



International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)



International  
Labour  
Office

# *IPEC Evaluation*

## **Sub-Regional Programme on Combatting the Trafficking of Children for Labour Exploitation in West and Central Africa (LUTRENA)**

**RAF/04/P58/USA & RAF/01/P51/USA  
P.250.07.100.058 & P.250.07.100.051**

**An independent final evaluation by a team of external consultants**

**Core countries:** Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon (until July 2006),  
Mali, Togo, Cameroon (until June 2006)

**Non-core countries:** Guinea, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal

November 2007

**This document has not been professionally edited.**

## **NOTE ON THE EVALUATION PROCESS AND REPORT**

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

The evaluation was carried out a team of external consultants<sup>1</sup>. The field mission took place in November 2007. The opinions and recommendations included in this report are those of the authors and as such serve as an important contribution to learning and planning without necessarily constituting the perspective of the ILO or any other organization involved in the project.

*Funding for this project evaluation was provided by the United States Department of Labor. This report does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Labor nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.*

---

<sup>1</sup> **MBAROU GASSAMA-MBAYE**

---

**Sub-Regional Programme on Combatting the Trafficking of Children for Labour Exploitation in West and Central Africa (LUTRENA)**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of acronyms and abbreviations .....	iv
I – Summary of major results, conclusions and recommendations. ....	1
II. Background .....	2
III- Objective of the Evaluation .....	3
IV – Methodology.....	3
Filed visits were not foreseen due to budget constraints. This restricts the scope of findings, especially for child beneficiaries who do not speak French. ....	5
V – Major outputs of the evaluation .....	5
1. Components of the Project Design .....	5
2. Project achievements .....	6
VI. Contribution and integration of the USDOL component in the global LUTRENA Programme.....	25
VII. Lessons learnt .....	27
VIII. Recommendations .....	28
IX. Conclusion .....	29
ANNEXES .....	30
Annex I: Terms of Reference.....	30
Annex II: Bibliography .....	39
Annex III: People Interviewed.....	41
Annex IV: Evaluation Tools .....	43

## List of acronyms and abbreviations

AEJT	l'Association des Enfants et Jeunes Travailleurs (Children and Young Workers Association)
BKF	Burkina Faso
CEEAC	Economic Community of Central African States
CFA	Communauté Financière Africaine (African Financial Community)
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DED	Design, Evaluation and Documentation of ILO/IPEC
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
GTZ	Gesellschaft für technische Zusammenarbeit German Technical Cooperation
HIV/AIDS	Human Immune Deficiency Virus /Acquired Immune Deficiency
ILO	International Labour Office/Organization
IOM	International Organization Migration
INSAE	Institut National de Statistiques et d'Economie Appliquée (National Statistical and Applied Economics Institute)
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
LUTRENA	Sub-Regional Project for the Elimination of Child Trafficking for Labour Exploitation in West and Central Africa
LVC	Local Vigilance Committee
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
PA	Action Programme
PNC	National Project Coordinator
RETRAM	Réseau des journalistes pour la lutte contre la traite des enfants (Journalists' Network to Combat Child Trafficking)
RWOGAT	Regional working group against trafficking , especially women and children
SIMPOC	Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour
TBP Mali Senegal	Time Bound Programme in Mali and in Senegal
TPR	Technical Progress Report
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations Commission for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNODC	United Nations Office for drug Control
USA	United States of America
USDOL	United States Department of Labour
USDOS	United States Department of State
WACAP	Sub-Regional Programme for the Elimination of Abusive Child Labour in Cocoa Plantations and Commercial Agriculture

## ***I – Summary of major results, conclusions and recommendations.***

The USDOL component of the LUTRENA programme has mainly achieved its objectives. All interviewees in line ministries and NGOs have praised the role played by the project in combatting child trafficking. Indeed, with a contribution of over 50% to finance action programmes, 100% for research activities and 100% for training, information and communication interventions, USDOL funding has contributed to greater awareness about the child trafficking phenomenon: It has helped to improve the legislative and regulatory frame work to create conducive conditions for prevention, withdrawal and reintegration of child victims. In the majority of beneficiary countries, prior to the LUTRENA programme, there was no institutional framework for interventions and public initiatives coordinated to fight against child trafficking. Through the USDOL contribution, the project was able improve access to formal and non formal education and vocational training.

It provided support services to child victims and to those at risk. The project also supported crisis/rehabilitation centers and helped them to align to standards adopted for child victims.

*The good news:* USDOL funding was a catalyst in the fight against child trafficking in West and Central Africa as it contributed to mobilize additional funding and attract international, local, public and private partners around these issues and proposed alternatives such as education and support to income generating activities in areas severely affected by poverty. Initially planned to cover 12 countries, the project was extended the 24 countries through the multilateral agreement to combat trafficking in persons, particularly women and children in West and Central Africa. The USDOL funding has also been able to meet challenges on factors which favour the supply side: Adoption of laws to punish traffickers, sensitisation of populations, increased opportunities for education and training of vulnerable groups.

*The bad news:* Much remains to be done on creating mechanisms to fight against poverty, one major pillar in combatting child trafficking. The funding of action programmes (AP) related to income generating activities did not result in the development of sustainable activities likely to reduce poverty, which is one major cause of child trafficking. Moreover, those who employ child labour in the informal sector, in trading and agricultural companies and in urban households, were not specifically targeted by the project.

The USDOL component of the LUTRENA programme did meet its objectives and is considered as one key project in the fight against child trafficking in West and Central Africa because of the relevance of its actions. In order to maintain such achievements, stakeholders are recommended to continue mobilizing governments in order to pursue efforts in terms of developing national and sub-regional legal and regulatory frameworks and to implement laws in order to improve the living conditions of populations and to further involve children themselves in the fight against child trafficking. In addition, it

has been recommended to act on the whole intervention chain, irrespective of a country being a core or non core country.

## II. Background

The LUTRENA Programme to Combat Child trafficking for Labour Exploitation in West and Central Africa is an ILO/IPEC programme. It is based on the same tripartite approach to ensure mobilization of the various ILO partners, employers and workers organisations to gradually eliminate the worst forms of child labour.

The US Department of Labor (USDOL) has committed since 2001 to finance part of the LUTRENA project in the amount of \$9.279,154. The LUTRENA project targets 12 countries, of which 10 are benefiting from support provided by USDOL. Six so called core countries namely Mali, Cote d'Ivoire, Burkina Faso, Benin, Togo and Gabon and for non-core countries, Guinea, Niger, Nigeria and Senegal received funding.

Until 2006, Nigeria and Gabon were among the core countries. The project was still conducting activities in both countries as non-core countries up to 2007. It should be noted that Nigeria became a non-core country in September 2004 with donor approval of the Addendum to the Project Document.

The project is physically present in core countries and has implemented direct action for children and their families but was not physically active in the non-core countries. However, partners were trained to conduct direct field interventions through training, seminars and research. For example, in 2006 and 2007, the country coordinator in Dakar attended two training seminars (Turin and Cotonou) and a feedback seminar on the study on child trafficking between Senegal and Mali held in Dakar. The focal point also took part in all LUTRENA staff meetings and contributed to the mid-term evaluation (Interview non-core country).

In Guinea, in addition to the training sessions, the country coordinator supported training on child trafficking for various organizations. « Indeed, Guinea being a non-core country, project contribution in this country was restricted to institutional issues through social mobilization, technical guidance and training of senior staff; yet, implementation of direct action would have helped to demonstrate project know-how to child victims of trafficking » (Interview non-core country).

Benin received funding from USDOL and DANIDA while Burkina Faso was funded by USDOL, DANIDA and USDOS. Between 2007 and 2008, Mali, Togo, Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea received funding from USDOL and additional funds from DANIDA. Other partners such as UNICEF, IMO and UNHCR contributed to the implementation of the LUTRENA project through co-funding mechanisms.

Between 1999 and 2008, the global LUTRENA budget totalled \$16.2 million of which \$9.279 million was provided by USDOL (about 60%), \$6.320 millions by DANIDA and

\$1.400 million by USDOS. The USDOL funding was used to cover the following activities:

- On the demand side : Creation and strengthening of cross-border child trafficking networks, studies and research, promotion of national legislations in compliance with national conventions, support for the development of national plans of action, replication and strengthening of monitoring systems at border level.
- Provision of service packages to child victims: Such services focus on capacity building for reception centres and improving standards of such centres, vocational training and support to the reintegration process.
- Interventions targeting communities exposed to child trafficking, formal and non formal education, vocational training through support to unschooled children or to those who never attended school or exposed to school exclusion and setting up of monitoring teams.
- Funding of the programme management and coordination activities. USDOL has funded operations of the Dakar office and covered expenses related to the CTA and the senior adviser based in Gabon, operating cost of the various national offices as well as staff salaries.
- Funding evaluations: The mid term evaluation, interim independent evaluation and the present final external evaluation.

### **III- Objective of the Evaluation**

This exercise is intended to assess the USDOL contribution in programme implementation, namely to analyze strategies and models of intervention used, to document lessons learnt and good practices and to make recommendations in order to mainstream such elements in the planning and implementation of project activities in the next phase.

### **IV – Methodology**

This exercise was conducted from the 10th of December 2007 to 15th of January 2008. Two tools were used: A literature review and direct interviews along with telephone interviews.

#### **1. Literature Reviews**

The main sources of information were the 2001 project design documents, the mid-term 2003 evaluation, the 2006 interim independent evaluation and technical progress reports

as well as final reports. Aspects to be addressed mentioned in the terms of reference were the guiding component of the literature review and interviews.

## **2. Direct Interviews**

The three direct interviews were held with the Dakar office staff. These direct interviews contributed to better understand the project and its major achievements. All background documents were prepared for the evaluator by the CTA.

## **3. Telephone Interviews**

A total of 26 interviews were held for this evaluation exercise. Two telephone briefing/interview were held with the *Design Evaluation and Documentation* (DED) Department of the ILO/IPEC Office in Geneva and one with the USDOL Office.

The telephone briefing with DED largely contributed to better understand and guide the strategic orientation of the evaluation process and the specific roles and responsibilities of key players in the exercise, namely USDOL and the Dakar office. Such interviews were used to briefly introduce expectations and constraints.

The telephone interview with the USDOL office Washington was also quite useful to clarify the terms of reference. USDOL requested that emphasis be put on lessons learnt and that recommendations and lessons learnt from the 2006 evaluation be revisited and that members of governments of beneficiary countries as well as children who benefited from the project be included.

The 24 other interviews were conducted with the six LUTRENA country coordinators, seven NGOs and eight partner Ministries and three child beneficiaries.

Coordinators of the five core countries were interviewed (Togo, Burkina Faso, Benin, Cote d'Ivoire and Mali), and two non-core countries (Senegal and Guinea) were included in the sample. Ghana, which received funding from DANIDA within the same project, was interviewed. All interviewees received the interview guide by email and had a telephone discussion with the evaluator. Four of them filled and submitted the questionnaire.

Implementing agencies, ministries, vigilance committees and NGOs received the interview guides and were interviewed by phone. National LUTRENA coordinators helped to identify focal points in ministry partners of the project and in NGOs. In all countries included in the sample, focal points within ministries in charge of social development and labour issues were interviewed. Children who benefited directly from the project were selected by the project or by the NGO. Some children were identified by partner NGOs in three selected countries, namely, Burkina Faso, Mali and Cote d'Ivoire.

