



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation
Office

Project of Support to the Indonesian Time-Bound Programme of the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour – Phase II- Final Evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries:	<i>Indonesia</i>
Final Evaluation:	<i>08/2011</i>
Evaluation Mode:	<i>Independent</i>
Administrative Office:	<i>DWT/CO-Jakarta</i>
Technical Office:	<i>ILO/IPEC</i>
Evaluation Manager:	<i>ILO-IPEC/DED (Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section)</i>
Evaluation Consultant(s):	<i>Philip Boyle (Leader) Santi Kusumaningru, (National Consultant)</i>
Project Code:	<i>INS/07/03/USA</i>
Donor(s) & Budget:	<i>USDOL (US\$ 5'750'000)</i>
Keywords:	<i>Child labour; Time bound programme</i>

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

In 2000 Indonesia was the first country in Asia to ratify ILO Convention 182 on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour. The following year Indonesia established a National Action Committee (NAC) to develop the organizational and policy structure necessary to implement the Convention. In 2002 the NAC produced a National Plan of Action (NPA) on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL) within 20 years. The first phase of the NPA was implemented from 2002 to

2007. Funded by the United States Department of Labour (USDOL), ILO supported the implementation of this first action phase through the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC). The Phase I support project (TBP I) ran from 2004 to 2007 and was evaluated in January 2008.

The goal of TBP II is to contribute to the reduction of the overall number of children engaged in exploitative labour in Indonesia. The project has four Immediate Objectives (IO) that target various aspects of the strategy to reach that goal:

- Children withdrawn from exploitative CL or prevented from entering child labour are educated;
- The programme, policy, and legislative framework for CL is enhanced and better enforced;
- Improved capacity of stakeholders to implement action against CL;
- Increased awareness of the WFCL and the importance of education for all children.

TBP II was built upon the accomplishments of TBP I. It continued to promote improvements in the policy and legislative environment, improve the knowledge base, build the capacity of those involved in actions to eliminate CL, and raise governmental and public awareness of CL concerns and issues. The project focused on four labour sectors: (a) child domestic labour, (b) CL in plantations, (c) commercial sex exploitation (trafficking), and (d) street children. It was carried out in North Sumatra, Lampung, Jakarta, West Java, and East Java and implemented 67 APs with 56 Implementing Partners (IPs). The

Jakarta-based Project Implementation Unit committed to a wide variety of activities to influence national policy, build stakeholder capacity, and raise governmental and public awareness. The IPs also sought to influence district-level governmental policy, while building capacity and raising awareness in the communities where they worked.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

- I. Determine if the project has achieved its stated objectives;
- II. Identify unintended positive and negative outcomes and impact;
- III. Determine the project implementation effectiveness and efficiency;
- IV. Determine project impact in terms of sustained improvements achieved and the long-term benefits of national legislation and policies;
- V. Provide recommendations to stakeholders wishing to build on project achievements under a subsequent Time-Bound Programme (TBP) or other institutional framework;
- VI. Document lessons learned and good practices.

Methodology of evaluation

Based on IPEC DED approach and ILO guidelines for independent evaluations, a two-person evaluation team examined the activities, products, and results of the TBP II project. Between 11 and 29 July 2011, the team visited 27 APs in three of the five project provinces (Jakarta, North Sumatra, and West Java), and conducted interviews with core project staff in Jakarta and in the provinces. Interviews were held in the field with a wide variety of stakeholders and beneficiaries.

Many interviews were also held with key personnel in collaborating national ministries: Ministry of Manpower and Transmigration (MoMT), Ministry of National Education (MoNE), Ministry of Social Affairs (MoSA), and the Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA). Despite attempts to have an interview with BAPPENAS (State Planning Agency), this was not possible. Meetings were also held with the employers' association APINDO, the federation of labour unions KSBSI, and with the Secretariat of the National Action Committee in MoMT.

Meetings with government officials beyond those at the national level in Jakarta included a meeting with

the West Java provincial Department of Manpower and Transmigration, including the Department Head and the Head of Labour Inspection. In North Sumatra, the team met with the Head of the district and the district team dealing with child protection issues in Serdang Bedagai district.

