including the e-METIP system as a collaboration and monitoring mechanism? How will the implemented work be institutionalised and used by government institutions to enhance future work on the intended objectives of the project?

5.4 What was the level of ownership of the project outcomes by partners and beneficiaries?

5.5 Assess what contributions the programme has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders and to encourage ownership of the programme to partners. How far the Projects interacted and possibly influenced national level policies, debates and institutions working on child labour.

#### **6. Additional questions**

6.2 Identify lessons learnt and potential good practices of intervention that could inform future projects and partners and stakeholders could incorporate into policy and practice.

6.3 Are you aware of the legal limitations for children's participation in agricultural work? If you are aware, did you get this awareness from the activities of the current project?

6.5 In your view what are the root causes for CL in agriculture and did the project address these?

6.7 Were similar (to those introduced by the current project) activities already earlier implemented by implementing partners or others?



## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Final independent evaluation of the Project “project “Elimination of Child Labour in Seasonal Agriculture”.

#### 1. Key facts

<b>Title of project being evaluated</b>	“Elimination of Child Labour in Seasonal Agriculture”
<b>Project DC Code</b>	TUR/20/01/EUR
<b>Project start and end date</b>	October 2020 - January 2025
<b>Type of evaluation (e.g. independent, internal)</b>	Independent
<b>Timing of evaluation (e.g. midterm, final)</b>	Final
<b>Donor</b>	European Union and Government of Turkey
<b>Administrative Unit in the ILO responsible for administering the project</b>	ILO CO Ankara, Türkiye
<b>Technical Unit(s) in the ILO responsible for backstopping the project</b>	Fundamentals
<b>P&amp;B outcome (s) under evaluation</b>	Outcome 7: Adequate and effective protection at work for all” of ILO’s Programme and Budget (2020-2021) and United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (2021-2025) in Türkiye.
<b>SDG(s) under evaluation</b>	SDG 08: Decent work and economic growth 8.7 calling for immediate measures to secure the prohibition and elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour
<b>Budget</b>	European Union 29,726,740.90 EUR
<b>Project Locations</b>	Adana, Ordu, Düzce, Malatya, Mersin, Hatay, Isparta, İzmir, Ankara, Eskişehir, Konya, Manisa, Bursa, Adıyaman, Şanlıurfa, Diyarbakır and Mardin



## LIST OF ACRONYMS

CA	Contracting Authority
CLU	Unit of Combating Child Labour (Labour Unit)
DGMM	Directorate General of Migration Management
EESP SOP	Employment, Education and Social Policies Sectoral Operational Programme
EU	European Union
EUD	European Union Delegation to Türkiye
EVAL	ILO Evaluation Office
DGL	Directorate General of Labour
DG LLL	Directorate General of Lifelong Learning
DG VTE	Directorate General of Vocational and Technical Education
GIS	Geographical Information System
ILO	International Labour Organisation
ITC ILO	International Training Centre of ILO
İŞKUR	Turkish Employment Agency
METIP	Seasonal Agricultural Workers Project
MoAF	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
MoLSS	Ministry of Labour and Social Security
MoH	Ministry of Health
Mol	Ministry of Interior
MoNE	Ministry of National Education
OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
PMT	Project Management Team
SBB	Presidency of Türkiye, Presidency of Strategy and Budget
SC	Steering Committee
SSI	Social Security Institution
SuTP	Syrians Under Temporary Protection
TVET	Technical Vocational Education and Training
TURKSTAT	Turkish Statistical Institute
TZOB	Union of Turkish Chambers of Agriculture
UN	United Nations
VQA	Vocational Qualifications Authority
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labour

## 2. Background information

Child labour is a problem that developed countries still cannot fully solve, although they are more intensive in developing countries. According to the latest global estimates around 160 million children worldwide were engaged in child labour at the start of 2020. While the percentage of child labour remained constant, the total number increased by more than 8 million. Similarly, the proportion of children engaged in hazardous work remained nearly unchanged, but the total number increased by 6.5 million.

Considering agriculture sector, working in mobile and temporary agricultural labour except for family business is identified as one of the worst forms of child labour by the National Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (2017-2023) due to the nature of seasonal agricultural work which exposes families to all types of risks to which children are most vulnerable. As also indicated in EESP SOP, for economic and social reasons, children of adult seasonal workers usually accompany their parents from place to place. As a result, children alongside with parents and other adults are found in work that is not suitable for their age in order to secure subsistence of their household income. During peak work periods, children are not able to regularly attend school and fall behind in their classes. Thus, seasonal agricultural work poses serious hazards to children's physical, psychosocial and educational development.

### Background of the Project

Since the 1990s, the ILO Office has been supporting Türkiye in its efforts to eliminate child labour, including providing technical assistance for the development and implementation of national policies. The ILO plays a significant catalytic role in creating interest, collaboration and coordination among the strategic institutions acting on child labour, developing replicable models of direct action, and contributing to the national strategy for the elimination of child labour. In this regard, the project aims to contribute to the elimination of the worst forms of child labour (WFCL) in seasonal agriculture. More specifically, it aims to enhance national and local capacity for the elimination of WFCL in seasonal agriculture.

The issue of child labour remains as an important problem in almost all developed and developing countries as well as Türkiye. TURKSTAT has conducted Child Labour Force Surveys in 1994, 1999, 2006 and 2012 in order to obtain disaggregated data such as by sector including social, economic and demographic characteristics, educational status, age groups and sex. According to the results of 2012 Child Labour Force Survey, 4.4% of children in the age group of 6-17 are working. Of 720 thousand working children, 146 thousand are in the age group of 6-14 and 574 thousand are in the age group of 15-17. 70.6% (508 thousand people) of working children are boys and 29.4% (212 thousand people) are girls. The number of children in the age group of 6-17 in Türkiye is 16 million 457 thousand. With respect to the branch of economic activity, working children mainly engage in service (45.5% - 328 thousand followed by agriculture (30.8% - 221 thousand) and industry (23.7% - 171 thousand).

The problem of child labour is multi-dimensional and multifactorial. All the factors that cause child labour are closely related. Poverty and unemployment come at the top of these factors. Parents' unemployment and insufficient household income cause children to work. As a result of child labour, children's health is continuously affected, and children's well-being and human capital accumulation become negative. This situation leads to the development of individuals with skill gap in the long term and thus the transfer of poverty from generation to generation. The Project adopts a multi-sectoral approach in order to tackle a multifaceted problem, recognizing that child labour in seasonal agriculture is a complex issue with social, educational, legal and economic dimensions. The project covers geographically a large number of cities namely Şanlıurfa, Mardin, Adıyaman, Diyarbakır, Adana, Mersin, Hatay, Isparta, İzmir, Manisa, Ankara, Eskişehir, Konya, Malatya, Ordu, Bursa and Düzce hosting and receiving seasonal migrant workers.

The project is based on five outcomes with a specific expected output as follows:

Outcome 1: Working/at-risk children are withdrawn or prevented from work in seasonal agriculture; families, employers, agriculture intermediaries and village heads abstain from or take action to combat child labour.

Outcome 2: MoFLSS, workers' and employers' organisations, gendarmerie, NGOs take coordinated action for policy development and implementation to eliminate the WFCL.

Outcome 3: Willingness among general public and target groups to eliminate child labour in seasonal agriculture is enhanced.

Outcome 4: Advocacy for, formulation, planning and implementation of policies to eliminate child labour in seasonal agriculture is enhanced.

Outcome 5: Coordination and cooperation between stakeholders in areas of implementation and management of child labour interventions at national and local levels is strengthened.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic there were some minor changes in the implementation of some activities, the intervention logic has been maintained to its original as mentioned above and the Project team made necessary arrangements to meet the project plan. In addition to Covid-19 adaptation, project management team proposed changes after devastating earthquakes some minor adaptation reflected to provide support for disaster affected people.

### **Project Strategies**

Based on the situation analysis and the feedback collected from the field during the recent child labour interventions since 1990, the ILO child labour programme strategy is based on three integrated programme outcomes with a particular focus and objective on enhancing national and local capacity for the elimination of worst form of child labour (WFCL) in seasonal agriculture as well as providing services to children at risk and their families.

1. Increasing access to free and quality public education.
2. Providing support for strengthening current child labour governance institutions and coordination/cooperation mechanisms.
3. Increasing and strengthening advocacy on child labour.

At the international level, Projects will contribute to the better implementation of the relevant International Standards which are leading and guiding the world of work where ILO is a normative UN organisation. In this respect, the Action will support implementation of ILO Conventions No.138 Minimum Age and No.182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour to which Türkiye is one of signatories; and contribute to reach Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8 of the 2030 Agenda on decent work and economic growth, and specifically to target 8.7 calling for immediate measures to secure the prohibition and elimination of the WFCL, and by 2025 end child labour in all its forms. Linking with SDG 8.7, Projects will also contribute to "Outcome 7: Adequate and effective protection at work for all" of ILO's Programme and Budget (2021-2022) and United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (2021-2025) in Türkiye.

The intervention of the Project is in line with the Government's Employment, Education and Social Policies Sectoral Operational Programme Activity I.I, fighting child labour with its specific focus on the elimination of child labour in seasonal agriculture. It will also ensure the sustainability of the interventions through capacity building at national and local levels, policy advocacy and awareness raising in line with the objectives of EESP SOP under the Activity 1.1 Promoting Decent Work. The intervention will also contribute to the National Program on the Elimination of Child Labour (2017-2023) which includes comprehensive

measures such as eradicating poverty, increasing the quality and accessibility of education, and improving public awareness and sensitivity.

There have been changes in the PMT members as detailed in the Project Management Team part of the Project Synopsis section. The implementation of the project has continued in close coordination and communication with the Beneficiary Institution in line with planned work plan. There have been major and minor challenging developments throughout the reporting period which prolonged delivery of all project targets and activities. These challenges included the changes in the senior management of the project main beneficiary and related changes in the priorities, devastating Earthquakes on February 6, 2023 and general elections. Specially devastating earthquakes on February 6, 2023, Earthquakes necessitated revisiting of the project activities in the affected project provinces and interventions as response to cover the basic needs of the project beneficiaries.

### **Project alignment with the DWCP, P&B, CPO & SDG**

A Combating child labour has always been a priority for ILO since its foundation in 1919. The ILO Office for Türkiye formulated an updated programme covering 2021-2025 to advance its work in and experience derived from combating child labour since 1992 in cooperation with national stakeholders. The ILO's Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour in Türkiye, prepared in line with the priorities of the National Employment Strategy (2014-2023) and National Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (2017-2023), plans to engage in comprehensive work to eliminate child labour in Türkiye. It is not possible to achieve the future of work with decent work and sustainable income for all without eliminating child labour. Through the Programme of 2021-2025, the ILO Office for Türkiye will focus on quality education as the key strategy to eliminate child labour including primarily the worst forms in Türkiye and continue to support the national partners by effective enforcement of legislation, expanding social protection and social dialogue support.