## **4. Constraints**

The evaluation was held at the end of the year, a period during which most project offices were closed, which delayed the finalization of the report.



Sampling of child beneficiaries: considering the limited period assigned to the evaluation, children were selected by partner NGOs, which restricts the scientific scope. Two children were initially supposed to be interviewed in each country but finally only one girl child selected by the NGO was covered. Moreover, in most cases, children did not understand the meaning of the questions, so an interpreter working for the NGO was used to facilitate the process. All these factors proved to be constraints to the generalization of the conclusions.

The Gabon Office was closed before the evaluation started and was therefore not included in the sample, which also restricts generalization of the findings

Filed visits were not foreseen due to budget constraints. This restricts the scope of findings, especially for child beneficiaries who do not speak French.

## **V – Major outputs of the evaluation**

### **1. Components of the Project Design**

#### **a. Realism of the Design**

The project is realistic as it is implemented in a context in which child trafficking is now a fully acknowledged reality and populations and States involved are taking measures to eliminate it. Actions planned in the project design address the root causes of the phenomenon, namely poverty, lack of a legal and regulatory framework, lack of information, training and public-awareness and an absence of a consultation framework between border countries to curb the scourge. All these aspects were taken into account in the design document.

Child trafficking particularly affects poor areas where the population is very young and hardly schooled, rural areas and those affected by disrupted traditional family structures because of the placement practise for training purposes. All these factors were identified in countries selected. The combination of such factors is a contributing element for child trafficking.

All 6 core countries namely, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Gabon, Mali and Togo have ratified ILO Convention 182 and officially acknowledge the existence of the phenomenon and are committed to eradicate it, which makes the design realistic.

Child trafficking is an inter-State and a national problem therefore the project was implemented at three levels: regional, national and local level with strong involvement of communities. The project is adequately structured at macro, micro and meso level. However, the absence of direct action in the non-core countries restricts the scope of the realism for successful project implementation.

### **b. Rationale and Coherence of the Project Design**

The project is overall logical and coherent. The USDOL component has the same development objectives as the global LUTRENA programme. The same approach is used in all countries, as well as organisational charts. This rationale and coherence are a key component which facilitates its management by ILO and increases efficiency of actions. Therefore, the USDOL component is perfectly mainstreamed within the global LUTRENA programme.

In addition, the project logical framework was used by beneficiary countries to develop their plans of action, which increases its coherence. It should be noted that the project is well sequenced in terms of planning and the activities were based on the achievements of the previous phase (I and II ). The design document also shows adequate distribution of project activities.

### **C. Mainstreaming of efforts to provide educational opportunities to address child trafficking**

Child education has been mainstreamed in the project design. Plans were to improve staff capacity in counselling, professional orientation and vocational training. Aware of weaknesses of local capacities to host all children in formal schools and the need to support those at risk, the idea was to create hubs for child victims to attend formal schools while those beyond school-going age would be channelled into apprenticeship with a non formal component. 6,860 children were to be included in that component (design P. 27). The project did mainstream educational issues and local capacity development to address child trafficking and activities had been scheduled to provide education services.

### **D. Clarity and realism of project activities**

The objectives are realistic because they are restricted to project actions, with a limited duration. The formulation of objectivities fits perfectly in the ILO/IPEC approach which analyzes the phenomenon through the supply and demand side and the provision of services for sustainable reinsertion of children so that they no longer become victims of trafficking. The project had a very short duration as actions to be conducted are structural and fit into poverty reduction, which goes beyond the LUTRENA project mandate. Reinsertion activities take a longer time and therefore should be designed as such to so that the impact achieved can be measured.

## **2. Project achievements**

### **A. Definition of concepts and terminology**

Interviews held with different partners within ministries and with national project coordinators and NGOs have shown that training sessions were quite relevant to improve understanding of the definitions by ministries and their departments at national, regional and local level and by local communities, NGOs and traditional leaders. However, it came to light that populations in general do understand transborder trafficking but tend to overlook internal child trafficking. Several socio-economic and cultural factors

contribute to this, especially the role of the child in the family, his/her decision-making power and traditional family structures (Interview in Togo and Cote D'Ivoire).

In the specific case of Cote d'Ivoire, Benin, Burkina Faso and Mali, at the beginning of the project the term used was "slavery" but today they talk of "trafficking". In Burkina Faso, the legislation used the concept of "trafficking" but the law is being revised to adopt the same terminology as international conventions that is, "women and child trafficking". This broadening of the concept has enabled local vigilance committees to go beyond the mere phenomenon of trafficking to address child trafficking and childhood protection especially in disadvantaged settings (interview Cote d'Ivoire).

When asked about the understanding of the concepts: How do you understand the concept of child trafficking? Child labour exploitation? Which criteria do you use to define withdrawal and prevention of child victims? All project partners interviewed have perceived exploitation as a central issue. A few examples can be given:

« For me, traffickers target exploitation of child labour».

« Withdrawal criteria: children victims of the worst forms of labour, maltreated children, prevention criteria: strengthening of the legal framework, sensitization and social mobilisation, support to families» (Interview in Cote d'Ivoire).

«It is considered as **sexual exploitation of the child**, whether a boy or a girl, requires intervention, his/her exposure to acts of prostitution, indecent assault, pornography and pedophilia either for financial gain or free of charge, directly or indirectly. »

«It is considered as **economic exploitation**, requires intervention, exposure to begging, trafficking or being involved in a hazardous work likely to keep him/her out of school or hazardous to his/her health, development or physical or moral integrity or a threat to his/her involvement in activities not compliant with the present code (interview guide with Ministry of Labour). »

« Exploitation is the central issue in the concept of trafficking, it is more suitable than child slavery, with includes illegal migration and maltreatment of children (interviews with non core countries). »

«The limits between work done in terms of socialisation and exploitative labour are not clearly defined, there is a need to spell this out (interview with non core countries). »

« Child labour for exploitation purposes and the worst forms of child labour are the key issues ».

The design document used ILO Convention 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour and the Palermo convention which defines trafficking as recruitment, transport, transfer, accommodation or reception of a person under threat, force or any other forms of coercion, fraud, abuse of power, situation of vulnerability with an ultimate objective of

exploitation (design document p.10). This definition is in line with Convention 182 which includes trafficking, displacement and housing.

In this definition, the idea of transfer and exploitation are central and remain valid in the context of the project. However, special focus should be put on exploitation of children within the families, children from Quranic schools who turn out to be begging on the streets, domestic workers or children who are sexually exploited. The concept of trafficking is more relevant because it helps to address internal trafficking while being compliant with the terminology used in major ILO Conventions. Good understanding of concepts and terminologies contributed to better targeting of project beneficiaries and relevant actions were conducted.

## **B. Efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation**

All project leaders, partners in technical ministries and in NGOs appreciated the relevance and efficiency of the intervention model and outputs. For most representatives of line ministries and NGOs, the project was timely.

The efficiency and effectiveness could be felt in the implementation of activities, in mobilizing additional resources and in the synergy developed with other ILO-IPEC projects and USDOL-funded programmes.

### **B. 1. Efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation process**

The LUTRENA project was efficient and effective because objectives initially targeted were well reached within the deadlines and at reduced cost. The 2003 and 2006 evaluations have shown that the project largely exceeded the objectives assigned in terms of prevention and withdrawal of child victims. This is confirmed in the September 2007 TPR which indicates that 36,128 children received assistance from the project while 9,552 were withdrawn and 26,576 prevented, out of the 9,000 targeted (data as of 08/31<sup>st</sup>/2007). These results were obtained through the approach used involving line ministries, UN agencies and other donors. Moreover, voluntary commitment of populations and the involvement of local NGOs contributed significantly to reducing the cost of activities.

The LUTRENA Project has facilitated access to education services for children and adults to combat the phenomenon. For example, the September 2007 TPR which aggregates education services provided to children between March and August shows that 15 children, of which 5 girls benefited from non formal education services, 952 from formal education and 847 from vocational and technical training. During the same period, the project also distributed 105 uniforms, 2,116 books and school supplies and 814 scholarships. Adults were also provided with education services: vocational training 287, literacy 750.

The project also reached its immediate objectives: creation of a legal environment and capacity building at national level, prevention and rehabilitation; community involvement through local vigilance committees, improvement of the knowledge base about the

phenomenon and development of prevention, withdrawal and reintegration models as well as coordination mechanisms in some countries. Support and counselling networks were created in nine countries and the child trafficking issue is now mainstreamed in the public debate in beneficiary countries.

Limited recourse to international experts/staff (one CTA and one Programme Manager) increases project efficiency and effectiveness as the local expertise is strengthened and added great value.

### **B2 Efficiency in resource mobilization**

The USDOL-funded component of the LUTRENA programme was the most important catalyst to the mobilization of funds in core countries. USDOL was the first partner to finance the child trafficking initiative in 2001. This effort has played a key role in encouraging additional state resources and funds from the UN system (UNICEF, IMO, and UNHCR). «The relevance of project activities to combat child trafficking has increased the interest of partners of this issue » (Interview with the national coordinator).

### **B.3. Efficiency and effectiveness of synergy with other programmes**

Consultation is a project requirement. The 2003 evaluation report had underlined the special priority given to regular and permanent consultations with UNICEF and IMO and, to a lesser extent, with UNHCR and UNODC. The existence of the Inter-agency Working Group (RWOGAT) based in Dakar is a perfect illustration. This was confirmed by the interviews that were held.

The creation of consultation frameworks between UN agencies on the one hand and a different ministry on the other, at the beginning of the project, has largely contributed to creating synergies between the various stakeholders. USDOL funding and the tripartite management model which includes various contributions from other donors and the civil society also improved project efficiency and effectiveness. The objective targeted by ILO to strengthen Conventions 138 and 182 was reached through the LUTRENA project.

In Cote d'Ivoire, the WACAP project had come to an end but according to the national coordinator, there was good collaboration between the two projects, with the conduct of joint activities. For example, the two projects co-funded the World Day Against Child Labour and mutually provided support to each other in the implementation of activities.

LUTRENA works in collaboration with other projects funded by USDOL. In Togo and in Benin, the project collaborated with the USDOL project on HIV/AIDS in the workplace, especially on risks for children victims of sexual labour. The USDOL project on HIV/AIDS is supporting LUTRENA by providing the content of training modules but no activities are jointly funded. However, this does not impact negatively on the costs of the LUTRENA action programmes.

The mobilization and synergy developed between various institutions not only helped to promote coherence in project activities but also ensured sound monitoring of field activities. This was an opportunity to put donors and the formal private sector in a situation of confidence and to encourage them to co-finance activities.

The implementation of LUTRENA activities is supervised by a project coordinator who acts as the IPEC programme manager in three countries (Benin Nigeria and Togo). In other countries, these functions are performed by two different staff. In cases where the LUTRENA coordinator is also the programme manager, coordinators believe it is advisable to coordinate the two aspects of the project for complementary purposes and for good synergy between child labour activities. In case IPEC and LUTRENA have separate coordinators, as in the case in Burkina Faso, good collaboration was noted because BOTH INFORMED THEMSELVES MUTUALLY about support to be provided to partners.