At the end of field work in North Sumatra and West Java, a half-day workshop to present preliminary results was held in each province, inviting all relevant stakeholders. After the presentation of results, questions were encouraged from the audience. At the end of the entire evaluation period, a similar national-level event was held on 29 July 2011 involving stakeholders from Jakarta.

Main Findings & Conclusions

1. TBP II achieved or came close to achieve most of its many targets, particularly in the case of prevention. The project was able to reach 76 per cent of its child withdrawal target (4,542 of 6,000) and 95 per cent of its prevention target (15,159 of 16,000) by the end of July 2011. Taken together the project realized nearly 90 per cent of its quantitative target for children withdrawn and prevented from exploitative labour.
2. Overall TBP II achieved four of 12 IO indicator targets and 17 of 32 output targets, an overall success rate of 48 per cent. In many other cases, the project came acceptably close to achieving its targets, although falling short.
3. The number of direct-action activities carried out under TBP II is impressive and represented a substantial management burden on core staff. Not only were 67 APs carried out successfully in 21 districts and municipalities, but a relatively limited number of project staff also engaged in scores of policy advocacy, capacity development, and awareness-raising activities at the national level. The number of APs could be reduced by lengthening their implementation period.
4. The Direct Beneficiary Monitoring and Reporting (DBMR) system is an efficient tool to monitor individual beneficiaries and was well suited to the needs of the project. It does become time consuming when large numbers of beneficiaries are involved in APs, because an individual monitoring of the beneficiaries is required every quarter.
5. Support to One-Roof Junior Secondary Schools in three districts has proven to be an effective tool to prevent children from dropping out between primary

and secondary levels and can be used as a model. This has been implemented through the District Offices of Education and much appreciated, but these districts must now sustain these efforts. If this is not done in these pilot areas, it does not bode well for further progress in moving CL issues forward at the district level.

6. Most community-level APs made use of the 3R Life Skills educational module, and it was rated highly by all those who used it. Teachers and children appreciated its novel and interactive lessons, focusing on the themes of Rights, Responsibilities, and Representation. This represents the successful application of a pre-existing ILO teaching tool for the empowerment of children, youth, and families.

7. TBP II and its predecessor support project have been relatively successful in developing the national policy and legislative framework, but there is a large gap between this national framework and effective institutional and regulatory impact at the district level, even in areas where the project has implemented APs.

8. Achievements in the national-level policy and institutional framework are relatively clear, although it is not possible to gauge the overall impact of activities in capacity building and awareness raising because baselines and follow-up surveys are absent. Most capacity building of stakeholders supported the direct actions carried out by IPs. Awareness-raising activities occurred at all levels from local communities involved in APs up through the district, provincial, and national levels.

9. The impact of awareness-raising activities of APs on parents and community members in remote areas has likely been substantial. Many villagers had little awareness of child education or labour issues, such as years of compulsory education, age of legal child work, types of hazardous labour for children, and what they could do locally to organize action against the WFCL. Although anecdotal, observations indicate that community awareness of these issues has increased in AP impact areas.

10. There is no mechanism to evaluate the longer-term impact of the project on direct beneficiaries. The length of time that children withdrawn from exploitative labour will remain unclear and will not be monitored beyond the end of project. The impact of remedial, life skills, and pre-vocational training on longer-term school drop-out and the degree to which drop-out leads to entry into exploitative labour will not be known during the life of project.

11. The degree of project impact on district governments has been limited. About one-third of the districts nationwide have District Action Committees, but very few have APs or local regulations against CL. The sustainability of local accomplishments of the APs through district governmental actions appears to be doubtful.

12. The income-generation APs or components of APs have not yet been convincingly linked to substantial anti-poverty results in communities. Interviewed participants in those cases examined in the evaluation seemed unclear about their savings and income. The mainstreaming of four village banking groups into a government programme in East Java is an accomplishment, but requires capital injection during the start-up stage. A savings-led methodology similar to that used in North Sumatra would be more effective and much less costly when generalized to a large population.

13. TBP II did not partner to any extent with employers' and workers' unions in the implementation of APs. This was due to the unfamiliarity of these organizations with proposal writing, budgeting, and project planning and also due to the pressure to achieve numerical targets for withdrawal and prevention in a relatively short period.

