



# Evaluation Summary



International  
Labour  
Office

Evaluation  
Office

## *Support for the Preparation of the Mali Time-Bound Programme - Final Evaluation*

### Quick Facts

<b>Countries/Regions:</b>	<i>Mali</i>
<b>Final Evaluation:</b>	<i>06/2010</i>
<b>Evaluation Mode:</b>	<i>Independent</i>
<b>Administrative Office:</b>	<i>DWT/CO-Dakar</i>
<b>Technical Office:</b>	<i>DWT/CO-Dakar</i>
<b>Evaluation Manager:</b>	<i>ILO/IPEC/ Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section (DED)</i>
<b>Evaluation Consultants:</b>	<i>Leader: Kerstin Bernecker National: Mamadou B. Traoré</i>
<b>Project Code:</b>	<i>MLI/06/50/USA</i>
<b>Donor(s) &amp; Budget:</b>	<i>USDOL (US\$ 3'500'000)</i>
<b>Keywords:</b>	<i>Child Labour</i>

### Background & Context

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

Child Labour (CL) and especially its worst forms (WFCL), is amongst the most serious social problems of our time – serious for the children concerned, but also for the future of the countries in which they are as part of a globalized world.

Mali is one of the countries with the highest incidence of CL. Usually, poverty is named as its major cause. Moreover, the change or loss in values and increasing monetization – with globalization - are, according to notable persons of the Malian society, basic causes of the high (increased) incidence of CL in their society.

The International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) has developed a most convincing and quite challenging approach to support countries – in this case, Mali – to combat and eventually eliminate CL, building on ownership, relatively low external input and using the most recognized project planning and management methods in a very systematic way.

The key concept is the “Time-Bound Programme” (TBP) – in the case of Mali a 10-year Programme aiming to eradicate CL in a well-planned and well-managed (monitored etc.) way. The IPEC project does neither directly establish nor implement the TBP. Instead, it gives “*Support for the Preparation of the Mali Time-Bound Programme*” (PoS-TBP), which is key for achieving real ownership. This support took place in Mali on the basis of well-prepared arguments:

IPEC had successfully cooperated with the Government of Mali (GoM) since 1995, with a National Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour from 1998 to 2010 and a series of other regional or bilateral projects regarding CL and Child Trafficking.

First steps towards capacity building, enhancement of the legal framework, networking and partnership building were underway. The time was ripe to start a project supporting a TBP.

This project was prepared according to a participatory approach during the first half of 2006 and it went successfully from 9/2006 to 6/2010: supporting a TBP – the project document was ready for implementation, the Child Labour Monitoring System (CLMS) tested, and more than 10,000 children (42 per cent boys, 58 per cent girls) were withdrawn or prevented from WFCL – more than 30 per cent more than the target.

## Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

The evaluation is to be conducted with the purpose of drawing lessons from the experiences gained during the period of implementation. It will show how these lessons can be applied in other planned ILO/IPEC intervention in the broader terms of action against CL in the context of the TBP process.

In addition, the evaluation will serve to document potential good practices, lessons learned, models of intervention and life histories of the beneficiary children in this cycle of the project. It will serve as an important information base for key stakeholders and decision-makers regarding any policy decisions for future subsequent activities in the country.

The evaluation will also involve a review of the role of the IPEC project in promoting the development of a National Action Plan (NAP) as an overall TBP framework in Mali to identify any needed changes in its strategy, structure and mechanisms. The analysis should focus on how the TBP concept and approach is being promoted, its relevance, how it has contributed to mobilizing action on CL, what is involved in the process of designing a TBP process type of approach and what the IPEC project has done for the process. The focus however will be on the IPEC project's role within the development of a NAP as a national TBP framework.

Given that the broader TBP approach is relatively young (since 2001), the innovative nature and the element of "learning by doing" of the approach should be taken into account. The TBP concept is intended to evolve as lessons are learned and to adapt to changing circumstances. The identification of specific issues and lessons learned for broader application for the TBP concept, as a whole, would be a particular supplementary feature of this evaluation.

The results of the evaluation will be used as part of strategic planning and possible orientation for further phases of the various projects, including models of intervention. The results should also be used by IPEC to design future programmes and allocate resources.

The evaluation will provide recommendations to the Government and other national stakeholders on taking forward and developing/finalizing the National TBP (contents of NAP, possible *modus operandi* etc.) and it will make recommendations to the project as to how its proposed exit strategy supports the longer-term consolidation of the National TBP.

## Methodology of evaluation

The methodology used for the expanded final evaluation followed largely the Terms of Reference (TOR) (see ANNEX 1 of the report) with some minor changes (as outlined in the evaluation instrument):

The desk review took place during the whole assignment:

- as the – highly valuable – material available is very comprehensive; and
- as the time before the mission to Mali was very short.

Inputs to the repeat Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice (KAP) study were not possible since the KAP team refused to add anything to the system.

One unforeseen, important element of information has been used: just after arrival of the evaluation team leader, a series of restitution workshops ("*ateliers de restitution*") of the seven APs took place; this was a chance to get very in-depth information, and to meet most of the relevant stakeholders/project partners (the breaks were used for discussions and interviews).

A special approach of the evaluation team leader was also applied during this evaluation, i.e.

- make small sample surveys (regarding CL and good practices [GP]) wherever possible;
- interview a few notable persons who are only indirectly related to the project, in order to get a competent outside view of the situation.

## Main Findings & Conclusions

*Project preparation and design* was very good, building on the achievement of previous IPEC projects and openness of the GoM to seriously tackle the issue.

The project preparation documents represent a systematic set of information and tools, such as a Strategic Planning and Impact Framework – SPIF (log frame) with a sustainability matrix, complemented by management tools such as the Project Work Plan and the Project Monitoring Plan. They were based on an "outcome tree" (or objectives network).

