



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation
Office

Towards child labour-free cocoa growing communities in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana through an Integrated Area-Based Approach – Midterm Evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries:	<i>Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana</i>
Midterm:	<i>5/2013</i>
Evaluation Mode:	<i>Independent</i>
Administrative Office:	<i>DWT/CO-Dakar</i>
Technical Office:	<i>DWT/CO-Dakar</i>
Evaluation Manager:	<i>Peter Wichmand</i>
Evaluation Consultant:	<i>Sue Upton</i>
Project Code:	<i>RAF/10/54/USA</i>
Donor & Budget:	<i>USDOL (US\$ 10,000,000)</i>
Keywords:	<i>Child labour; Cocoa farming; Global supply/value chain</i>

Background & Context

Summary of project purpose, logic and structure

Since the signing of the Harkin-Engel Protocol in 2001, considerable resources have been invested in eliminating child labour (CL) from the cocoa supply chain through raising awareness and supporting education. The Cocoa Communities Project (CCP), aligned with several other projects, is part of IPEC's strategic programme on CL in West Africa. The project aims *"To accelerate progress in the elimination of child labour, with a focus on its worst forms, in cocoa growing communities in Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana"* through using an Integrated Area-Based

approach in response to a theory of change which recognizes poverty and Decent Work deficits as among the root causes of CL. The elimination of child labour (ECL) is designed to be managed as a process embedded in wider national strategies for CL elimination, the promotion of education and decent work and the reduction of poverty.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

The CCP seeks to develop a supportive environment in which vulnerable families are empowered to improve their economic situation and make decisions that are in the best interests of their children. It plans to offer appropriate educational opportunities to 5,000 children and support for improved livelihoods to 2,000 of their families. To complement community-level interventions the project is building national and local institutional capacity through a range of research and training initiatives. In addition to working with NGOs, the CCP involves government agencies and workers' and employers' organizations as implementing agencies as part of this capacity-building process. The project thus seeks to encourage the consensus and ownership at community and national levels that are essential for long-term change.

The Project Implementation Review provides an opportunity for the project team and representatives of district and national level stakeholders to assess progress towards achieving project objectives. Through a process of group discussions participants were able to identify gaps and challenges and propose strategies to improve delivery and sustainability.

Methodology of evaluation

1. Following a preliminary desk review of project-related documents, the facilitator spoke to key stakeholders based in Geneva and Washington before spending one week in Accra and a second week in Abidjan. Each week started with two days of preparatory meetings with national project teams and various groups of stakeholders. This enabled stakeholders to outline their roles and responsibilities in project implementation and the current status of their planned activities and to raise and discuss issues of concern, thus enabling the facilitator to develop a more in-depth understanding of the project and sharing of information between stakeholders.
2. In each national workshop participants worked in five heterogeneous groups. Each group brought together local and national level stakeholders to discuss and analyse activities and outputs for one of the five project objectives. Representatives from ILO/IPEC Geneva and from USDOL were able to move between groups, as were the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) and the International Project Manager (IPM). Each group was facilitated by a member of the national project team and group facilitators were asked to ensure that participants had the necessary space to express themselves. At the end of each session the groups shared the content of their discussions and there was an opportunity for debate and further input from the wider group.
3. On the final day of the process, the facilitator held a short debriefing with the project teams in each country in order to outline and discuss issues arising and proposed recommendations. This draft report has been prepared on the basis of inputs from the above process and will be circulated to enable stakeholders to comment and suggest amendments.

Main Findings & Conclusions

Key findings

Community-based activities to raise awareness of CL are progressing well in both Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana and the development of Community Action Plans is

underway in project communities. Support for improved access to relevant quality education started with research to assess needs and available resources and some teacher training and infrastructure improvements have taken place. Activities are more advanced in Ghana than in Côte d'Ivoire and both formal and non-formal educational support to direct beneficiaries will start in both countries once direct beneficiaries are identified.

Research and mapping activities to enhance sustainable livelihoods are largely completed in Ghana but ToR's for these activities have yet to be signed in Côte d'Ivoire. Some 2,270 cocoa farmers have registered as Ghana Agricultural Workers Union (GAWU) members and an Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) manual has been developed, which will eventually be available in both countries. In Ghana, agricultural agents have been assigned to project communities in preparation for productivity enhancement through practice-based field schools, however, support for the families of direct beneficiaries has yet to begin.

A list of project beneficiaries drawn from Ghana's initial baseline study was completed in November 2012 but the National Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour in Cocoa (NPECLC), backed by the National Steering Committee on Child Labour, insisted on using Ghana Child Labour Monitoring System (GCLMS) procedures to identify CCP direct beneficiaries. After training for those concerned at community and district levels, a new listing exercise was due to be completed by March 2013. Ministry stakeholders explained how this provided an opportunity to refine the GCLMS and to highlight areas where there may be blockages to resolve. In Côte d'Ivoire, further action to develop the national CLMS is dependent on the signature of the Minister of Labour to the agreement between the project and the government.

Technical and institutional capacity building of ILO constituents and partner organizations is well advanced in Ghana through a comprehensive approach covering a broad range of local and national agencies. In Côte d'Ivoire many activities are awaiting the results of the budget review, but some training workshops have taken place.