The 2003 evaluation had shown that LUTRENA activities are more visible than IPEC country programme or other interventions and project leaders pointed to the low level of resources available to manage the two programmes because each project has its own requirements, which cannot be handled by one single person.

#### **B.4. Level of efficiency of plans of action, research projects and policy projects to combat child trafficking**

All initiatives related to the plans of action, research projects and policy project contributed to increasing project visibility to improve awareness by the state and population on the issue of child trafficking. Such initiatives have promoted better knowledge about the phenomenon and more adequate care of child victims. However, programme implementation was hampered by slow procedures and the poor capacities of implementing agencies.

##### **B.4.1 Programmes of action and mini programmes:**

Between December 2005 and January 2008, 17 action programmes and mini programmes were implemented, of which 11 were funded by USDOL. Out of a total of US\$970,000, US\$552,000 were provided by USDOL, amounting to 57% of the implementation of APs. In Mali, Togo and Burkina Faso, APs were entirely funded by USDOL and focus on sensitization, social professional reintegration, monitoring systems, non-formal education, support to vigilance committees, adoption of the legislative and regulatory framework and development of a reception and referral system for child victims. The implementation of these APs contributed significantly to combat child trafficking. However, interviews with NGO officials and National Coordinators revealed that project procedures were either not well understood or implementing agencies understood them late, which generated delays and reduced the efficiency of field interventions. (Interviews with NGOs and National Coordinators).

Co-funding through mobilization of resources from stakeholders largely contributed to increasing project efficiency (LUTRENA DANIDA, IMO). The co-funding mechanism also yielded economies of scale on funding activities and helped to reduce costs (2003 evaluation, p. 31).

In general, the existence of vigilance committees, the involvement of State services, voluntary participation of populations and NGO involvement significantly helped to conduct cheap and relevant actions, as salaries paid to civil servants and NGO staff are well below those paid to international experts.

**B.4.2. Information and communication training:** Training and information programmes have played a key role in project activities. Between 2005 and January 2008, 38 training sessions and workshops including 3 conferences, one which was an inter-ministerial meeting funded by USDOL. They covered both core and non core countries: Burkina Faso (2); Cote d'Ivoire (4), Gabon (4), Guinea (5), Mali (9), Nigeria 2, and Togo (5). Training, information and communication sessions contributed to put in place a legal and judicial framework at both national and sub-regional level and to improve exchange of experience between coordinators in the various countries (interviews with project coordinators)

**B.4.3 Quantitative, qualitative studies and consultations:** A complete list of 21 studies and consultations has been or is being finalized for the period 2002-2008. Such studies helped to disseminate knowledge about the phenomenon and to provide the users with some scientific documentation.

**B.4.4. Use of research documents:** Interviews conducted with project leaders, ministries and NGOs show that the LUTRENA project documents are actually used and have been largely disseminated outside the project management office in Senegal where the dissemination process was just limited to the CTA (this could be due to the presence of the sub-regional office in Dakar).

In general, the results of the evaluation show that in all countries where studies were undertaken the project held meetings and sessions to validate such results. Documents were sent to partners. Workshops proved to be more efficient to share information with stakeholders involved. Research results were used by national coordinators, NGOs and partner ministries to prepare training and sensitisation workshops, official speeches and national plans of action. Students also consulted the documentation. In Côte d'Ivoire, the US Embassy held a round table on the LUTRENA programme publications (interview with the coordinator).

The document on « Child Trafficking for Labour Exploitation in the Issia Gold Mines (Côte d'Ivoire) has always been cited as a reference in Burkina Faso and in Guinea (Source: interviews). An official of the Burkina Faso ministry believes that the similarity between mining work in Côte d'Ivoire and in the national mining sector increases the relevance of the project in the sub-regional context. Data collected in Cote d'Ivoire and the recommendations of the study were used by countries exploiting gold mines. In Mali the Ministry of Labour has used and distributed the study on child labour between Mali and Senegal while the document on Child Trafficking for Labour Exploitation in the Issia gold mines was distributed to all focal points in all regions of Mali.

Some NGO officials interviewed in Mali confirmed having received all publications on child trafficking and that they are easy to read. This is a concrete example of similarities with local realities (interview with an NGO).

The 2006 Evaluation p.17 noted a clear lack of statistics on the scope of the phenomenon and its related components. Project leaders did not take corrective measures due to the fact that the results of the evaluation are not published in time and their implementation is thus delayed. However, the September 2006 progress report showed that preliminary results of the regional consultation launched in July 2006 indicated that local vigilance committees have systematically collected data on child trafficking since their inception, which means that a data collection system does exist in countries where such committees are operational. Benin had planned to commission a national survey on child trafficking from October 2006. In Cote d'Ivoire, the national survey on child labour is being finalized.

The setting up of the protocol in March 2006 for a monitoring system at sub-regional level and its validation and use by beneficiary countries will contribute to improve the knowledge base about child trafficking and traffickers so that efficient actions can be conducted. The 2006 evaluation showed that the system was hardly used. Sensitization campaigns and incentives should therefore be organized/provided to promote its use.

The project has helped to disseminate information about child trafficking, itineraries used (through posters), traffickers, the tacit complicity of communities and the nature and scope of the phenomenon. The internal flow of trafficking is now being better understood, even though the exact figures are not known. The availability of all such data helps not only to improve the knowledge base but also to heighten vigilance in target areas.

The LUTRENA programme is a reference for many institutions which use the information generated by LUTRENA. This particularly applies to members of the RWOGAT network namely, ILO/IPEC, Enda Tiers-Monde, MAEJT, IOM, Plan International, Save the Children, SSI, UNICEF, UNDOC. Other partners such as the German Technical Cooperation (GTZ) also use such data as baseline information to launch other projects. Indeed, the objective targeted by research projects is not to provide information solely to project users but rather maximise dissemination. Research documents are of a good quality and easy to use. (Interview with LUTRENA staff).

However, the 2006 evaluation revealed that perpetrators of child trafficking and child labour are hardly informed about the relationships between child trafficking, domestic work, the phenomenon of Quranic school and child sexual exploitation. The action programme in the design document (Design document Annexe A P 38) was supposed to conduct direct actions on employers of child labour. The LUTRENA programme can play a lead role in providing some knowledge about the phenomenon.

**B.4.5. The Child Trafficking Monitoring System:** This was designed based on the IPEC child monitoring model which reflects all data about child trafficking. In beneficiary countries, data on child trafficking are only available when the IPEC or LUTRENA projects are conducting surveys.



Vigilance committees have some potential to collect information but they have been restricted only to act as interception or vigilance bodies (most of their members are farmers). The example of Togo has shown that they can be used to collect information.

In Togo, the interview revealed that in NGOs, staff does not give priority to computer science but rather to field activities. The new software being a new working tool, there is need to train staff in the use of the child monitoring system.

#### **B.4.6 Use of the child monitoring software developed by the project:**

The 2006 evaluation confirms that this software has never been used and should therefore be made operational. Interviews with project leaders indicated that staff has very good knowledge of the software.

**B.4.7. Policy projects:** Significant progress was made in implementing policies on child trafficking. Achievements were obtained at sub-regional, national and local level. USDOL has funded the signing of multilateral agreements, holding of training and information sessions to sensitize policy makers on the need to develop plans of action (sub-regional and national level).

The adoption of the joint plan of action between ECOWAS and ECCAS countries (2006-2009) is one of the most commendable outputs achieved by the LUTRENA project. The main objective is to protect women and children against trafficking in persons. These plans of action will be strengthened by legislations in force in different countries.

At the regional level, the signing in Abuja on 6th July 2006 of the Multilateral Cooperation Agreement by 24 countries to combat trafficking in persons, particularly women and children, in West and Central Africa is an illustration of how successful project actions have been in setting up the legal mechanisms needed to eradicate child trafficking.

The September 2007 TPR has shown that more than half the beneficiary countries have introduced legislations banning child trafficking and exploitation while five others have ratified the Palermo Protocol (Benin, Burkina Faso, Mali, Nigeria and Senegal).

The Project has largely met its objectives in terms of sensitization as even those which refused to pass legislations because they did not acknowledge the existence of the phenomenon have today started the process for the adoption of anti-trafficking laws. LUTRENA through USDOL has played a key role by providing technical assistance and advice to various governments.

The LUTRENA Project has also contributed significantly in the harmonization of legislations. Several meetings were held with the nine beneficiary countries in this regard (2003 Evaluation, p.8) to create synergy between various stakeholders.

Cooperation agreements were signed between Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria and Togo to prevent and address child trafficking issues (see Cooperation Agreement).

The USDOL Funding was used between 2005 and 2007 to finance eight meetings in order to prepare and/sign agreements: Abuja, Multilateral Cooperation Agreements between 9 West African countries to finalize some bilateral cooperation agreements (Guinea-Mali).

All countries have initiated reforms under legal and administrative aspects to combat child trafficking, through the adoption and the dissemination of laws on Child Labour and Trafficking. Benin passed Law No 2006-04 regulating the movement of juveniles and the repression of child trafficking. Cote d'Ivoire and Mali have signed bilateral and multilateral protocols against child trafficking. Some ministries have created special units in charge of addressing child labour and its worst forms within Ministries of Labour and Social Affairs.

All these actions have contributed to inform the public about the phenomenon and to mobilize all stakeholders, NGOs and national administrations. Thus, the number of children withdrawn and prevented has increased, as well as the number of people sensitized. Related legislations were also passed.

All beneficiary countries have developed or have initiated the process of developing their own national plans of action to combat child trafficking. If the plan of action is well adhered to and mainstreamed in the various national development programmes, this will help to institutionalize USDOL efforts on child trafficking.

### **C. Integration of the recommendations from the 2006 Evaluation**

The evaluation process started in 2006 and ended in 2007. In the majority of countries, the project made some adjustments based on lessons learned and difficulties encountered during the implementation process. Thus, capacity building continued for local vigilance committees while children were involved in the action programmes and good practices were documented.

#### **C.1. Use of Community Structures within the villages targeted as a means of combatting child trafficking**

The Project continued to create new community structures. The progress report covering the period March-September 2007 shows that 10 grassroots community structures were set up. These are perceived as the best way of sustaining LUTRENA interventions.

#### **C.2. Improving procedures for the approval of action programmes**

By reducing the number of people involved in the process, recommendations could not be implemented. The September 2007 technical progress report recommends the adoption of rapid approval procedures in the next contract to be signed with future donors.

**C.3 Duration of action programmes beyond 24 months:** Not yet implemented.

**C.4. Empirical research structured around the child trafficking issue,** especially domestic labour, the “talibé” phenomenon and sexual exploitation of children. No new study has been conducted but the Malian Network against child trafficking held a sub-regional forum in Segou in March 2007 to study the phenomenon of migration including the “talibé” dimension.

**C. 5. Capacity-building for governments and implementing agencies** on legislations developed including the cooperation agreement in the sub-region. In Togo, Cote d’Ivoire, Mali, Benin and Burkina Faso this is one major component developed by the project. Magistrates were trained as trainers and they were able to train staff in charge of child trafficking at all levels, mainly the police, the gendarmerie, social workers, etc. Ghana held a training session during 2007.

**C.6. Creation of a statistical information system:**

This should facilitate the monitoring of the development process for each victim identified at country level. NGOs and vigilance committees collected some information but there is no real information system as such. Indeed, in Mali for example, NGOs and vigilance committees keep records and information is sent to the prefecture but at the regional level the information is not systematically managed and processed (interview with an NGO in Mali).

Information collected with project coordinators generally show how weak statistical information systems are. “We have not made much progress in setting up a statistical system”. Partner NGOs do not have statistical data collection systems but data gathered include periodic reports sent to LUTRENA. Answers are generally vague

**C.7. Incentives for mainstreaming data on child trafficking in national statistical programmes**

In Cote d’Ivoire, the National Statistical Institute, in partnership with IPEC-SIMPOC through LUTRENA will include in the questionnaire some items on child labour and trafficking (Source: TPR September 2007). Mali has conducted a national survey on child labour in December 2006. The study was adopted by Government in April 2007. Benin and Burkina Faso started the process while in Benin INSAE will be the implementing agency. In Togo, LUTRENA which started the statistical project on child trafficking has transferred competences to the Ministry of Labour. The State is now collecting and disseminating such information.

**C. 8. Involving children in decision-making bodies on child trafficking:**

There is no evidence of such integration. Some countries such as Benin and Burkina Faso have already created LUTRENA Clubs. Activities focussing on listening, information, orientation and education are still predominant in services provided to children. USDOL has funded an information and public awareness session for the

Association des Enfants et Jeunes Travailleurs (AEJT Mali). In Cote d'Ivoire, activities planned for children always focussed on reinsertion, schooling and counselling.

Child beneficiaries interviewed are not yet involved in decision-making bodies but they play an active role in sensitization activities. An interview with a beneficiary in Cote d'Ivoire revealed that she was provided with services such as medical assistance, food, and training in tailoring but she confessed that she was not involved in the activities conducted by the local vigilance committee. In Mali, the child beneficiary selected in the evaluation process and representing a group of 15 girls said that the beneficiaries do not actively participate in local vigilance committees to sensitize and search for victims (Source: interviews with child beneficiaries). In Togo, children are well integrated through child-victim clubs and LUTRENA Clubs. The project is conducting activities on listening, information and orientation in which children are at the forefront to better understand their own problems (Source: interview with the national coordinator). At the local level vigilance committees work in close collaboration with former victims who have information about mechanisms used, traffickers and other useful information (interviews).

**C. 9 The label « Combatting Child Trafficking »** should be promoted with institutional players along with the award of prizes, certificates and other distinctions. In Cote d'Ivoire, members of local vigilance committees are associated with the ILO image, which gives them some social status in the fight against child trafficking.

**C. 10. Synergy between partners on technical, logistical and financial issues :** United Nations institutions are still working in synergy with the project through co-funding of activities, which contributes to generate economies of scale. Governments provide some in-kind contributions through project housing as is the case in Togo. Subsidies are also provided to NGOs.

**C. 11. Ministries should mainstream such actions in their planning process and allocate budgets.**

The implementation of national plans of action combined with the adoption of laws provides governments with the opportunity to conduct efficient and coordinated action to fight against child trafficking. In Mali, a plan of action has already been developed for the Koulikoro region. In addition, two area councils in Southern Mali have earmarked a budget to finance activities for withdrawing and rehabilitating child-victims. In Cote d'Ivoire the State has committed in July 2007 to finance the 2007-2009 plan of action to the tune of CFA F 1,9 billion (Source: interview in Cote d'Ivoire). In Burkina Faso, the plan of action was developed in April 2007.

**C. 12. Grassroots community organizations should be encouraged to identify local financial partners:** in Togo, wheat and cassava plots are used to generate gains and lump sums contributions are offered for beneficiaries to self finance activities. Training

in entrepreneurship was organized to assist members of vigilance committees to generate incomes which can be used to fight against child trafficking.

**C.13. Training on income generating activities** was organized in Burkina Faso where 200 families in the West Southern zone and 80 in the Eastern zone were trained in agricultural, livestock and management of micro-credit schemes. Families received in-kind donations as start-up to economic activities. However, these actions are not integrated in the global poverty reduction framework. Income generating activities are not yet predominant in interventions to combat child trafficking.

**C. 14. Good practices and lessons learned** should be documented and disseminated: all countries have documented good practices and organized feedback seminars.

**C.15. To put all countries at the same level to fight child trafficking as one of the worst forms of labour:** in non core countries, no direct actions were conducted. Senegal has requested to be included in the category of core countries. Senegal and Guinea are making such requests in view of the importance of the phenomenon (interview with focal points). It has been recommended to address the whole chain of trafficking without making a distinction between core and non core countries.

**C. 16. To encourage programs to work in the global child labour framework and not to restrict solely to the IPEC program:** the ROGWAT network is a case in point as it pools together partners working in child promotion. The same type of network also exists in Central Africa. Moreover, the project expertise was used in other projects led by UNICEF or IMO. The LUTRENA project experts are often invited as moderators in training workshops on child trafficking (interview with national coordinators).

## **D. External constraints and limited capacities of implementing agencies and their impact on project implementation**

### **D. 1 External constraints**

The crisis in Côte d'Ivoire which broke out in 2002 has affected project implementation both in this country and in border countries. In Côte d'Ivoire, the project started in February 2002 and the crisis burst out in September of the same year. Main areas initially targeted by the project were no longer accessible and the project was thus compelled to select new sites where children were victims of exploitation, especially in the South which is a prosperous and a receiving zone for child labor exploitation. Due to the crisis, these children were re-inserted in a network of foster families which were provided with one-off support in terms of donations of material and small subsidies (interviews in Côte d'Ivoire). In Mali, initial actions focused on withdrawing Malian children working in the agricultural sector but the crisis led to a re-orientation of actions to focus on prevention (interviews with NGOs).

In the specific case of Togo, the LUTRENA project started in 2001 which was a difficult period in view of the suspension of international cooperation with the European Union and Bretton Wood Institutions. Thus, from 1992 to 20007, State resources were limited which negatively impacted on both the educational and health systems. This situation reduced State financial participation to the project. However, to address this difficult situation, the State provided in-kind contribution through the provision of buildings to house the project as well as a vehicle for field activities along with coverage of water and electricity bills, etc. The project paid mission expenses for civil servants and contributed to the purchase of fuel during field missions. In addition, the State used its decentralized structures to conduct activities at regional or local level which contributed to reduce costs. Other external factors are linked to a car accident during which a driver and the secretary passed away (November 2006). This impacted significantly on the moral of the project coordinator (interviews).

In Nigeria and Gabon, program activities slowed down because of the recruitment of a new national coordinator during the implementation process for Nigeria and due to limited interest shown by Gabonese authorities, linked with little knowledge on child trafficking by civil society. All these factors impacted on the global project implementation process (2003 evaluation).

The fall of the dollar exchange rate against local currencies has reduced the purchasing power of partners, which also had a negative impact on the implementation of programs of actions initially planned.

## **D.2 Constraints faced by implementing agencies**

### **D. 1. 1. NGOs**

The inadequate financial resources of partner local NGOs significantly hamper project actions. Indeed, many NGOs are not in a position to self finance their field activities and disbursement procedures are lengthy. It happens in some cases that a NGO receives an advance, but has to stop its activities due to lack of funds (interview with an NGO). Moreover, delays in payments are perceived as an additional constraint which impacts on the planning of tasks (interviews with NGOs). According to NGOs based in Côte d'Ivoire, major constraints are the political instability and difficulties to access some areas where the demand in support services is high. They face few constraints in terms of good understanding of LUTRENA project procedures as this issue was addressed since the 2006 training session.

The short duration of re-insertion programs which require monitoring and significant financial resources to pay staff and finance missions was an issue. Social re-insertion of victims requires the conduct of activities for a minimum of two years. Planning over two to five years is therefore necessary so that changes generated by project activities can be measured. There is also a need to extend certain action programmes to at least two years to have an impact on populations. International NGOs have been more efficient than local NGOs in managing action programmes. In Côte d'Ivoire, rehabilitation/crisis centers are managed by the State.

Delays noted in the approval of procedures are identified at different levels and the process is lengthy which reduces efficiency. This was mentioned in the 2003 and 2006 evaluations. In addition, the payment of 30 % on the first disbursement along with the short duration of the AP limits activity performance (Interview with NGO).

#### **D. 1.2. Line ministries**

The interview guide included a question on constraints faced by ministries in the implementation process. Below is a summary of the main constraints :

- The short project implementation period;
- Limitations in intervention areas : in Mali 2 regions out of 9 were targeted;
- No control over child participation by implementing agencies and poor understanding of the phenomenon by populations ;
- Turnover of State workers and NGOs staff;
- Inadequate financial resources and delays in allocating budget, which delays program implementation. In Benin, some activities had been suspended till 2008;
- The complexity of LUTRENA procedures for the submission of reports and justification of expenses. In the specific case of Benin, some partners of line ministries request to be trained on models for the development of reports for the next project phase;
- Delays in the disbursement of funds, which negatively impacted on adhering to deadlines ;
- Anchoring of migratory traditions in some environments;
- Negligence of internal aspects of trafficking ;
- Illiteracy of populations ;
- Non harmonization of national texts with international legislations;
- Lack of viable statistics on child trafficking ;
- Lack of specific legislations on child trafficking ;
- Monitoring of cooperation agreements ;
- Inadequate or non enforcement of existing legislations ;
- The crisis in Côte d’Ivoire which reduced the level of cooperation with neighboring countries, especially Mali and Burkina Faso, while the war situation exacerbates child trafficking.
- Lack of coordination of activities between the different ministries in charge of this issue. For example, in Burkina Faso, the Ministry of Social Action has developed a plan of action while the Ministry of Labour has not. In other countries, there is no synergy between Ministries. For exemple, some rivalry is noted between the Ministries of Labour and Women’s Affairs which both claim project leadership. Thus, the fact that the project is under the Ministry of Labour is perceived by the Ministry of Labour as a constraint and a difficulty. This situation creates “lack of synergy between the two line entities” (Interview with Ministries).

## **E. Possibilities of replication and sustainability**

Sustainability indices are noted in successful actions conducted by the State, NGOs and populations and these can continue to be conducted even without the project. The following actions can fit in that category : vigilance committees, commitment by NGOs, creation of child clubs, involvement of former victims in public awareness campaigns, mainstreaming of the child trafficking issue in child parliamentarians, construction of rehabilitation centers and involvement of populations to eradicate the phenomenon.

The LUTRENA model to fight child trafficking has convinced partners and different stakeholders, other donors, States, NGOs and populations in general. Interviews held with project coordinators, partners in Ministries and NGOs point to the possibility of replicating and maintaining project achievements.

### **E.1. Involvement of NGOs and Voluntary participation**

The existence of well trained and committed vigilance committees was mentioned as being a key mechanism which can be replicated to sustain LUTRENA actions. In Mali, although the action programmes to support local vigilance committees came to an end in 2004, members of the local committee continued intercepting children in Sorobasso, Koutiala district, in Zebala. They were supported by the Regional Department for Women, Children and Family Promotion. The good collaboration between Ministries and NGOs around the issue could be a token of sustainability of LUTRENA actions (interview with NGOs).

