



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation
Office

Towards the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour (TECL) Phase II with a Focus on HIV/AIDs: Supporting and Monitoring the Implementation of National Plans of Action in Three Core Countries in Southern Africa – Final Evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries: *South Africa, Botswana, Namibia*

Final Evaluation: *11/2012*

Evaluation Mode: *Independent*

Administrative Office: *DWT/CO-Pretoria*

Technical Office: *ILO/IPEC*

Evaluation Manager: *ILO/IPEC/DED*

Evaluation Consultants: *none listed in report*

Project Code: *RAF/08/52/USA*

Donor(s) & Budget: *USDOL (US\$ 4,750,000)*

Keywords: *Child Labour; HIV/AIDs*

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

TECL II built on the achievements of TECL I which supported the implementation of the Child Labour Programme of Action (CLPA) in South Africa and laid the basis for concerted action against child labour (CL) in Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia and Swaziland, by putting into place National Action Plans (NAPs) on the elimination of child labour (ECL). Botswana, Namibia and South Africa have been chosen as the main target countries for TECL II because (a) they

had drafted and endorsed NAPs, (b) they had concluded memoranda of understanding with the ILO on steps to eliminate CL, and (c) they had therefore good chances of success for the TECL II interventions. All three countries qualified as “medium development”.

South Africa has been included in TECL II to ensure that government-driven action under the NAP – developed under TECL I – is effective and sustainable. The project aims to ensure that the South Africa experience also becomes a source of learning and good practice in the sub-region and beyond.

Botswana and Namibia have a relatively well-developed system of social services, and are close to achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) objective on education. The three countries have ratified the ILO Convention No. 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour. In July 2010, a three-month no-cost extension of TECL II (from March to June 2012) was agreed. This decision had basically budget implications. Few programmatic adjustments were decided. One of the few adjustments was that in the programme strategy in South Africa direct action responsibilities shifted from the Government of South Africa to two implementing agencies (IA) – New Life Centre and Kids Haven.

The programme has the following immediate objectives:

a) By the end of the project, capacity of the key partners will have been strengthened to more effectively mainstream CL issues into legislative and policy frameworks and take action against the worst forms of child labour (WFCL), and awareness will have been raised among the general public and among key stakeholders (eight outputs);

b) By the end of the project, models of interventions (focusing on education and HIV/AIDS) for addressing selected WFCL and prioritized forms of CL in Botswana, Namibia and South Africa will have been developed, tested and – in South Africa – further mainstreamed through pilot interventions involving direct action programmes (three outputs).

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

The main purposes of the final evaluation are:

1. Determine if the project has achieved its stated objectives and how and why they have been/have not been achieved (i.e. achievements and shortfalls in project implementation).
2. Identify unintended positive and negative changes at outcome and impact levels.
3. Determine the implementation effectiveness and efficiency of the project.
4. Establish the relevance of the project implementation strategy and outcomes and the level of sustainability attained.
5. Provide recommendations regarding relevant stakeholders, building on the achievements of the project in supporting NAPs or other institutional framework at local, country and sub-regional levels toward the sustainability of the project outcomes.
6. Identify lessons learned and potential good practices, especially regarding models of intervention developed that can be applied in the target countries, the African region (at national and regional/sub-regional levels) and beyond.

The final evaluation should provide all stakeholders with information to assess work plans, monitoring plans, strategies, objectives, partnership arrangements and resources, as needed. It should identify the potential impact on mainstreaming policy and strategies and suggest a possible way forward for the future.

Methodology of evaluation

The evaluation consisted of three phases:

- (a) a five-day preparation and desk review of the key background and project documents;
- (b) a field visit to Botswana, Namibia and South Africa. The field visit was limited to one week in each country and included interviews with project staff, key national stakeholders such as government officials, then one to three-day field visits to assess direct interventions. After returning from each field visit, a draft report was prepared. Each national consultant prepared a country report as input to the main draft report.
- (c) The last phase was reserved for a stakeholder workshop.

Main Findings & Conclusions

Objective 1 Capacity of the key partners will have been strengthened to more effectively mainstream child labour issues into legislative and policy frameworks and take action against the worst forms of child labour, and awareness will have been raised among the general public and among key stakeholders:

Policy on CL has progressed significantly in Botswana and Namibia. TECL II has made contributions in terms of putting CL on the agenda and pushed the governmental processes forward. Both countries have had child welfare processes taking place (new laws and regulations) and TECL II has made CL a more prominent part of these processes and the final legislative documents. Government machinery works slowly in these two countries and there is no convincing evidence that TECL II has speeded up the processes.

For South Africa TECL II has supported the already ongoing policy and implementation, but it is likely that TECL II has strengthened the CL part of the South African policy on child welfare.

Objective 2 Model of intervention:

Models of intervention are found mainly on the direct interventions. *Humana* and *Child Line* in Botswana are both good examples. In South Africa, the New

Life Centre gave a good impression. The evaluation team had a very short time to visit Kids Haven, the other IA in South Africa.

Some good practice reports have been made in Botswana and Namibia; however the definition of what constitutes a good practice is so broad that this evaluation has found that it could not use the cases as models of intervention even if a good practice report has mentioned the intervention.

Recommendations

Main recommendations and follow up

1. Needs still exist and support would still be beneficial. As all countries are getting stronger and with strong ownership of their own policy, a process involving participation of the countries will be essential before a decision is made. This is of particular importance for South Africa.
Responsibility: IPEC.

2. For Botswana and Namibia, ILO/IPEC should utilize its competitive advantage.
Responsibility: IPEC.

3. An upcoming programme should have a well-structured budget and follow good financial management and with monthly/quarterly status reports. Communication, including that between the HQ, the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) and National Project Coordinators (NPC) must be strengthened.
Responsibility: IPEC.

4. Secure that both upstream and downstream interventions are supporting the implementation.
Responsibility: IPEC and Programme Advisory Committee on Child Labour (PACC).

Namibia

5. CL should be part of the school curricula.
Responsibility: Ministry of Education.

6. Headmen, councillors, social workers and caregivers are still stakeholders that could be utilized more to train, inform and educate children, parents and the community. They could be particularly important in changing negative culture and identify cases as they have good networks and influence at community level.

Responsibility: IPEC and NPC.

7. ILO could help to facilitate better coordination between the Namibian authorities, such as linking the acute need for accommodation for children with the Ministry for Youth and Sports' hostel capacity. The hostel capacity was unknown to local stakeholders according to interviews in the field.

Responsibility: PACC.

Botswana

8. Commitment from the agribusiness sector (large farms) to change their use of CL.

Responsibility: National government.

9. Assess target groups at risk of violation and implement interventions.

Responsibility: National government.

South Africa

10. Allow the national government to lead. It is important to identify the correct ministry as a counterpart.

Responsibility: IPEC and national ministry with responsibility (Ministry of Labour).

Important lessons learned

Lesson 1: Programmes are costly in terms of long set-up time. It is important that activities like sub-projects, in TECL II the direct interventions, are allocated as much time as possible.

Lesson 2: Communication between the different project levels should be smooth, including those between national partners, CTA and HQ.

Potential good practices

1. Network building done by the IA's in TECL II has been more intense, less formalized and more practical oriented than the government ones.

2. Using national organizations, like the IAs, to deliver both services as well as for building capacity among local government and other local stakeholders.