14. TBP II did not develop the linkages it hoped to forge between the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) interests of private-sector entities and reducing CL. It is clearly unfamiliar for companies to embrace CL issues, particularly when these are primarily found in their supply chains. More emphasis on involving this sector is warranted in future Time-Bound Programme activities.

15. Results of the Social Monitoring and Early Response Unit (SMERU) preliminary impact study on the added value of the activities of the "Support to the TBP Project" linked to the CCT Programme appear to indicate little impact of these activities on CCT or non-CCT or children's propensity to leave school prematurely or engage in early or abusive CL.

16. Sustainability of the work already accomplished and where to go from here, were major concerns of IPs in the post-evaluation workshop, as well as documentation of past experiences and replications of successful interventions.

17. Participants in the stakeholder workshops also stressed the need to keep attention on the upstream issues of policy, legislation, and normative changes and the need to broaden and deepen audiences for

awareness raising. The importance of developing tools to measure institutional change was also noted by stakeholders.

Recommendations

1. Regarding Conclusion #3, there is a wealth of AP implementation experiences that requires comparative analysis by the IPs in each CL sector and in both, withdrawal and prevention activities.

2. Also regarding Conclusion #3, future efforts should be based on the experience of the existing IPs and mechanisms should be explored to link them in activities.

3. Regarding Conclusion #4, IPs should be encouraged to compare experience and lessons learned in the use, usefulness, and cost effectiveness of the DBMR tools to improve the instruments for future use. IPs, USDOL, and ILO should engage in this appraisal.

4. Regarding Conclusion #5, ILO/IPEC should examine the usefulness and impact of pre-vocational activities carried out in One-Roof Schools. The follow up of some of the child participants beyond the present project should be done by IPs to gauge the impact these activities have on children.

5. Regarding Conclusion #6, ILO/IPEC and IPs should carry out an assessment of IPs experiences with the usefulness and impact of the 3R Life Skills educational module, since it was used in virtually all APs.

6. Regarding Conclusion #7, NGOs and Civil Society Organizations (CSO) need to develop the capacity to understand and influence the linkages between national policy and appropriate planning and budgeting processes at the district, sub-district and village levels.

7. Regarding Conclusions #8-10 on the impact in capacity building, awareness raising and on direct beneficiaries, it would be well worth the effort to conduct some small surveys and focus groups among various target groups.

8. Regarding Conclusion #11, in future activities ILO/IPEC should allocate more resources to provide technical support and capacity building to local governments. For sustainability to be realistic, local

governmental personnel have to be more involved in activities focused on CL.

9. Regarding Conclusion #12, an effective model for the parents to save and generate income together with actions to prevent or reintegrate school drop-outs, has high potential for impact in future projects focused on reducing CL.

10. Regarding Conclusion #13, ILO/IPEC should strengthen linkages with employers' organizations and workers' unions and involve them as IPs in future activities. If they do not respond as well or as actively to requests for proposals as NGOs, they should be assisted in this process beyond the assistance normally given to NGOs.

11. Regarding Conclusion #14, ILO/IPEC needs to develop linkages with various private-sector entities and direct their CSR interests toward reducing CL. The Support to TBP II project found that a number of smaller- and middle-sized private companies, as well as well-known larger firms, have CSR aspirations but do not know how to apply their funding.

12. Regarding Conclusion #15, a far more comprehensive study on the impact of the support to TBP II Project prevention activities should be undertaken by SMERU or another research organization. It would be especially interesting to compare impact on children from non-CCT and CCT households, as well as between Support to TBP II Project activity areas and CCT-only programme areas. This should be funded by ILO, USDOL or the GoI, or a combination of these sources.

13. Regarding Conclusion #16, sustaining and replicating achievements under the support of TBP I and II projects over the remainder of the Time-Bound Programme will depend on identifying clearly what worked and what did not and which activities were most cost efficient in generating durable results in underage withdrawal, drop-out prevention (educational retention), and removal of legal-age children from exploitative labour conditions.

14. Regarding Conclusion #17, whether in upstream legislation, norms, and mandates, awareness raising of target groups, or capacity building and institutional change, developing specific means to continue past successful activities will require to bring the stakeholders together in one or more future workshops to focus on how to proceed in all areas.