The successful implementation of the village committee approach initiated in Mali, Togo and Benin has encouraged other stakeholders such as UNICEF to get involved. The creation of a network of trainers of village local committees in Côte d'Ivoire could be replicated to ensure sustainability. Some answers to the evaluation questionnaire indicate that local vigilance committees are not financially autonomous and are yet to put in place mechanisms for sustainability. Indeed, various interviews conducted have shown that local vigilance committees should be supported and there are not yet models of income generating activities which could be replicated in Benin. However, NGOs are working with local communities to mobilize resources to finance the plan of action being developed.

The LUTRENA project has funded income generating activities on tie and dye, tailoring, production of simple cosmetic products such as local soap, jewellery making, bakery and pastry. Support provided by the project took the form of training for acquisition of skills in production techniques, donation of production material and technical support. The 2006 evaluation p. 16 has recommended collaboration with international NGOs such as CARITAS and Save the Children which have gathered vast experience in creating income generating activities. Such activities should be assigned to specialized agencies while LUTRENA would focus on policy actions such as counselling and advocacy.



Vocational training is a replicable activity able to guarantee sustainability. Skills acquired by NGOs during training sessions will continue to be used after the end of the project. The NGO Communauté Abel is still training artisans on the right of a child at the end of its action programme, to monitor APs funded by LUTRENA. It is still conducting vocational training sessions and is covering expenses for transportation of vigilance committees while literacy centres are still functional despite the closing of the LUTRENA project.

In general, NGOs interviewed are aware of their role in replicating good practices and involving communities. In Côte d'Ivoire, NGOs have developed mechanisms such as : support to local vigilance committees through assistance in income generating activities (sale of sugar and chicken to cover the salary of the supervisor and transportation of members of vigilance committees), monthly visits to local vigilance committees ; functional rehabilitation/crisis centers which receive subsidies from the area council. The NGO is exploring partnerships with the private sector to support the reinsertion of child victims. Populations actively participate in phone-in radio programs (interviews with NGOs). Examples of commitment by Governments and the civil society are indices of project sustainability.

Moreover, voluntary contribution is an additional input to project sustainability. However, in view of the low standard of living of the populations involved, there is need to institutionalize vigilance committees, to professionalize workers and to earmark a minimal operating budget or to put in place an income generation system.

Political commitment is also a sustainability factor. In all countries, there is State commitment to involve technical ministries and to develop bilateral and multilateral cooperation agreements to fight against child trafficking.

## **E. 2 Commitment by States and local communities**

The setting up of a legal framework is the first step for the continuation of activities. As mentioned above, the signing of the multilateral agreement on child trafficking by 24 countries including those covered by the project is a case in point. Côte d'Ivoire has confirmed its commitment to pursue the fight against exploitation of child labour through the creation of two important national committees, namely, the National Inter-ministerial Committee Against Child Trafficking and Exploitation which is presided over by the Ministry of Women, Family and Social Affairs and meet regularly. It works in close collaboration with ILO and UNICEF and conducts field activities. Côte d'Ivoire has validated the child labour monitoring system with the technical assistance of ILO/IPEC.

Interviews conducted with officials in technical ministries in Cote d'Ivoire indicate that a mechanism has been put in place to institutionalize child trafficking interventions.

These are:

- The Social Protection Division within the Ministry of Family, Women and Social Affairs;
- The National Child Exploitation and Trafficking Committee;
- The National Child Trafficking Subdivision within the Ministry of Labour;
- The National Child Trafficking and Juvenile Delinquency Subdivision within the Ministry of Security

The National Plan of Action to Combat Child Trafficking and Labour was developed. It shows state commitment to the eradication of this phenomenon. It is a global framework which spells out the national policy on this issue and it is funded to the tune of two thirds by the government and relies on other partners such as ILO/IPEC, UNICEF, GTZ etc. to mobilize the budget required (Source : Interview in Cote d'Ivoire).

In the September 2006 Technical Progress Report there was information that the Malian Minister of Labour was about to sign a decree creating the National Committee in charge of Monitoring Child Trafficking Programmes. The TPR also mentions the creation by Burkina Faso of a special child labour unit within the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare. In Mali, the September 2006 Progress report states the commitment of the Kolodieba council area which has adopted a budget to finance child trafficking interventions which was also confirmed during interviews with NGOs.

In Burkina Faso, the Ministries of Social Affairs, Agriculture and Basic Education have signed a memorandum of understanding to launch a youth vocational training programme for child trafficking control and prevention. Cote d'Ivoire has already taken measures to create a child labour unit within the Ministry of Agriculture while the Ministry of Labour is planning to implement a child labour monitoring system. The government has committed to address the child trafficking issue. The September 2006 Progress report also indicates that the Ministry of Family, Social Protection and Solidarity is developing its five-year plan to combat child trafficking with the support of ILO –IPEC.

In Mali, the Committee in charge of monitoring child trafficking programmes is still monitoring interventions to ensure their relevance, efficiency and effectiveness. The United Nations Master Plan for development assistance for the period 2008-2012 developed in March 2007 clearly stipulates within Output 1 on human rights the need for reintegrating child victims and providing care for vulnerable children.

In Togo, village plan of actions have been developed since June 2006 with the support of UNDP.

The Project has contributed to the development of synergy with the government: the Italian NGO Communauté Abel has initiated partnership with the Ministry of Social Affairs for the past 5 years and the latter is providing technical assistance through the deployment of civil servants. The Ministry of Justice also provides them with an annual subsidy the amount of which was 8 million CFA in 2007.

## **F. Good practices and intervention models**

**E.1 Local Monitoring Committees:** UNICEF replicated the project strategy in Togo in community districts. The local monitoring committees have contributed to the prevention of child trafficking by directly involving people concerned. All stakeholders playing a key role developed a sense of ownership on prevention strategies and participate in the search for family solutions. If strengthened, the committees can contribute to eradicate the phenomenon.

**F. 2. Sensitization of parents, local authorities and children:** This approach has proved to be efficient and requires few resources

**F. 3 National coordination structures:** they were quite useful in strengthening the institutional framework. They have many advantages especially they represent the State authority, they are open to the outside and they use all decentralized administrative structures including ministries, the police, the gendarmerie and other social services.

**F.3 Strengthening the legislative and regulatory framework:** Creation of national commissions in charge of developing anti-trafficking laws in Mali, Ghana, Togo and Benin.

**F.4. Involving national and international media:** Broadcasting on radio France International of the trial of a trafficker in Togo, to discourage traffickers in general; network of journalists involved in child trafficking : RETRA in Benin, RICAE in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali and Burkina Faso, RSB-TDE. Well informed and sensitized media can make the difference and put child trafficking in the forefront as a national problem.

**F.5 Encourage birth registration:** UNICEF has implemented this for about 4,000 children

**E.6 Cooperation with other institutions working in the same domain:** synergy in action increases efficiency and effectiveness.

**F.7 Documentation of good practices:** Priority countries work on documenting good practices including testimonies of child victims of trafficking.

**F.8. Culture communication through sketches and drama:** drama is a relevant communication tool in Ghana and helps to reach populations without access to television especially in rural areas and it is easy to replicate.

**E.9 LUTRENA child clubs:** these clubs are dynamic in Cameroon, Benin, Burkina Faso and Mali

**F.9 Advertisement tools :** on boarding passes « No to child labour ! » in Cameroon.

**F.10. Synergy between NGOs, different ministries and the project:** a good model of interaction between public services provided through Ministries of Social Affairs, NGOs and Village committees.

**F.11. Resource mobilization:** The LUTRENA project has contributed to mobilize other donors. Their input generated a budget 20 times higher than the initial amount forecasted.

### **G. Multiplier effects and unexpected outputs generated since the 2006 evaluation**

**G.1. Mobilizing partners around anti-child trafficking objectives.** The implementation of the LUTRENA model has attracted more than one donor outside the United Nations system through UNDP, UNICEF and UNHCR and other international and local NGOs have now contributed to combat the phenomenon.

**G .2 Involving villages not initially targeted by the project.** Some local vigilance committees have reported that their presence has forced traffickers to target other villages. Thus, other sub-committees were created to cover remote villages (Source : September 2007 Progress report).

**G.3. Number of countries involved :** The project covered 12 countries but 24 have signed the Abuja Accord. The child labour issue is now better known, even by non beneficiary countries.

## VI. Contribution and integration of the USDOL component in the global LUTRENA Programme

The USDOL component was harmoniously mainstreamed in the LUTRENA project. An unified approach is used in the implementation process under the supervision of ILO which has used its own tripartite operating principles. Good collaboration was noted with other USDOL-funded projects. Interviews revealed no competition whatsoever between USDOL-funded projects. Rather, project coordinators laid emphasis on the quest for assistance.

### USDOL-funded component's Actions

LUTRENA Actions	USDOL-funded component Actions	Comments
<p>Countries covered</p> <p>Benin, Togo, Cote d'Ivoire, Burkina Faso, Mali, Gabon, Ghana.</p> <p>Non-core : Senegal, Niger, Nigeria, Cameroon, Guinea</p>	<p>Core countries: Benin Togo Cote d'Ivoire Burkina Faso Mali Gabon and Ghana.</p> <p>Non core : Senegal, Niger, Nigeria, Cameroon</p>	<p>Out of the 12 countries covered by the project, 10 are supported by USDOL, with focus on direct actions in 6 countries.</p>
<p>Project institutional development</p>	<p>Funding of programme management and coordination (CTA Dakar, programme coordinator based in Gabon)</p> <p>Support to various national coordination offices</p> <p>Support to national plans of action</p>	<p>Institutional support by USDOL</p>
<p>Direct actions</p>	<p>Promotion of national and sub-regional legislations</p> <p>Formal, non formal</p>	<p>Direct actions have contributed to improving awareness about the phenomenon and prompted authorities to pass legislations.</p>

LUTRENA Actions	USDOL-funded component Actions	Comments
	<p>education, vocational training</p> <p>Assistance to child victims : capacity building for reception centres,</p> <p>Support to border monitoring systems</p> <p>Support to the reintegration of child victims</p>	<p>Create conditions required for prevention and reintegration</p> <p>Support the return of child victims in adequate conditions</p> <p>Prevention and withdrawal</p> <p>Reintegration of children</p>
Research, studies, documentation and follow-up	Qualitative and quantitative studies and consultations	Between 2002 and 2007, 21 studies and consultations were conducted of which 18 are available for a global cost of 630.747 USD
Training , information and communication	Training, information and communication	Public awareness and support to the legislative and regulatory framework
Sub regional cooperation and joint actions	Capacity building for transborder networks	Sub-regional cooperation
Number of children targeted	9,000	20,772 children covered
Total final contribution: US\$ 13,163.234	US\$5 Million	USDOS and DANIDA : US\$ 8,163.234

## VII. Lessons learnt

**Successful actions** : The project was globally a success. Major partners did appreciate the relevance of actions directly targeting children and governments

The project was able to withdraw and prevent child victims beyond expectations

The project contributed to the harmonization of the definition of concepts such as « child trafficking » and « child slavery » in the various partner countries

The project has made it possible to put in place a regulatory and legal framework to combat child trafficking and has encouraged governments to get further involved in the process; moreover, it promoted cooperation between neighbouring countries to eradicate the phenomenon.