The United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development including particularly Sustainable Development Goal SDG 8 on decent work and economic growth, and specifically Target 8.7, calls for immediate measures to secure the elimination of child labour in all its forms by 2025. Emphasizing that the goal could be reached through leaving no one behind, the United Nations declared the year 2021 as the "International Year for the Elimination of Child Labour" and initiated global action. The programme developed by the ILO Office for Türkiye aims to support the said global action at local level and ensure that the national work would set a model internationally.

### **Project Management**

ILO established a PMT for the overall management of the Action in Ankara. Local staff will be composed of 16 people: Project Coordinator, Communications Officer, Training and Education Officer, Child Labour Officer, Governance and Compliance Officer, Field Support Officer, Social Support Officer, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, Finance and Procurement Officer, IT Officer, Finance Assistant, a Procurement Assistant, Administrative Assistant, Social Support Assistant and a Field Support Assistant. Furthermore, there is one international staff as Technical Specialist. The PMT (except Finance Officer, Procurement Assistant and Administrative and Finance Assistant are based in the ILO premises) are based in the project office to be rented under the Action. ILO ensured compliance with ILO's rules and regulations during all recruitment processes.

The Director of ILO Office for Türkiye acts as ILO Responsible Official for this Action. As the manager of the PMT, the Project Coordinator reports to the Director and facilitates the regular interaction on project activities and project progress with the MoLSS, the EU Delegation and other relevant project stakeholders. The coordination is provided through quarterly project coordination meetings and quarterly briefing notes, e-mail correspondences, etc. The members of the PMT provides up-to-date information and data on the project implementation and project activities when requested by the MoLSS, as well as the EU Delegation.

## Main Recommendations and Follow Up Actions of Mid-Term Evaluation<sup>1</sup>

1. For the remaining time of the project, focus on critical needs in terms of the institutional capacity of MoLSS and ISKUR CLU employees as well as other public institutions partners and start up the exit strategy with a gradual transition of project responsibilities to active local partners/governors and promote the use of E-METIP: The implementing partners play a critical role in referring children to social support centres and mobilizing public resources for project activities. Main capacity-building activities (in form of training) were about to be started at the end of the evaluation. CLU structure and eventually their employees are given important roles in the existing policy framework, however not always interpreted in the same way. In this context, the project should ideally dedicate its focus to capacity-building activities, and also piloting in the remaining time. It is worth noting that both implementing partners have extensive past experience working with seasonal migrant workers. Such expertise may take time to build among public authorities. Yet, the ownership in certain provinces is reassuring and the interest level of the local authorities to carry out the intervention is promising. To ensure a smooth exit, it is advised to plan a gradual transition of project activities to active local partners/governors before the project comes to an end. This may be done by selecting one pilot region and providing direct access to human and financial resources for public authorities/local governance (e.g., in the form of grant management based on TOR and/or direct contracting). In this context, the efficient use of the E-METIP system may significantly decrease the resources needed to identify children.
2. Enhance cooperation and communication among different provinces and regions and disseminate knowledge by encouraging peer learning among ISKUR-CLU employees, and public institutions and systematically share good examples and guidance: The project has a large geographical scope, and there exist differences in terms of capacities and interpretation of the existing policy framework among different ISKUR CLU employees and directors. Over the remaining time of the project, the project may consider enhancing communication and cooperation among different provinces as well as between central and local governance by facilitating the organisation of country-wide meetings, and workshops. Peer learning can be also encouraged by matching active ISKUR CLU employees with other provinces in Türkiye. Good examples and active participation from selected ISKUR CLU's can be documented and shared country-wide in the form of case studies and short guidance. Given the changing location of the local governors and civil servants, such peer learning exercises, and documentation of case studies may provide a considerable opportunity for the replication of the project in other regions and promote consistent understanding and interpretation of the existing policy framework.
3. Continue promoting and supporting the implementation of a direct intervention model for seasonal migrant workers' children through public authorities and identify windows of opportunity for tailoring approaches for the withdrawal of children in high-risk age groups: Many stakeholders recognised the project's success in terms of providing a safe space for children during the harvest season. The project nearly reached its target numbers and was successful in identifying and referring children. Yet the seasonal migrant workers children also have diverse profiles and the needs of children in terms of social inclusion, language skills and social development may vary. In this frame, the project may consider adapting the training program or adding additional modules for certain provinces. In addition, stakeholders also noted limitations of the intervention model keeping children between the ages of 14 to 18 at social support centres. Factors such as monetary and multidimensional poverty highly influence the prevalence of child labour in this age group, as it is one way for families to manage poverty and deprivation risk. School feeding and in-kind programmes may have limited effect in reducing children's engagement in work.
4. Facilitate involvement of municipalities and other public authorities in the improvement of temporary settlement areas and accommodation facilities and continue supporting renovation activities: The conditions of the temporary settlement areas and accommodation facilities are one of the subjects that

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://webapps.ilo.org/ievaldiscovery/#b5r2q12>

was highlighted as critical by both direct beneficiaries and other informants. In this context, challenges are manifold (e.g., lack of officially recognised areas, changing times of the harvest, lack of resources). Given the importance of the subject, and based on the feedback from the stakeholders, the following points may be taken into consideration: sustainability of the material used, energy efficiency, safety measures for emergencies and disasters, and promoting engagement with users/beneficiaries. Mapping unused buildings and areas can be also considered to provide more stable conditions for workers.

5. Promote cross-ministerial cooperation and data sharing on seasonal migrant workers and children: The project is considered as unique for Türkiye's context in terms of bringing many stakeholders together and targeting WFCL in seasonal agriculture from various angles (promoting education, enforcing policy framework, building capacity among public authorities and supporting livelihood of workers). Child labour is a complex issue and indirectly, other issues such as child protection, safety, poverty alleviation and promoting education, fall under the responsibility of various ministries. In addition, all relevant ministries have their own data collection mechanisms in place. In this context, the project success is evident in terms of ensuring involvement of relevant ministries. It has also great potential to encourage collaboration in terms of data sharing and action planning.

6. Continue strengthening child monitoring activities in the city of origin and enhancing cooperation with district commissions of MoNE: The project is successful in keeping and monitoring the data of children who directly benefit from the intervention; the long-term impact of the project is highly dependent on how children will be kept in education through monitoring activities at the city of their origin. The project's monitoring activities are often done through telephone calls, the household, and school visits. The Ministry of National Education has also district commissions in place to monitor seasonal agriculture workers' children. In this context, child monitoring efforts could be strengthened and cooperation between different public authorities can be enhanced.

7. Create a knowledge and data management model, document lessons learned and good practices addressing different groups' needs and disseminate knowledge among public institutions, private sectors and other civil society organisations in the process: Although the project has only completed its first two years, the evaluators noted that field staff, teachers, school principals and local authorities (who have more experience on implementing such measures/interventions) have valuable knowledge about their regions/intervention areas. These field experiences may be of great value to new implementers (including other civil society organisations and private sector). Furthermore, the project has also strong data and research component with baselines, therefore development of a knowledge and data management model and documenting lessons learned will increase the sustainability of the project and its potential to be replicated in other regions of Türkiye.

8. Continue promoting decent work conditions for seasonal migrant workers through awareness-raising, capacity-building, and policy development support: Working conditions of the seasonal migrant workers indirectly affect their decision about their children working. In particular, measures on compensation, working hours and occupational health and safety are crucial. In this context, the project has already been successful in raising awareness about the elimination of child labour, therefore this momentum can be also used to bring attention to the connection between workers' working conditions, decent work and legal gaps in the existing national framework.

9. Consider cooperating with other initiatives on livelihood solutions and poverty alleviation solutions for seasonal migrant workers: Livelihood solutions including vocational trainings address the root causes of the problem. Yet given the limited time of the project, its focus on elimination of child labour and further synergies can be explored with existing and/or long-term livelihood initiatives/programmes targeting vulnerable groups in skills development and employment.

10. Consider no-cost extension: The capacity building the activities were heavily impacted by the high number of beneficiaries, public staff, and long bureaucratic processes. Required ownership and capacity building for public authorities may necessitate longer intervention. A no-cost extension for one year might

be a logical option allowing the project to duly complete the remaining activities and fully utilise the project's resources.

### **3. Purpose, objectives, and scope of the evaluation**

ILO considers evaluation as an integral part of the implementation of development cooperation projects. Therefore, the evaluation will be planned and implemented in accordance with the ILO Evaluation Policy<sup>2</sup> and the ILO Results Based Evaluation Strategy<sup>3</sup>, using the ILO policy guidelines for evaluation<sup>4</sup>: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations. The evaluation will also comply with the evaluation criteria established by the OECD / DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation and the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System.

#### **The Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation**

The evaluation in the ILO is for accountability, learning, planning, implementation improvement, and building knowledge. Therefore, this independent final evaluation will indicate to the ILO, the EU, and its partners the extent to which the project has achieved its aims and objectives. The evaluation will ensure accountability to the beneficiary, donor, and key stakeholders, and promote organisational learning within ILO and among key stakeholders.

The evaluation will also identify strengths and weaknesses in the project design, strategy, and implementation as well as lessons learned, good practices, and recommendations. It will also touch upon cross-cutting issues such as gender equality, disability, social dialogue, environmental sustainability, and international standards, in terms of challenges and opportunities for tackling the most vulnerable segments in line with guidelines and protocols set by EVAL/ILO<sup>5</sup>.

The learning and recommendations generated by the evaluation will be shared to project stakeholders. It will also provide the basis for the design of future intervention models in the country and contribute to documenting management and delivery approaches.

The evaluation will consider the project's relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency sustainability, and contributions to broader developmental impacts. The objectives of this independent evaluation are therefore to:

- i. Assess the relevance and coherence of the project to address constituents and target groups' needs.
- ii. Assess the extent to which the project has achieved its stated objective and expected results regarding the different target groups, while identifying the supporting factors and constraints that have led to them, including implementation modalities chosen.
- iii. Assess the extent to which the project partnership arrangements (Public Private Development Partnerships) and ILO management contributed to the achievement of the stated objective and expected results.
- iv. Identify unexpected positive and negative results of the project.
- v. Assess the extent to which the project outcomes will be sustainable.
- vi. . Assess the integration of ILO cross cutting themes (i.e., gender equality and non-discrimination, international labour standards, social dialogue and just environmental transition) in the project strategies and results
- vii. Identify lessons learned and good practices to inform the key stakeholders (i.e., the tripartite constituents, national stakeholders, the donor and ILO) for future similar interventions.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.ilo.org/evaluation-office/evaluation-policy>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.ilo.org/resource/conference-paper/gb/332/ilo-results-based-evaluation-strategy-2018-21>



- <sup>4</sup> <https://www.ilo.org/publications/ilo-policy-guidelines-results-based-evaluation-principles-rationale>
- <sup>5</sup> <https://www.ilo.org/publications/ilo-policy-guidelines-results-based-evaluation-principles-rationale>

- viii. Provide recommendations to project stakeholders to promote sustainability and support further development of the project outcomes; and
- ix. Provide recommendations to contribute to further project development to contribute to the elimination of Child Labour in Türkiye.

