



International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)



International  
Labour  
Office

---

# **Combating the worst forms of child labour in shrimp and seafood processing areas of Thailand**

## **THA/10/50/USA – P.270.16.350.051**

---

### **Project Implementation Review**

October 2012

**This document has not been professionally edited.**

IPEC/EVAL/2013/02

## NOTE ON THE REVIEW PROCESS AND REPORT

This Project Implementation Review was managed by ILO-IPEC's Evaluation and Impact Assessment section (EIA) following a consultative and participatory approach. EIA has ensured that all major stakeholders were involved throughout the review and that the review was carried out to highest degree of credibility, methodological soundness and independence and in line with established evaluation standards.

The review was facilitated out by a team of external consultants<sup>1</sup>. The field mission took place in September 2012. The opinions and recommendations included in this report are those of the facilitators based on the views and perspectives of the stakeholders who participated in the review and as such serve as an important contribution to learning and planning without necessarily constituting the official perspective of the ILO or any other organization involved in the project.

*Funding for this project review was provided by the United States Department of Labor. This report does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Labor nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Mia Sorgenfrei (Team Leader) and Jan Boontinand

## Table of contents

<b>Abbreviations.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>1. Background .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Project Implementation Review: Purpose and Methodology .....</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1 Purpose of Project Implementation Review.....	1
2.2 Review Sequencing.....	2
2.3 Methodological Considerations .....	2
<b>3. Understanding the Project .....</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1 Making the Connections between the Project Objectives.....	4
3.2 A Complex and Systemic Project Approach with Innovative Components .....	4
<b>4. The Stakeholder Workshop .....</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1 Project Team Presentations: Core Principles and Project Evolution .....	5
4.2 Facilitator Presentation: Stakeholder Contributions and Emerging Findings.....	6
4.2.1 Three Distinct Project Phases .....	6
4.2.2 A Complex Project Requiring Strategic Focus and Realistic Planning .....	7
4.2.3 Thematic Priority Areas.....	7
4.2.4 Strategic Adaptation: Purpose and Process .....	8
4.3 Group Work around the Immediate Objectives .....	8
4.3.1 Group Discussion about Immediate Objective 1 .....	9
4.3.2 Group Discussion about Immediate Objective 2 .....	10
4.3.3 Group Discussion about Immediate Objective 3 .....	10
4.4 Stakeholder Comments in Plenary.....	11
4.5 Concluding Remarks.....	12
<b>5. Follow-up Meeting for Project Decision-makers.....</b>	<b>13</b>
5.1 Principal Modifications to Logical Framework .....	13
<b>6. Initial Project Achievements .....</b>	<b>14</b>
6.1 Awareness-raising of and Trust-building with Stakeholders .....	14
6.2 Child Labour Baseline Surveys in Targeted Areas.....	15
6.3 Industry mapping .....	15
6.4 Hazardous Child Labour List.....	15
6.5 Action Programming.....	16
<b>7. Assessment of Initial Project Achievements .....</b>	<b>16</b>
7.1 Relevance and Appropriateness of Project Design and Strategy .....	16
7.2 Project Implementation Effectiveness .....	16
<b>8. Capacity and Resource Implications of Review Findings .....</b>	<b>17</b>
8.1 Support Required to the Provincial Coordinators .....	17
8.2 Strengths and Weaknesses of the Action Programme Partners .....	18
8.3 Resource Management.....	20
8.4 Institutional Set Up .....	20
<b>9. Recommendations for Project Implementation .....</b>	<b>21</b>
9.1 Recommendation 1: Maintain and Refine Strategic Focus.....	21

9.1.1	Project Scope: Child Labour in the Shrimp and Seafood Processing Industry .....	21
9.1.2	Thematic Priority Areas.....	22
9.2	Recommendation 2: Respond to Implementing Partner Concerns .....	24
9.3	Recommendation 3: Build Capacity and Provide Support to Stakeholders.....	24
9.3.1	Capacity building of Direct Action Implementing Partners .....	24
9.3.2	Capacity building of labour inspectors .....	25
9.4	Recommendation 4: Respond to Stakeholder Priorities, