



Evaluation Summaries

Evaluation: Supporting the Time Bound National Policy and Programme for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Turkey (2004-2006)

Quick Facts

Country: Turkey

Mid-Term Evaluation: October 2005

Mode of Evaluation: independent

Technical Area: Child Labour

Evaluation Management: Rights and Standards Sector

Evaluation team: International and one national consultants

Project Start: September 2003

Project End: March 2007

Project Code: TUR/03/50/USA

Donor: USA (US\$ 2,500,000), Germany (US\$500,000), Turkey (US \$ 6,243,000)

Keywords: child labour, plan of action, institution building, capacity building, child labour monitoring system, educational policy, gender mainstreaming, local government, community participation, participatory development, poverty alleviation, agriculture, informal economy

Background & Context

Project Background:

IPEC has provided capacity building and legal support through projects and direct action programmes (DAP) in the field of child labour (CL) in Turkey since 1992. Its work has had a sustainable impact in the fields of government policy and legislation, public awareness raising, CL monitoring systems, the general knowledge base on CL and more particularly the worst forms of child labour (WFCL), and

approaches and methodologies in dealing with CL.

Based on the Time Bound Policy and Programme Framework (TBPPF) of Turkey, IPEC launched its project of support to the TBPPF in September 2003.

A Time-Bound Program (TBP) is essentially a strategic framework of policies and programs which are closely coordinated to prevent and eliminate the WFCL in a given country within a specific period of time. A critical factor common to all TBPs is that the responsibility for its implementation rests with each country. The development of a TBP implies a commitment to mobilizing and designating national human and financial resources to combat this problem.

The IPEC project of support to the TBPPF in Turkey essentially consists of assisting the government in this process. During a consultative strategic planning workshop, the Turkish Government along with IPEC identified the WFCL in seasonal commercial agriculture, informal urban economy and street work as the key areas in which IPEC could assist the Turkish Government in its project of support.

The project has following immediate objectives:

- Establishment of a multi-sectoral Child Labour Monitoring System at the end of the project
- Enhancement of the capacity of relevant institutions to implement the national

Time-Bound Policy and Programme Framework.

- Mainstreaming child labour issues into national policies and programmes.
- At the end of the Project, there is an enhanced school system (with particular sensitivity to gender issues) that meets the needs of working children.
- Establishment of new social support centres and improvement of existing ones.

Evaluation Context: The evaluation team assessed the IPEC project of support on (a) whether the project has achieved its intended outputs; (b) whether it has achieved its objectives; and (c) the effectiveness of the different action programmes implemented and their contribution to the immediate objectives of the project. The mid-term evaluation was intended to serve as a learning tool for the project management team. The evaluation was to provide all stakeholders with the information needed to assess and possibly revise work plans, strategies, objectives, partnership agreements and resources.

Main Findings & Conclusions

The evaluators identified several characteristics which they believe led to successful ILO/IPEC involvement in Turkey in particular regarding the present project of support. The evaluation team identified the following:

- The capacity on local resource mobilization
- The competent coordination of multiple stakeholders
- The emphasis in all CL sectors on the need for children to be educated
- The inclusion of family education in the project activities
- The speed and the quality of accompaniment with which working children are withdrawn from CL and mainstreamed into education.

- The safety net approach (vocational training, credits, siblings to school, meetings with parents etc)
- A social project where all sides gain (e.g.. employers in the furniture sector are trained on occupational health and safety)
- The high level support in government (mayors, governors, directors general, parliament, ministers, prime minister, president) and religion (imams)
- The inclusion of CL in the State Development Planning
- The important partnership between ILO/IPEC and the Ministry of Labour and Social Security Child Labour Unit (MOLSS CLU).
- The consistent and very positive and strategic facilitating role of ILO/IPEC in the whole CL elimination process (ILO/IPEC inputs: strategic planning, facilitation, technical advice, financial support)
- The multi-stakeholder approach, including all those who are concerned (e.g. within the seasonal agriculture support activities, land owners, labour intermediaries and money lenders are trained)
- The active involvement of students, teachers, interns, and “wealthy ladies” as volunteers in the support centres (and even in the Provincial Action Committee)
- The participatory approach in Strategic Programme Impact Framework (SPIF) and implementation and self-evaluation meetings, creating “ownership” feeling with stakeholders
- The continuity factor: while mayors, governors and ministers change (as these are political nominations), the labour inspection, education, the municipality and ILO/IPEC staff remain the same
- The special “family feeling” in the project, i.e. the system is based on real partnerships

Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Recommendations:

The ILO/IPEC team and the National Steering Committee (NSC) members all recognize that legislative infrastructure is still an unfinished product. Therefore, there is still significant room for improvements through the new DAP on “capacitating the CLU”.

The experience gained through the DAP on seasonal commercial agriculture needs to be incorporated into the new DAP on capacitating CLU. Early involvement of the MARA (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs) into the DAP is certainly a must and has already been taken into account. This CL issue should also be incorporated in the agricultural reform process in Turkey.

It is recommended that senior staff of the ILO/IPEC and IMPAQ projects (USDOL-funded education initiative and CL project) hold regular meetings (outside the NSC and CLU platforms) to continue to exchange experience and seek the most advantageous mode of collaboration. The US Embassy in Ankara could be a useful facilitator for such meetings. The NSC and the MOLSS CLU will need to be the structures to coordinate the implementation of the two projects financed by the United States Department of Labor (USDOL).

The development of an advocacy strategy including a well-elaborated national communication plan should be seriously considered as a future project activity.

Projects financed by different donors, such as the case with the EU-funded and the USDOL-funded projects, need effective coordination. The evaluators feel that here again the NSC and the MOLSS CLU will be the most logical coordination structures, the NSC for policy and the larger questions, the CLU for the more practical and operational questions.

The NSC should consider whether inviting two (or may be more) representatives from NGOs and universities could possibly add more value to the functioning of the mechanism, through increased civil society inputs.

The evaluation team strongly encourages the ILO/IPEC team to tap into the EU funding potential.

The Child Labour Monitoring System (CLMS) is an area which may be considered for further investment, maybe as a special direct action programme with sufficient funds to build a system that can communicate with the management information systems of the implementing agencies.

It is strongly recommended that ILO/IPEC commission a cost/benefit analysis for the development of an internet-based child labour portal.

It is very important that the monitoring of the children withdrawn from CL is sufficiently long-term (at least one year) and looks beyond school attendance, by following the child’s academic progression and the family’s socio-economic situation. If this is not done, there is a good chance that the child may drift back to CL!

At the end of this project period, there is still a need for IPEC to continue to be a provider of technical support (“technical” in the broad sense, including methodological issues). In any case there should not be an abrupt end of ILO/IPEC’s involvement in the activities it has set in motion and it has so well facilitated. There should be a well planned and prepared transition period of say one year to allow staffing arrangements and sustainability conditions to be organised in the most optimal way.