### Scope of Evaluation

The evaluation will cover the entire duration of the programme since its inception i.e. October 2020 – January 2025. It will consider all the documents linked to the project. This includes the project document, periodic reports, results of mid-term evaluation and implementation of its recommendations as well as documents produced as outputs of the project (e.g. knowledge products, policy strategies/briefs, IEC materials, etc)

The evaluation will cover project office in Ankara in addition to a large number of cities namely Şanlıurfa, Mardin, Adıyaman, Diyarbakır, Adana, Mersin, Hatay, Isparta, İzmir, Manisa, Eskişehir, Konya, Malatya, Ordu, Bursa and Düzce hosting and receiving seasonal migrant workers. The evaluation will integrate gender equality, inclusion of people with disabilities, environmental sustainability, ILS, and social dialogue, as crosscutting concerns throughout its methodology and deliverables, including the final report. This is based on EVAL's protocols on cross-cutting issues to ensure stakeholder participation in the evaluation process.

### 4. Evaluation criteria and questions (including Cross-cutting issues/ issues of special interest to the ILO)

The evaluation will apply the key criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact potential and apply international approaches for international development assistance established by OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard and in line with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). In particular,

- The evaluation should address the evaluation criteria related to relevance, coherence, project progress/ achievements and effectiveness, efficiency in the use of resources, impact, and sustainability of the project interventions as defined in the [4<sup>th</sup> edition of the ILO Policy Guidelines](#) for results-based evaluation (2020).
- The evaluation adheres to confidentiality and other ethical considerations throughout, following the [United Nations Evaluation Group \(UNEG\) Ethical Guidelines and Norms and Standards in the UN System](#). The evaluation process will observe confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. To mitigate bias during the data collection process and ensure maximum freedom of expression of the implementing partners, beneficiaries and other stakeholders, project staff will not be present during interviews.
- The core ILO cross-cutting priorities, such as gender equality and non-discrimination, promotion of international labour standards, tripartism, and constituent capacity development and just transition on environment should be considered in this evaluation, throughout the methodology, deliverables, and final report of the evaluation. It should be noted that gender is the core dimension of the project. Therefore, evaluation should also include how the activities and budget contributed to promoting gender equality whether they were “Specific” or “Supportive” or “Neutral” or “Transformative”.
- The evaluation will also focus on the effects of and the earthquake unexpected factors such as COVID 19 and the earthquake affected project implementation and whether the project effectively addressed them.

- It is expected that the evaluation will address all of the questions detailed below to the extent possible. The evaluator may adapt the suggested evaluation criteria and questions, but any

fundamental changes should be agreed upon between the ILO Evaluation Manager and the evaluator. The evaluation instrument (as part of inception report) to be prepared by the evaluators will indicate and/or modify (in consultation with the Evaluation Manager), upon completion of the desk review, the selected specific aspects to be addressed in this evaluation.

The suggested evaluation criteria and indicative questions are given below:

### **Relevance**

1. Were the project approach and activities relevant to the needs of the constituents (Government of Turkey, employers' and workers' organisations) and the stated objectives?
2. Was there a fit between the project design and the direct beneficiaries' needs?
3. To what extent did the project address key relevant components of and contribute to UN Country programme frameworks (UNSDCF), strategic country development documents, and Sustainable Development Goals – especially SDG 8 as well as ILO's strategic and national policy frameworks??
4. Has the project reflection on general policies? Does the project relate to ILO results framework (including P&B 2022-23), the ILO mandate and relevant policies, including gender equality and non-discrimination, disability inclusion, international labour standards, social dialogue, just transition on environment?

### **Coherence**

5. How well did the interventions of the project fit with other interventions of the ILO Office for Türkiye? What synergies were created? How well did the interventions of the project fit with other interventions of the relevant partners?
6. How well did the design and implementations of Projects take into account the national institutions work in child labour elimination that goes with Türkiye have national efforts on elimination of child labour s?
7. Has the project established partnerships with relevant organisations/institutions at the global and country-level throughout its implementation? What were their roles? And what were their expectations? To what extent have these partnerships been useful in the achievement of the intended results?
8. What was the added value of the ILO work in terms of comparative advantage?

### **Effectiveness**

9. To what extent were the project objectives achieved? Were there any notable successes or innovations? Which were the positive factors and obstacles or barriers to achieve the project results?
10. Were there any unintended results (positive or negative)?
11. How effective have been the capacity building of national stakeholders' activities, especially those started in the second part of the project (after the mid-term evaluation)
12. To what extent did the project adapt its approach to respond to the COVID-19 and the earthquake crisis and what were the implications on the nature and degree of achievement of the project and project targets after those? Did the project foster ILO constituents' active involvement through social dialogue through the project in articulating a response to the immediate effects of the crisis? How gender considerations were mainstreamed throughout the project cycle (, planning, implementation, M&E),

including that of implementation partners?

13. Was the quality of outputs satisfactory?

14. How effective was the monitoring mechanism set up, including the regular/periodic meetings among project staff and with the beneficiary, donor and key partners? Was there a suitable monitoring and evaluation framework for accountability, management and learning developed at the outset of the project and updated regularly?
15. What mechanisms were in place to ensure the inclusion of beneficiary feedback in the design and implementation process?
16. Assess the level of government involvement in the project and how their involvement with the project has built their capacity to continue further work on future programmes.
17. How has the capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners (at national and local levels) to develop effective action against address child labour been enhanced as a result of programme activities?
18. How important was the capacity development activities especially the activities undertaken after the mid-term evaluation?