It also has improved the knowledge base, motivations and modes of operation of transborder trafficking while cooperation between border countries has been strengthened, although the scope of child trafficking is still significant and much is to be done on internal trafficking.

Training and public awareness activities have contributed to transfer some competences to local populations, which promotes sustainability.

Education activities encouraged some pupils to go back to formal education (which is the case for beneficiaries in Mali who are now attending college). This also promotes adequate reinsertion of children.

The project provided capacity building activities to rural communities in prevention, withdrawal and rehabilitation. Training efforts and sensitization are achievements which will enable communities to continue work already started.

The network of journalists united to combat child trafficking and maltreatment: the media include some committed people with professional capacities who can contribute to the eradication of the phenomenon.

**Improvements needed:** the following actions showed limited impact:

Lack of visibility of the LUTRENA project in non core countries: due to the lack of direct action, populations do not develop ownership at the field level whereas there is real need to conduct interventions (this is the case for Senegal and Guinea with the street children and « talibe » phenomenon).

The statistical monitoring system: as yet there is no viable data collection system. In Mali, vigilance committees do collect information at local level and transmit them at district level but there is no national statistical information collection system on child trafficking. The LUTRENA project has started actions which need to be consolidated.

Income generating activities did not produce stable employment for populations. All beneficiaries were trained in the same traditional areas such as tailoring, tie and dye, hair dressing for women and mechanic and other trades for boys. Revolving funds available are not enough to develop viable micro schemes.

Lack of training for partners on project procedures: partners in line ministries and NGOs do not adequately understand report drafting procedures.

The low level of salaries of NGOs staff could create a feeling of frustration.

## **VIII. Recommendations**

There is need to continue supporting all beneficiary countries which should be considered a priority : it is recommended to act on the whole intervention chain and to keep working on poverty reduction strategies and involve other partners specialized in economic issues and micro schemes and to identify partners willing to support the creation of income generating activities

Training needs of the various stakeholders should be assessed in areas such as planning and preparedness so that they have sound knowledge about project procedures. Interviews have revealed the low capacity of NGOs in terms of standards and procedures regulating the drafting of periodic reports. This delayed the submission of reports. Interviews also showed that NGOs were trained in 2006, which contributed to foster their knowledge on procedures.

To act at the request of children : efforts are being made to involve children in child trafficking strategies although it will be useful to also involve them both in project planning and in the decision-making process as well as in the selection of indicators.

To specifically target users of child labour, namely employers in the informal sector, well-to-do households using children as domestic labour and users of children for sexual exploitation.

To put in place regulation systems to prosecute all traffickers, whether they are the parents or not, to discourage child lending practices.

To strengthen synergy within IPEC projects through the development of the joint work programme, with specific objectives and indicators.

To extend the last project phase in order to mainstream mechanisms for project sustainability with possibilities to test results obtained in making sure local partners have developed ownership on project activities



To continue mobilizing governments on bilateral and multilateral agreements on child trafficking.

To continue financing such projects in order to consolidate achievements. Some governments have expressed real commitment to combat child trafficking but are not yet ready to take over after the project completion. All persons interviewed said they are willing to continue supporting the LUTRENA project because of its proven impact on combating child trafficking.

## **IX. Conclusion**

The implementation of the project was deemed globally satisfactory and the USDOL funded component has played a key role in combating child trafficking for labour exploitation. It also strengthened the legal and regulatory framework for better knowledge of the phenomenon both qualitatively and quantitatively, while authorities and populations in general were sensitized. The project also provided support to victims and families at risk. Moreover, governments through Ministries of Labour and Social Affairs have developed plans of action and financial commitments which is a token of their desire to take over after project completion. However, much remains to be done on putting in place a statistical child monitoring system and launching income generating activities to prevent populations at risk. In this regard, the consultation framework between the project, donors and the governments could be one way of finding a solution to a problem which goes beyond the competences of ILO.

# ANNEXES

## ANNEX I: Terms of Reference



### International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour ILO/IPEC

**Final Version  
Basis for  
Contract**

#### Terms of Reference For

#### Independent Final Evaluation of the USDOL-funded Activities of the Project “Combating the Trafficking of Children for Labour Exploitation in West and Central Africa (LUTRENA)”

ILO Project Code	RAF/04/P58/USA & RAF/01/P51/USA RAF/01/P53/USA
ILO Project Number	P.250.07.100.058 & P.250.07.100.051
ILO Iris Code	12473
Countries	<b>Core countries:</b> Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Gabon (until July 2006), Mali, Togo, Cameroon (until June 2006) <b>Non-core countries:</b> Guinea, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal
Duration	77 months
Starting Date	July 2001 & September 2004
Ending Date	August 2006 & December 2007
Project Locations	Regional level, national level and selected districts
Project Language	English/ French
Executing Agency	ILO-IPEC
Financing Agency	USDOL
Donor contribution	US \$ 4,279,154 US \$ 2,000,000.00 US \$ 3,000,000.00

## I. Background and Justification

1. The International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) is a technical cooperation programme of the International Labour Organization (ILO). The aim of IPEC is the progressive elimination of child labour, especially its worst forms. The political will and commitment of individual governments to address child labour – in cooperation with employers’ and workers’ organizations, non-governmental organizations and other relevant parties in society – is the basis for IPEC action. IPEC support at the country level is based on a phased, multi-sector strategy. This strategy includes strengthening national capacities to deal with this issue, legislation harmonization, improvement of the knowledge base, raising awareness on the negative consequences of child labour, promoting social mobilization against it, and implementing demonstrative direct action programmes (AP) to prevent children from child labour and to remove child workers from hazardous work and provide them and their families with appropriate alternatives.
2. Trafficking in children being a particularly pernicious form of child labour, there is an urgent need to promote awareness about it and take immediate and effective action to combat it. During the 1990s, the number of reports of children being trafficked across borders for labour exploitation has steadily increased in West and Central Africa. Although some cases of trafficking of children within West Africa for commercial sexual exploitation have been reported, these have been far outweighed by the numbers reportedly trafficked across borders for other forms of work, of which recruitment for domestic work appears to be the most important. Other types of labour exploitation include work in plantations, small trade, begging and soliciting.
3. Several reasons are put forward to explain this phenomenon, in particular the decline throughout the region in the extended family system and the traditional forms of solidarity linked to it. Traffickers usually promise good money and job proposals in order to persuade parents to send their children away. However, after the children arrive at their destination, neither the child nor their parents are paid for the work they do, or at least not as much as they have been promised. Trafficked children who have been interviewed often tell harrowing stories of their journey from their home to their place of employment and many complain of bad working conditions and being deprived of food once they arrive. Many report that they have been beaten by their employers.
4. In this context, ILO-IPEC has launched a major sub-regional programme in October 1999, entitled “Combating the trafficking in children for labour exploitation in West and Central Africa” (LUTRENA project). Under LUTRENA phase I the project covered Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cote d’Ivoire, Gabon, Ghana, Mali, Nigeria and Togo. LUTRENA Phase II began in July 2001 and end on December 31, 2007. With the amendment in 2004 the project covered Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d’Ivoire, Mali, Gabon and Togo as core countries and the non-core countries were Guinea, Niger, Nigeria and Senegal which were based on the recommendations of the first mid-term evaluation. Direct actions in Cameroon and Gabon ended in June 2006.
5. The programme is funded by the US Department of Labor (USDOL), the US Department of State (USDOS) and the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA). While donors focus on different project countries, there are several countries in which more than

one donor has been funding activities under the LUTRENA project. The part of the project which is funded by USDOL has different components with separate budgets which are however closely interlinked. The components that will be looked at in the present evaluation (RAF/04/58/USA and RAF/01/51/USA) which is built on an earlier component (RAF/01/53/USA) and thus the evaluation will address all three components.

6. The development objective of the USDOL-funded part of the LUTRENA project is to contribute to a reduction in the incidence of trafficking in boys and girls for labour and sexual exploitation in Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, Gabon and Togo.
7. The project has three immediate objectives:

**Immediate objective 1: *Addressing the Demand for Boys and Girls***

At the end of the project, the demand side of the trafficking problem is being addressed by key stakeholders at the national, regional and local level.

**Immediate objective 2: *Addressing the State of Exploitation***

At the end of the project, 860 boys and girls have been withdrawn and provided with a range of services leading to their sustainable reintegration.

**Immediate objective 3: *Addressing the Supply of Boys and Girls***

At the end of the project, 3440 boys and girls and 3440 adult family-members in trafficking-prone high risk areas are being provided with viable education and socio-economic alternatives to reduce their vulnerability to child trafficking. The Amendment noted that the amendment phase will target 4,300 children as direct beneficiaries. This does not reflect a change in the original project target for direct beneficiaries for the project. The original project target of 9,000 children withdrawn or prevented did not change as a result of the amendment.

### ***Evaluation Background***

8. A mid-term evaluation of the LUTRENA Phase II was conducted in June-July 2003 (RAF/01/P53/USA). The global interim LUTRENA evaluation comprising all components (USDOL; DANIDA, USDOS) was carried out as per IPEC procedures, through a participatory consultative process conducted during the months of May, June and July 2006. The interim m evaluation made several concrete recommendations to the key stakeholders on various subjects ranging from providing more trainings, prioritising the vocational training/apprenticeship component, raising awareness, documenting good practices, further collaboration and synergies with various partners. (Please see the mid-term/interim evaluation report for further information).
9. The final evaluation is required by ILO/IPEC policies and procedures as well as per donor requirements. It is intended to serve as key tool for planning and learning and focus on facilitating and supporting the further action on child labour where solid documentation and analysis of the experience from current support initiative are important.
10. This evaluation is considered to be an input to the global final evaluation of the LUTRENA project (i.e. activities funded by all donors) which will be covered by funding of DANIDA (final evaluation date dependent on the project extension currently being requested to the donor now tentatively scheduled for March/April 2008).

## II. Scope and Purpose

### Scope

11. The evaluation will cover all activities (including action programmes) of the USDOL component of the IPEC project in Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Mali, Togo, Guinea, Niger, Nigeria and Senegal which have been funded by USDOL (project codes RAF/01/P53/USA, RAF/04/P58/USA & RAF/01/P51/USA).

### Purpose

12. The primary purpose of the present evaluation should be to assess the USDOL contribution to the programme's achievements. The evaluation should analyze strategies and models of intervention used, document lessons learned and potential good practices, and provide recommendations on how to integrate these into planning processes and implementation of future interventions in the field of child trafficking. A particular focus should be on identifying elements of effective models of intervention including their potential use and their strengths and weaknesses. The evaluation should also look at how the USDOL component linked up with and was integrated into the global LUTRENA project.

## III. Suggested Aspects to be Addressed

13. The evaluation should address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability as defined in the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy and associated guidelines. It should be carried out in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy, the ILO-IPEC Guidelines and Notes, the UN System Evaluation Standards and Norms, and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard

### Design:

- Were the overall project targets realistic?
- Assess whether the project design was logical and coherent and took into account the institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders.
- Assess the internal logic of the project and the external logic of the project (degree to which the project fits into existing mainstreaming activities that would impact on child labour).
- How well did the project design take into account local efforts already underway to address child labour and promote educational opportunities for targeted children and existing capacity to address these issues?
- Are the time frame for project implementation and the sequencing of project activities logical and realistic? If not, what changes are needed to improve them?