The project aimed at *contributing to the elimination of WFCL and the progressive elimination of all forms of child labour in Mali (Development Objective)* by six Immediate Objectives (IO) which concern:

- strengthening and supporting the GoM and its relevant partner organizations in order to enable them to design, implement and eventually manage a National Time-Bound Programme (National Action Plan) for the elimination of WFCL and dangerous CL (IO 1);
- strengthening (reinforcing, diffusing, facilitating application) of the legal framework that forbids WFCL (IO 2);
- strengthening and supporting the GoM and its relevant partners to ensure they have adequate mechanisms for CL data management and use (collecting, updating, analysing, storing and actively using that data) (IO 3);
- increased awareness of the Malian society with regard to negative consequences of the WFCL, mobilized to combat it (IO 4);
- improved and expanded education and vocational training opportunities for working children or children at risk of exploitation in the WFCL (IO 5);
- model interventions for withdrawal, prevention, and rehabilitation of children in WFCL in targeted areas, available for scaling up at the end of the project (IO 6).

These model interventions were identified during project preparation and further planned at the beginning of project implementation. They are expressed in five APs in the following sectors in which CL is very frequent:

- Mining and quarrying;
- Agriculture and rural craftsmanship;
- Domestic labour;
- Informal urban economy;
- Sexual exploitation.

The AP interventions were foreseen in the four most affected of the eight regions of the country, plus Bamako.

*Project implementation* was very satisfactory: within quite a short time span (less than four years) with relatively low external input, very impressive results were achieved.

As inputs to the IO 1 (support to the establishment, implementation and management of a TBP) and IO 3 (CL data collection, management, monitoring), two other APs were initiated, i.e. AP 6 for the establishment of a CLMS (SOSTEM) and AP 7 for the establishment of a National Action Plan itself against CL.

All APs except the last were implemented by experienced NGOs, the last one, establishment of a NAP, was under the responsibility of the Child Labour Unit (CLU/CNLTE) [National unit to combat CL] in the Ministry of Labour. For the APs 1 to 5, targets of direct beneficiaries, i.e. children withdrawn and children prevented from WFCL were even exceeded: instead of 8,000 targeted children, more than 10,600 children benefited from the project (girls: 2,236 withdrawn, 3,866 prevented; boys: 1,490 withdrawn, 3,019 prevented).

The other IOs (1 to 5) as well as the remaining APs (6 and 7) were successfully implemented.

However, IO 4, awareness raising of the Malian society as to the negative consequences of CL, is a rather long-term task which could only briefly be tackled within that short period.

Also for the other IOs and APs, the time available was short.

## Recommendations

### Main recommendations and follow up:

The PoS-TBP Mali is a very positive and successful project. However, despite success in ownership and enabling, it is not evident that sustainability could be achieved already. To increase likelihood of sustainability, a short and “slim” consolidation phase is recommended.

Instead of continuing some assistance from other IPEC ongoing projects a special consolidation phase is deemed preferable, because:

- as explained above, it is not easy for the stakeholders to get the idea of the project concept; so “mixing” the PoS-TBP/TBP with another IPEC

- project, would again complicate the concepts and approaches (LL);
- a special “slim” concept could be tested or applied, e.g. with the national staff still continuing for two more years whereas the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) could contribute on a temporary – time-to-time basis;
- for future PoS-TBP/TBP projects it might be easier to learn from this project if conditions are completely clear.

The utmost challenge for the consolidation phase would be to concentrate fully on achieving sustainability in all dimensions, i.e. awareness raising, revising concepts under realistic financing perspectives for the future, i.e. minimizing external input requirements, really integrating CL/WFCL into framework conditions such as the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) – all this with a maximum of problem-solving imagination and innovative ideas.

Such a consolidation phase is probably more effective than foreseeing a longer implementation phase for PoS-TBP from the very beginning and would allow staff to fully concentrate on revising the existing and partly-tested concepts in view of sustainability.

Some potential of the country’s resources might also be made available for an increased government budget – via or together with other development agencies, in the spirit of the Paris Declaration.

### **Strengths and Weaknesses, Good Practices (GP) and Lessons Learned (LL)**

The major strengths to be mentioned are

- the highly convincing TBP and PoS-TBP approach with its high potential for ownership and sustainability (GP);
- the equally very convincing participatory working approach of the project team (GP), combined with adequate management by the CTA (management by objectives and management by delegation);
- the close and constructive collaboration with the other relevant projects, IPEC projects, but also UNICEF and others (GP);
- the explicit inclusion of higher level or “external” issues (e.g. the persistence of integrating CL issues into the PRS expected for the upcoming PRS/CSCR (GP);
- the achieved ownership of the attainments of the project (mainly due to the two points above)(GP);

- the “over”-fulfilment of the set targets for withdrawing and preventing children from WFCL.

A special issue – neither strength nor weakness - but rather challenging is:

- the TBP/PoS-TBP approach is highly demanding and not easily understood by stakeholders – as it differs in a very positive way from other projects of development cooperation – emphasis on enabling and ownership building (LL).

The following minor weaknesses or areas for improvement have been identified:

- the analysis – at the basis of all planning seemed in a few aspects a bit too limited (LL):
  - the psychological and moral problems of CL appear to be underestimated so far in the project in Mali,
  - boycott of CL/WFCL as one means to contribute to the elimination of WFCL should be considered and achieved within Mali but also in other countries (especially neighbouring countries and countries importing goods from Mali).
- the implementation time was quite short; therefore, some more time might be necessary in order to achieve sustainability (LL);
- the sustainability approach proposed in the PRODOC was quite weak, – possibly reflecting the difficulty to reach sustainability.