### **Efficiency**

19. How efficiently were the resources of the project (time, expertise, funds, knowledge and know-how) used to produce outputs and results? Were resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) allocated strategically to achieve the project objectives? Did the project benefit from complementary resources at the global and country levels that supported the achievement of its intended objectives?
20. Given the size of the project, its complexity and challenges, were the existing management structure and technical capacity sufficient and adequate?
21. Did the project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from the ILO HQ and Regional Office and its national partners? If not, why?
22. To what extent did the project leverage resources (financial, partnerships, expertise) to promote international labour standards, social dialogue and disability inclusion Gender equality and non-discrimination and just transition on the environment?

How effective was the communication strategy? Did the project receive adequate technical and administrative support/response from the ILO backstopping units?

### **Sustainability and emergent impact**

23. Are the results achieved by the project so far likely to be sustainable and last beyond the project (including the e-METIP system as a collaboration and monitoring mechanism? How will the implemented work be institutionalised and used by government institutions to enhance future work on the intended objectives of the project?
24. To what extent have results contributed to advance sustainable development objectives (as per UNSDCFs, similar UN programming frameworks, national sustainable development plans, and SDGs)?
25. To what extent did the project contribute to advancing the ILO's core principles (ILS, tripartism and social dialogue, gender equality and non-discrimination -i.e. Gender and people with disabilities and other groups as relevant- and just transition)?
26. What was the level of ownership of the project outcomes by partners and beneficiaries?
27. Assess what contributions the programme has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders and to encourage ownership of the programme to partners. How far the Projects interacted and possibly influenced national level policies, debates and institutions working on child labour.

28. To what extent knowledge developed throughout the project (research papers, progress reports, manuals, and other tools) can still be utilised after the end of the project to inform policies and practitioners?

### General

- To what extent the project addressed the mid-term evaluation recommendations? Identify lessons learnt and potential good practices of intervention that could inform future projects and partners and stakeholders could incorporate into policy and practice.

The list of questions can be adjusted by the evaluator in coordination with the ILO Evaluation Manager. Based on the analysis of the findings the evaluation will provide practical recommendations that could be incorporated into the design of potential future initiatives.

## 5. Methodology

The evaluation will comply with UNEG evaluation norms, standards and follow ethical safeguards, as specified in the ILO's evaluation guidelines and procedures. The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner by engaging the stakeholders at different levels and ensuring that they have a say about the implementation of the project, can share their views and contribute to the evaluation, and participate in dissemination processes.

The methodology will include examining the project's **Theory of Change** in the light of logical connect between the levels of results, their alignment with the ILO's strategic objectives and external factors/assumptions. Particular attention will be given to the logical connection between levels of results and their alignment with ILO's strategic objectives and outcomes at the global and national levels, as well as national strategic frameworks with the relevant SDGs and related targets, and other relevant external factor .

The evaluation process should be implemented in three phases (1) *an inception phase* based on a review of existing documents to produce inception report; (2) *a fieldwork phase* to collect and analyse primary data; and (3) *a data analysis and reporting phase* to produce the final evaluation report.

The evaluation would apply a mixed-method approach. Both qualitative and quantitative evaluation approaches should be considered for this evaluation. First of all, the evaluator(s) will make a **desk review** of appropriate materials, including the project document, Logical Framework, progress reports, mission reports, project briefs, news/articles and other outputs of the project and relevant materials from secondary sources (e.g., national research and publications). Secondly, the Evaluator(s) will collect relevant data for the evaluation. Individual or group interviews will be conducted with the main stakeholders defined in the TOR.

Evaluator(s) would be given a list of recommended/potential persons/institutions to interview that will be prepared by the Project Team in consultation with the Evaluation Manager. Thirdly, the Evaluator may use **surveys, interviews and/or focus group discussions** to collect data for the evaluation from the target groups, if applicable.

Opinions revealed by the stakeholders will improve and clarify the quantitative data obtained from project documents. The participatory nature of the evaluation will contribute to the sense of ownership among stakeholders. Quantitative data will be drawn from project documents including the Progress Reports.

Sound and appropriate data analysis methods should be developed. Different evaluation questions may be combined in one tool/method for specific targeted groups as appropriate. Attempts should be made to collect data from different sources by different methods for each evaluation question and findings be triangulated to draw valid and reliable conclusions. Data shall be disaggregated by gender and other relevant categories, during the collection, presentation and analysis of data.

The evaluator will be expected to follow EVAL's Guidance material on appropriate methodologies to measure key cross-cutting issues, namely the ILO EVAL [Guidance Note 3.1 on integrating gender equality](#)



[and non-discrimination](#); and the ILO EVAL [Guidance Note 3.2 on Integrating social dialogue and ILS in monitoring and evaluation of projects](#).

More specifically, in accordance with ILO Guidance note 3.1: “Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of projects”, the gender dimension should be considered throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. The evaluator(s) should assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve the lives of women and men. Data shall be disaggregated by sex where possible and appropriate during the collection, presentation and analysis of data. To the extent possible, data should be responsive to and include issues relating to diversity and non-discrimination.

All this information should be accurately reflected in the inception report and evaluation report.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the **inception report** and the evaluation report, and should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, surveys, etc. The limitations of the chosen evaluation methods and the mitigation strategies followed should be also clearly stated.

**Planning Consultations:** The evaluator(s) will have a consultation meeting (online) with the Evaluation Manager and Project Team. The objective of the meeting is to reach a common understanding regarding the status of the project, the priority assessment questions, the available data sources and data collection instruments, and an outline of the final assessment report. The following topics will be covered: project background and materials, key evaluation questions and priorities, data sources and data collection methods, roles and responsibilities of the assessment team, outline of the final report. A meeting with the donor will also take place to understand their expectations of the evaluation.