- Were the objectives of the project clear, realistic and likely to be achieved within the established time schedule and with the allocated resources (including human resources)?

**Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness):**

- Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation. As applicable, assess what were the factors that contributed to the project's delay?
- How effective was the project in terms of leveraging resources? What process was undertaken by the project to identify and coordinate implementation with other USDOL-funded projects and other child labor-focused initiatives and organizations in West Africa?
- How effective were the APs, research projects, and policy projects, and how did they contribute to the project meeting its immediate objectives?
- How were the conclusions and recommendations from the 2006 mid-term evaluation addressed by the project? Were the recommendations, lessons learned, and identified good practices from the mid-term evaluation successfully incorporated into project implementation?
- Examine the capacity constraints of implementing agencies and the effect on the implementation of the designed projects.
- To what extent were assessments, policy papers, and other forms of project research shared with relevant stakeholders and linked to project activities?
- Do the IPEC programme and programme partners understand the definitions and their use (i.e. child trafficking, exploitative child labour, and the criteria for determining the withdrawal and prevention of child trafficking victims, in the pilot projects) and do the partners have similar understanding of the concepts and terminology utilized by the project? Please assess whether the programme is accurately able to report on direct beneficiaries based on partners' understanding of the definitions/terminology.
- Does the operational definition of child trafficking utilized by the project remain relevant to the present context in West and Central Africa? What if any changes merit consideration should a further phase of the project be implemented?
- How did factors outside of the control of the project affect project implementation and project objectives and how did the project deal with these external factors?
- Assess the effectiveness of the project i.e. compare the allocated resources with results obtained. In general, did the results obtained justify the costs incurred?
- Assess whether the project has achieved its immediate objectives, especially in regards to meeting the target of withdrawing and preventing children by means of the pilot interventions. Assess the effectiveness of the different action programs implemented and their contribution to the immediate objectives of the project.
- What role has the project played in promoting bilateral and multilateral agreements on trafficking between countries in the region?
- What role has the project played in strengthening policy within the target countries?
- What role has the project played in increasing the knowledge base on child trafficking including of effective strategies to combat the phenomenon
- What possibilities are there for effective replication of efforts?
- Identify unexpected and multiplier effects of the project, and since the mid-term.

**Sustainability**

---

**Sub-Regional Programme on Combatting the Trafficking of Children for Labour Exploitation in West and Central Africa (LUTRENA)**

- How effective has the project been to date in promoting local ownership of the program and promoting long-term sustainability? How effective and realistic was the phase-out strategy for the project? How well was the phase-out strategy communicated with the project's partners?
- Will local and national institutions (including governments) and the target groups continue their commitment to the project objectives even after the project ends? What efforts to combat exploitive child labor do project stakeholders think will continue even after the project ends?

### **Special Aspects to be Addressed**

The evaluation is to concentrate on looking at approaches and strategies of the USDOL-funded activities under the LUTRENA project. It should in particular identify:

- Assess the synergies created by the project with other IPEC projects in the region? What were the benefits of this collaboration in countries with several IPEC projects? What were some of the difficulties encountered? How can greater synergies be achieved in the future?
- In the Mid-Term Evaluation report it was noted that the crisis in Cote d'Ivoire caused delays in implementation of some of the planned initiatives. Please indicate whether these delays were seen in all participating countries or only in Cote d'Ivoire? Has the project been able to catch up on its schedule and remain on target?
- Regarding the Monitoring System, the evaluators reported in the Mid term evaluation that the project lacked basic information to conduct proper monitoring including up-to-date statistics on child trafficking victim numbers, training activities, and schooling. The way the project is monitored is through their reporting of project statistics, including the number of children withdrawn or prevented from exploitative work through the provision of educational or training opportunities. This information is used to set the annual goals under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). Which countries show evidence of this lack of statistical information? What records can be accessed to give evidence of this determination given in the mid-term report?
- The mid-term report stated that during its lifetime, the LUTRENA program has invested in research-related activities which should have generated a solid knowledge base, but had not generated the desired results by the time of the mid-term evaluation. Does the project show evidence of a solid knowledge base? If it doesn't, what are the reasons that have prevented its development?
- The mid-term report also stated that the project developed software that was never used and the evaluator suggested making the system operational. However, it was also noticed that there were weaknesses in program design and that an assessment of the software needed to be conducted. Could the evaluator review the software themselves to determine its usefulness or the assessment of its weakness? Can the weight of both costs and benefits within the framework of existing funds determine if this suggestion was viable?
- The mid-term report informed on the lack of knowledge of law enforcement officers in Ghana and Cameroon. Has some training occurred for law enforcement officials at the operational level in all the countries of LUTRENA?
- It is one of the main stakeholders understanding that LUTRENA and WACAP had some difficulties in working together, as did LUTRENA and UNICEF. Did the project moved past the competitiveness and formed collaborative networks. Did this occur in all the countries or just in select ones, such as in Benin where LUTRENA and NGOs participate in the GTI forum?
- Emerging good practices and models of intervention

- The sustainability of interventions: which activities have been carried out / continued by implementing agencies since their action programs have ended? Which ones are likely to continue after USDOL funding has ended?
- What was the contribution of USDOL-funded activities to the progress made on a regional agreement on trafficking in persons?
- Examine the linkages and integration of the USDOL component into the overall LUTRENA evaluation framework.

#### **IV. Expected Outputs of the Evaluation**

15. The expected outputs to be delivered by the evaluation consultant are:
  - Desk review of project documents in Dakar
  - (Telephone) interviews with project staff in the countries of implementation
  - In-depth consultation with the CTA based in Dakar
  - Telephone interviews with USDOL, IPEC HQ and ILO IPEC Regional
  - Draft evaluation report. The evaluation report should include findings from desk review and interviews
  - Final Report including:
    - ✓ Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions and recommendations
    - ✓ Clearly identified findings
    - ✓ Clearly identified conclusions and recommendations
    - ✓ Lessons learnt
    - ✓ Potential good practices and effective models of intervention.
    - ✓ Appropriate Annexes including present TORs
  - Translated version of the draft and final version of the evaluation report from English into French
  
16. The total length of the report should be a maximum of 30 pages for the main report, excluding annexes; additional annexes can provide background and details on specific components of the project evaluated. The report should be sent as one complete document and the file size should not exceed 3 megabytes. Photos, if appropriate to be included, should be inserted using lower resolution to keep overall file size low.
  
17. All drafts and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided both in paper copy and in electronic version compatible for Word for Windows. Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with ILO-IPEC and the consultants. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of ILO-IPEC. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.
  
18. The final report will be circulated to key stakeholders for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated by the Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section (DED) of ILO/IPEC Geneva and provided to the evaluator. In preparing the final report the evaluator should consider these comments, incorporate as appropriate and provide a brief note explaining why any comments might not have been incorporated.



## V. Evaluation Methodology

19. The evaluation will be carried out by one evaluation consultant based in Senegal. The evaluator will carry out a desk review of appropriate material, including the project document, progress reports, outputs of the project and action programmes, results of any internal planning process and relevant materials from secondary sources. He/she will moreover conduct telephone interviews with project staff in the countries where USDOL funded activities under the LUTRENA project have taken place.
20. It is expected that the evaluator will work to the highest evaluation standards and codes of conduct and follow the **UN evaluation standards and norms**.
21. The background of the **evaluator** should include:

### Evaluator

Responsibilities	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review of project documents</li> <li>• Briefing with ILO/IPEC-DED</li> <li>• Telephone Interviews with IPEC HQ desk officer, donor and USDOL project component staff in the project countries</li> <li>• In-depth meeting with CTA in Dakar</li> <li>• Draft evaluation report in French</li> <li>• Finalize evaluation report taking into consideration stakeholder comments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Relevant background in social and/or economic development.</li> <li>○ Experience in the design, management and evaluation of development projects, in particular with policy level work, institution building and local development projects.</li> <li>○ Experience in evaluations in the UN system or other international context</li> <li>○ Relevant regional experience preferably prior working experience in Senegal.</li> <li>○ Experience in the area of children's and child labour issues and rights-based approaches in a normative framework are highly appreciated.</li> <li>○ Experience at policy level and in the area of education and legal issues would also be appreciated.</li> <li>○ Familiarity with and knowledge of specific thematic areas.</li> <li>○ Fluency in English and French is essential</li> </ul>

22. The evaluator will be responsible for undertaking a **desk review** of the project files and documents and for conducting telephone interviews with project staff and other stakeholders located in the countries covered by the project.
23. The evaluator will be responsible for **drafting** the evaluation report. Upon feedback from stakeholders to the draft report, s/he will further be responsible for **finalizing** the report **incorporating** any comments deemed appropriate.
24. The evaluation will be carried out with the technical support of the IPEC-DED section and with the logistical support of the project office in Dakar and with the administrative support of the ILO office in Dakar. DED will be responsible for consolidating the comments of stakeholders and submitting it to the Evaluator.

### Timetable and Workshop Schedule

25. The total duration of the evaluation process including submission of the final report should be within two months from the end of the field mission.

26. The evaluator will be engaged for 22 work days. The timetable is as follows:

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks
I Desk review & Consultations/Interviews	Evaluator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Briefing with ILO/IPEC</li> <li>○ Desk Review of project related documents</li> <li>○ Telephone interview with USDOL, ILO/IPEC HQ, ILO/IPEC Regional, Project staff</li> <li>○ In-depth consultation in Dakar with CTA</li> </ul>
II Report preparation	DED, Evaluator, Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Draft report based on consultations from desk review and interviews</li> <li>○ Draft report to be sent to translator by DED upon receipt from evaluator</li> <li>○ Send draft for translation</li> <li>○ Circulate draft report to key stakeholders</li> <li>○ Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to team leader</li> <li>○ Finalize the report including explanations on why comments were not included</li> </ul>

Schedule and Duration (tentative dates, will be finalized in consultation with the project)

Phase	Duration	Dates
I	12 days	Dec. 10-21
II	10 days	Dec 22-31

## VI. Resources and Management

### Resources

27. The resources required for this evaluation are:

- Fees for 22 days of work for one consultant based in Senegal including translation of the draft and final version of the evaluation report from English into French
- Expenses for telephone interviews

### Management

28. The evaluator will report to IPEC-DED in headquarters and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with IPEC-DED should issues arise. The ILO Office in Dakar will provide administrative support to the evaluation.