Stakeholders in both Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire drew attention to limited understanding of the International Cocoa Initiative's (ICI) Community Action Planning

approach. This has resulted in Action Programmes (APs) that were implemented simultaneously in the same communities, being designed independently of each other resulting in a lack of synergy which would have improved results. These issues occurred in spite of considerable efforts on the part of the project team to coordinate partner activities during the planning phase. Some stakeholders expressed concern about the lack of specialist input in relation to support for livelihoods. On the positive side, the Programme Implementation Report (PIR) facilitator saw the use of GAWU as an implementing agency to enable cocoa farmers to increase health and safety at work and better organize themselves through membership of unions and cooperatives as an effective approach to capacity building that reflected project design.

While the project is underway and has reported a number of encouraging results, implementation is seriously behind schedule and this poses a real threat to the achievement of project objectives. A number of activities are currently on hold awaiting approval for a budget review that was submitted to USDOL during the PIR in March 2013 and this is particularly affecting capacity-building activities in Côte d'Ivoire. Work with direct beneficiaries and their families has yet to begin, so the time available for education and livelihoods interventions before the project end date is significantly less than planned.

CONCLUSIONS

In Ghana, the CCP team can be proud of significant progress in capacity building to develop the technical and institutional environment, since stakeholders demonstrated broad-based ownership and commitment to an integrated area-based approach to tackling CL across social partner agencies and other stakeholders. In Côte d'Ivoire, the project serves to remind stakeholders of the need for a functioning institutional framework to tackle CL. There are signs of progress at local and community levels, which will no doubt bear greater fruit as the project progresses. The important in both countries is how to ensure that support to direct beneficiaries and their families is effective and sustainable. Among the key factors affecting this are the effective coordination and use of the expertise and time available for the delivery of livelihood-related interventions.

The CCP is a pilot project but it is too soon to know whether it provides a cost-effective, replicable and scalable model that is an effective approach to

reducing CL, and since USDOL and IPEC (Geneva) are adamant that the project extension favoured by in-country stakeholders is not a viable option, it may prove difficult to answer the question at all.

Based on stakeholder input, the overall conclusion at the end of the review process is that if the CCP is to be a useful pilot, provide meaningful results from the impact evaluation and reach its stated objectives with regard to work with direct beneficiaries and their families, then a significant extension to the planned project period would be the most desirable response. This would provide the conditions for effective implementation and ensure that commitments are respected and trust maintained. However, since the financial resources required to make this a reality are currently unavailable, there are a number of measures that can be taken to support the achievement of project objectives within the time remaining, and these are indicated in the recommendations coming out of the PIR.

Recommendations

Main recommendations and follow-up

To IPEC and USDOL:

1. If the project cannot be significantly extended, explore and support all possibilities to enable direct action activities to be effectively implemented and the project's education- and livelihood-related objectives to be met. Some such possibilities mentioned during the PIR include the speedy conclusion of the budget review process and making appropriate training resources available to the project team.

To IPEC:

2. Review project start up procedures to avoid undue delays and reduction in the time available for project implementation.
3. Include more details in project documents of how the underlying approach to eliminating CL needs to be reflected through the implementation of clearly-defined strategies.

4. Encourage greater consistency and communication between project design teams and project implementing teams.
5. Review channels of communication to avoid project delays due to multi-level decision-making procedures.
6. For future projects ensure that implementing agencies working in the same communities over the same period with related objectives are required to design their APs together so that they complement each other.

To the project team and implementing agencies:

7. Review AP objectives and activities to see if they can be implemented within the time available. If not, make appropriate changes so that objectives are achievable through the proposed activities.
8. Identify any areas related to livelihoods and education initiatives where more specialist advice and input is suggested, and ask the project to assist in providing this.
9. Ensure that strategies are in place for supporting any direct beneficiaries who will not complete their cycle of training before the project end date and prepare those involved for this responsibility before the project ends.
10. Ensure that post-project strategies are in place to offer appropriate support to families involved in CCP livelihood initiatives.

To social partner stakeholders:

11. Communicate regularly with the project team – do not wait for them to come to you if you have something to say! Appreciate their work, don't expect them to be perfect and let them know how best to help you build capacity to deliver services to combat CL.

Important lessons learned

1. Good communication between stakeholders and coherence between project design and project implementation are key to the achievement of project objectives: The CCP experience in using CAPs highlights the importance of ensuring that implementation strategies are not only in line with the approach that underpins project design, but are

also fully understood by implementing stakeholders. This means giving more attention to defining implementation strategies in the project document and to communication and consistency between the design and implementation teams.

2. Long project start up periods and multi-tiered decision-making processes reduce the time available for effective project implementation:

While the degree of delay experienced by the CCP is unusual, IPEC projects do tend towards long start up periods and it is important to look at how to avoid projects continually being implemented in less time than planned. Internal channels of communication between IPEC projects and Geneva are multi-tiered and time-consuming and need to be reviewed. Communications between the field and USDOL are obliged to pass through similar channels, which can also be inefficient and ineffective, as demonstrated by the length of time taken by the budget review process that was initiated in 2012 and only reached USDOL during the PIR in March 2013. Procedures are not set in stone and sometimes they need to change