**Field Visits:** The evaluator(s) is proposed to visit Ankara and at least five cities. Meetings will be scheduled in advance of the field visits by the ILO project staff, in accordance with the evaluator’s requests and consistent with these terms of reference. The meetings should cover all the different groups including at local and national level authorities, social partners, implementation agencies and beneficiaries (men, women, children, people with disabilities, and other relevant actors). The data collection should be inclusive.

**Stakeholders’ Workshop to present preliminary results and developing of the evaluation report:** Upon completion of the data collection and analysis, the evaluator(s) will conduct a stakeholders’ workshop to share the preliminary findings, conclusions, and recommendations. After incorporating inputs from the stakeholders’ workshop, the evaluator(s) will share the draft report with the Evaluation Manager who, after a methodological review, will circulate it to the stakeholders for their comments and inputs and the evaluator(s) will be responsible for considering the feedback provided and reflecting relevant inputs to the final report and his comments log.

**Debriefing/Presentation:** Upon completing the report, the evaluator will provide a debriefing to the ILO Team on the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final draft of the report will be shared by the evaluator with the Evaluation Manager, who will approve the report at her level and then will share it with the Regional Evaluation Officer, upon his approval it will be shared the report with EVAL for their comments, inputs and final approval. The evaluator will be responsible for considering the feedback provided and reflecting relevant inputs to the final report.

## 6. Main deliverables

**Inception Report:** To be submitted to the Evaluation Manager within **7 days** of the receiving of all programme documents and may be circulated among key stakeholders.

This report will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection and analysis. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The Evaluator will also

share the initial draft inception report with the Project Team and Evaluation Manager to seek their comments and suggestions. The inception report should be in line with [ILO EVAL Office Checklist](#).<sup>6</sup>

**Workshop: To present the preliminary results to the stakeholders for their feedback**

**Draft Report:** To be submitted to the Evaluation Manager within **10 working days** of completion of the data collection and after the stakeholders' workshop.

The draft report will be approx. 30 pages plus executive summary and appendices. The draft report will be disseminated to all key project stakeholders to seek their comments and suggestions.

**Final Evaluation Report:** To be submitted to the Evaluation Manager within **2 days** of receipt of the draft final report with comments. The Final Report should be submitted along with all relevant Annexes as indicated in ILO Guidance Note on the evaluation report (including executive summary, good practices, lessons learned etc.)

Once the final report is completed and reviewed by the Evaluation Manager, it will be shared with the Regional Evaluation Office (REO), and finally with EVAL for final approval and requests the management response to the ILO responsible officer. Then the report will be available for wider dissemination to all stakeholders.

**An evaluation summary:** using the ILO Summary template.<sup>7</sup>

**Suggested Report Format:** The final version of the report shall follow the below format in accordance with the ILO Evaluation Office guidelines (see Checklist 6 on Rating the quality of evaluation reports<sup>8</sup> and be no more than 30 pages in length, excluding the executive summary and annexes:

1. Title page
2. Table of Contents
3. Acronyms
4. Executive Summary
5. Project Background
6. Evaluation Background
7. Evaluation criteria and questions
8. Evaluation Methodology, (including limitations and mitigation)
9. Main Findings
10. Conclusions
11. Lessons learned and Emerging Good Practices
12. Recommendations
13. Annexes (TOR, inception report, lessons learned template, list of interviews, meeting notes, relevant country information and documents)

All deliverables must be written in English. All deliverables will be submitted in electronic format in Word. The process of the finalisation of the Evaluation reports:

- The Evaluation Manager will provide methodological comments to the draft final report, which will be also shared with all the stakeholders to receive their comments.
- After consideration of the comments of stakeholders on the report, the draft final report will be subject to approval by the evaluation manager and regional evaluation officer for review and then for submission to the ILO Evaluation Office for final approval. The final report shall be delivered no later than **7 days** after receiving the comments on the draft report.

---

<sup>6</sup> [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed\\_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms\\_165972.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_165972.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> Writing Evaluation Summary Checklist:

[https://www.ilo.org/sites/default/files/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed\\_mas/@eval/documents/publication/wcms\\_746811.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/sites/default/files/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed_mas/@eval/documents/publication/wcms_746811.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.ilo.org/publications/checklist-6-rating-quality-evaluation-reports>

## 7. Management arrangements and work plan (including timeframe)

The evaluation team will be composed of a team leader and team member, independent consultant(s), working under the supervision of the ILO Evaluation Manager. The evaluation will be managed by Ms Perihan Tawfik, ILO officer based in Cairo and with no relationship with the project.

- **Evaluation Manager:** The Evaluation Manager will supervise, coordinate, and guide the assignment. He will give the final decision and feedbacks on all the outcomes of the assignment.

The responsibilities of the lead evaluator are as follows:

- Responsible for supervising the team member in Türkiye.
- Ensure quality control and adherence to ethical guidelines.
- Defining the methodological approach and drafting the inception report (including all data collection tools), producing the preliminary findings presentation, drafting reports and drafting and presenting a final report
- Ensuring the evaluation is conducted per TORs and timeline, including following ILO and UNEG guidelines, methodology, and formatting requirements and adhering to evaluation report quality standards as referred to above
- Liaising with the evaluation manager
- Conduct face-to-face and virtual meetings with stakeholders (scheduling, debriefing and stakeholders' workshop)
- Contributing to the report dissemination and communication (if any) by participating in webinars and supporting or providing inputs to evaluation communication products

The responsibilities of the evaluation team member are as follows:

- Provide context-specific and technical and methodological advice necessary to the lead evaluator.
- Support the lead evaluator throughout the evaluation process (inception, data collection, data analysis, and report writing)
- Represent the evaluation team in meetings/interviews/focus group discussions with stakeholders upon request of the lead evaluator.
- Taking note and interpreting between English-local languages for the lead evaluator, when needed
- Contribute to the report drafting, dissemination and communication by participating in webinars and supporting or providing inputs to evaluation communication products.