## ***Annex II: Bibliography***

International Labor Organization, International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC), Multi-bilateral Programme of technical cooperation (September 2004), Government of the United States of America, Government of Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, Gabon and Togo, Combating the trafficking of Children for Labour exploitation in West and central Africa (LUTRENA), Amendment (Annex A), RAF/01/P53/USA

International Labour organization –IPEC (March August 2006) Technical Progress Report (TPR) – LUTRENA, avec annexes A-F et annexes 1-10

W& C Africa LUTRENA USDOL TPR International Labour organization –IPEC (Septembre 2006) Technical Progress Report (TPR) – LUTRENA, avec annexes 1-15

W& C Africa LUTRENA USDOL TPR International Labor organization –IPEC– LUTRENA (Mars 2007) Technical Progress Report (TPR), avec annexes 1-15

International Labor organization –IPEC - LUTRENA, Technical Progress Report (TPR) (March August 2007), avec annexes A-G et annexes 1-10

W& C Africa LUTRENA USDOL Technical Progress Report (Mars 2007), avec annexes 1 – 15

W& C Africa LUTRENA USDOL Technical Progress Report, TPR (Septembre 2007), avec annexes 1 – 15

Organisation Internationale du Travail, Programme International pour l'abolition du travail des enfants (IPEC) – Projet sous régional de lutte contre la traite des enfants a des fins d'exploitation de leur travail en Afrique de l'Ouest et du centre – LUTRENA, avec la collaboration de Bocoum B. (Décembre 2007), Rapport final, les bonnes pratiques, les leçons apprises et les enseignements tirés du projet LUTRENA Mali

Organisation Internationale du Travail, Programme International pour l'abolition du travail des enfants (IPEC) – Projet sous régional de lutte contre la traite des enfants a des fins d'exploitation de leur travail en Afrique de l'Ouest et du centre – LUTRENA, (Décembre 2007), Rapport final, Analyse situationnelle de la traite des enfants dans la zone de non couverture LUTRENA (2001-2006)

Bureau Internationale du Travail, Programme International pour l'abolition du travail des enfants (IPEC) – Projet sous régional de lutte contre la traite des enfants a des fins d'exploitation de leur travail en Afrique de l'Ouest et du centre – LUTRENA, (Décembre 2006), Rapport de synthèse, réalisé par Tolo H., Leshem G., et Akpaka K. A. Documentation des réalisations des bonnes pratiques et des leçons apprises relatives aux « Comités Locaux de Vigilance » et de lutte contre la traite des enfants, mis en place par le projet LUTRENA au Burkina Faso, en Côte d'Ivoire, au Mali et au Togo

---

**Sub-Regional Programme on Combatting the Trafficking of Children for Labour Exploitation in West and Central Africa (LUTRENA)**

Bureau Internationale du Travail, Programme International pour l'abolition du travail des enfants (IPEC) – Projet sous régional de lutte contre la traite des enfants a des fins d'exploitation de leur travail en Afrique de l'Ouest et du centre – LUTRENA, (Décembre 2005), Abega, C., Abe C.Mutia B., et Eloga M. La traite des enfants aux fins d'exploitation de leur travail au Cameroun, Rapport d'enquête

International Labor Office, IPEC, LUTRENA (2005), International Training workshop on child trafficking for security agencies in Ghana and Nigeria, ILO, 2005

International Labor Organization, IPEC, LUTRENA (December 2006), staff meeting 5, summary of proceedings, Dakar, Senegal

Organisation Internationale du Travail, Programme International pour l'abolition du travail des enfants (IPEC), (2007), Traite des enfants, la réponse de l'OIT a travers l'IPEC, [www.ilo.org/IPEC](http://www.ilo.org/IPEC) Genève 2007

LUTRENA (Septembre 2007), fiches sur les réalisations LUTRENA par pays : Bénin, Burkina Faso, Cameroun, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Mali, Togo, Ghana

LUTRENA (Septembre 2007), fiches synthétiques

LUTRENA (Septembre 2007), résumé exécutif RR2 Burkina Faso, RR2 Mali, RR2 Togo

IPEC Evaluation (April 2007), Combating the trafficking of Children for Labour exploitation in West and central Africa (LUTRENA), an external evaluation by a team of consultants

### **Annex III: People Interviewed**

Name	Country	Functions	Email/tel
Essodina Mibafei Abalo	Togo	ANP/CNP/PAD	<a href="mailto:abalo@ilo.org">abalo@ilo.org</a>
Aliou Seck	Senegal	IPEC focal Point CNP/PAD	<a href="mailto:secka@ilo.org">secka@ilo.org</a>
Boua-Bi Siemen Honoré	Cote d'Ivoire	Project national Coordinator LUTRENA-IPEC	<a href="mailto:boua-bi@ilo.org">boua-bi@ilo.org</a>
Sigui Mokié	Cote d'Ivoire	Deputy director, Child Trafficking Division, Ministry of Labour and Employment	<a href="mailto:siguimokie@yahoo.fr">siguimokie@yahoo.fr</a>  Tel 00 225 20 21 0157
Coulibaly Adom	Cote d'Ivoire	Director, Social Protection Department (DPS), Ministry of Family and Social Affairs	<a href="mailto:couladom@yahoo.fr">couladom@yahoo.fr</a> tel (225) 20 32 4233
Kouaho Alice	Cote d'Ivoire	General Coordinator, NGO ASA	<a href="mailto:asaasbj@aviso.ci">asaasbj@aviso.ci</a> (225) 22 52 4513
Ndri Yao Claude	Cote d'Ivoire	Coordonator, NGO Communauté Abel	<a href="mailto:Commabel@yahoo.fr">Commabel@yahoo.fr</a>  (225)21 30 1191
Florent Valere Adegbidi	Bénin	ANP/CNP/PF LUTRENA Project coordinator	<a href="mailto:florent@ilo.org">florent@ilo.org</a> (229) 21 31 4940
Sylvie Adanhode	Bénin	Director, Childhood and Adolescent Department	<a href="mailto:Florsyl52@yahoo.fr">Florsyl52@yahoo.fr</a> 229 95 85 3148
Anani Folly	Bénin	Head of District. Interpreter to child beneficiary	<a href="mailto:cafolly@hotmail.com">cafolly@hotmail.com</a> 229 95 71 9164
Yvette Sokpin	Bénin	Child beneficiary	229 95 71 9164
Mariama Barry Ouedraogo	Burkina Faso	CNP Lutrena	<a href="mailto:ouedraogom@ilo.org">ouedraogom@ilo.org</a> 226 50 30 0457
Kobanka Romain	Burkina Faso	Ministry of Labour	<a href="mailto:romianhk@yahoo.fr">romianhk@yahoo.fr</a> (226) 78 86 6749
Bilgo	Burkina Faso	Ministry of Social Action	<a href="mailto:seloghinbi@yahoo.fr">seloghinbi@yahoo.fr</a> (226) 7071 9177

Name	Country	Functions	Email/tel
Sanogo	Burkina Faso	Member of the vigilance Committee	(226) 76 14 6763
Sawadogo Joanny	Burkina Faso	NGO Grade -FRB	(226) 76 63 3819
Donire Inoussa	Burkina Faso	Child beneficiary	(226)78 88 3463
Matthew Dally	Ghana	CNP	(223) 21 683 259
Almoustapha Nouhou Toure	Mali	CNP LUTRENA	<a href="mailto:toure@ilo.org">toure@ilo.org</a> (223)640 6978
Boucary Togo	Mali	Director, National child trafficking Unit	<a href="mailto:Togobal7@yahoo.fr">Togobal7@yahoo.fr</a> (223) 601 4682
Moussa Beidy Tamboura	Mali	Deputy National Director for Child and Family Promotion	<a href="mailto:moussabeidi@yahoo.fr">moussabeidi@yahoo.fr</a> (223)603 9454
Moussa Coumbere	Mali	National Coordinator NGO Jekataanie	<a href="mailto:moussacoum@yahoo.fr">moussacoum@yahoo.fr</a> (223) 620 7009
Oumar H. Maiga	Mali	Coordinator, NGO Gardem	<a href="mailto:oumarhamma@yahoo.fr">oumarhamma@yahoo.fr</a> (223) 637 5040
Salimata Konaté	Mali	Child Beneficiary	ONG Gardem

## ***Annex IV: Evaluation Tools***

### **Vigilance Committees and NGOs**

- How relevant was the LUTRENA project ?
- Which type of support are you receiving?
- Which constraints did you meet in the implementation of programmes of action ?
- What are your relationships with government technical Departments ?
- What is the contribution of populations?
- Which mechanisms were put in place to continue child trafficking interventions at the end of the project?
- Did you put in place a statistical data collection system?

**Questions to technical ministries,**

- How do you appreciate the LUTRENA project ?
- Do you think it has contributed to combat child trafficking?
- What major constraints did you encounter in your capacity as a partner or implementing agency?
- What is your understanding of the concepts « child trafficking »? « child exploitation for labour purposes »? Which criteria do you use to define withdrawal and prevention of child victims ?
- Do you think these criteria are similar to those used by the LUTRENA project?
- Did the LUTRENA project conduct research projects in your country and in the subregion? Could you list some of them ?
- How did you use research results ?
- Are you a signatory to the 2006-2009 plan of action?
- What were the major actions conducted within this plan since its development in 2006 ?
- Did the State provide a budget for the implementation of activities planned in the plan of action?
- Did you note some delays in the implementation process; if so what were the causes?
- Do you intend to apply results and lessons learnt after 2007?



**Questionnaire to non-core countries:**

1. As non-core country, what is your assessment of the contribution of the project to mitigate child trafficking in your country?

2. Do you think that the distinction between core and non-core countries is relevant in the framework of this project to combat child trafficking in West and Central Africa?

3. Did you use the results of research conducted by the project to guide your activities?

4. How did you contribute to the dissemination of research results?

Thank you for spending some time to answer this questionnaire.

**Questions to LUTRENA national project coordinators (NPC):**

How do you appreciate the overall LUTRENA project in your country?

Do you think that other partners share the same definition of the project? Do they have the same criteria to define Child exploitative labour, withdrawal, prevention?

What are the external constraints that affected the project implementation? How did you deal with those constrains?

What were the main constrains of the ministries and NGO partners that affected the project implementation?

What was the level of efficiency and effectiveness of the project implementation? Particularly for APs implemented by NGOs and State agencies

Did the project share the outcomes of the research? Did you conduct research project? Who financed them? Did you share the outcome of research financed by USDOL? Which process was used?

Did you use the research outcome on your work? Did you share with other agencies working on the issue?

Did you incorporate the conclusion and recommendations of 2006 evaluation on these particular areas?

The approval procedures and the length of action programmes

Involvement of youth organizations in decision making and in mini action program

Improvement of living conditions of families from where victims are originated

Training of Law enforcers?

Did you promote the label « Combating Child Trafficking » in Ghana for institution partners; did you organize recognition activities for your partners?

Do you manage LUTRENA and IPEC programme

If yes, What do you think about managing the two programmes IPEC/LUTRENA by one person, Does this effect the implementation action programmes?

If no what are your relationships

Do you work with other projects funded by USDOL? Other IPEC projets ? Any other project on child trafficking? What are your relationships?

Do have an information system on child trafficking? How do you manage the statistics? Do you work with the government of the issue of child trafficking tracking system?

Do you use the CMTS for monitoring as did Mali and Togo, pilot countries) Do you have a monitoring system? Do you use software?

What are your relationships with WACAP?

Do you feel that national institutions are committed to continue working on the issues of child trafficking after the end of the project?

What is the level of involvement of the government?

What are the possibilities for replication of the project?

Could you give us contact persons from partner ministries, NGOs and vigilance committee?

#### **Questions to children**

What has been the impact of the project: What did the project provide to you?

What services have you received from the project: education, health, counselling, reintegration, vocational training ?

What is your current situation?

Are you a member of the LUTRENA Club?

Do you attend Vigilance committees meetings?