ILO Project Team who will support the final evaluation and their responsibilities in this context are stated below.

- **Project Coordinator and Project Team:** Coordinator (Senior Programme Officer), will lead the project support to the process and will ensure that the planned activities are realised in a timely manner to deliver the expected results. The team will ensure that all relevant documentation is up to date and easily accessible in electronic form by the evaluator from the first day of the contract. It includes the necessary documentation, information, and lists of contacts/stakeholders/constituents/ beneficiaries and provides technical support to the consultant within the scope of the assignment when necessary.

### Place of Work

This is a home-based assignment for the desk review and the preparation of all reports. However, External Collaborators are expected to travel to Ankara and other project provinces in order to successfully

complete the assignment. The travel related costs (including inter-city travel, accommodation and meals)

associated with the field study as part of this assignment will be paid to the External Collaborators upon submission of travel documents.

### Timeframe workday requirements

Expected contract start date: 25 November 2024 - Contract

end date: 31 January 2025

The Team External Collaborators are expected to work below indicated number of days to successfully deliver respective tasks and deliverables and successfully complete this assignment.

Tasks	Team Leader - Number of working days	Evaluation Team member -Number of working days	Deliverables and Deadlines
vii. Desk review of project related documents; Online briefing with Evaluation Manager and project team. viii. Prepare inception report including interview questions and questionnaires for project stakeholders	10.5 workdays	9.5	Submission of Inception Report (5 December 2024)
iii. Conduct interviews, and surveys with relevant project staff, stakeholders, and beneficiaries iv. Presentation of preliminary results to the stakeholders in a workshop.	14 workdays	10.5	9 December –23 December 2024
Analysis of data based on desk review, field research, interviews /questionnaires with stakeholders; draft report	10 workdays	3	Submission of Draft Evaluation Report (2 January 2025)
Revise and finalise the report	2 workdays	0	Submission of Final Evaluation Report (31 January 2025)
<b>Total</b>	<b>36.5 workdays</b>	<b>21workdays</b>	

## 8. Profile of the evaluation team

The independent final evaluation will be conducted by a lead I evaluator with international experience, who will work with an evaluation team member based in Türkiye.

The independent lead evaluator will have the following profile:

- University degree in social development, economics, or a related subject at the master's level or equivalent.
- Seven years of international experience in project/program evaluation, including a theory of change-based approaches, and desirable in Labour Market and Employment and Child labour
- Knowledge of the ILO's mandate and Decent Work agenda
- Substantial knowledge of gender issues and familiarity with the issues of women and labour market in Türkiye or similar contexts.
- Good knowledge of the political situation, labour market and employment issues in Türkiye is an asset.
- Adherence to high professional standards and principles of integrity in accordance with the

- guiding principles of evaluation professional associations, UNEG, and ILO/EVAL
- Excellent analytical and report-writing skills in English

- Qualitative and quantitative research skills
- Demonstrated excellence in facilitating workshops.
- Full command of English is mandatory. Turkish spoken and written would be an asset.
- Certificate indicating completion of the ILO EVAL's online Self-induction programme<sup>9</sup> (*Desirable*).

The team member consultant will have the following profile:

- Education: University degree in social science, development studies/public administration/Statistics or another related field
- Five years experience in the evaluation of local development projects. Knowledge of research methodologies and data analysis would be preferred.
- Experience and exposure to engagement in child labour, labour market and employment related projects and programme will be an asset.
- Experience in the targeted localities is an asset.
- Experience in facilitating workshops for evaluation findings and participating in field questionnaires.
- Extensive knowledge of and experience in applying qualitative and quantitative research methodologies
- Hands-on experience in using participatory tools and methods for data collection and analysis.
- Fluency in spoken and written Türkiye and relevant local languages, and English
- Experience in the UN system or similar international development experience is desirable.

**The final selection of the evaluator(s) will be done by the EVAL/ILO.**

## 9. Legal and ethical matters

The evaluation will be carried out in adherence with the ILO evaluation policy guidelines, UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards, and OECD/DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance.

Ethical considerations will be taken into account in the evaluation process. As requested by the UNEG Norms and Standards, the evaluator(s) will be sensitive to beliefs, manners, and customs, and act with integrity and honesty in the relationships with all stakeholders.

The evaluator(s) shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality while ensuring that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.

The ILO owns the copyright and will decide on the possible dissemination of the findings and any other information produced under this assignment. For detailed information, please follow this page: <https://www.ilo.org/publications/ilo-evaluation-guidance>

All deliverables will be paid for on satisfactory completion and certification by the ILO evaluation manager and in line with the ILO Evaluation report checklist.



---

<sup>9</sup> [https://training.itcilo.org/delta/ILO-EVAL/ILO\\_Self-induction\\_Module\\_for\\_Evaluation\\_Consultants-Part-1/story\\_html5.html](https://training.itcilo.org/delta/ILO-EVAL/ILO_Self-induction_Module_for_Evaluation_Consultants-Part-1/story_html5.html)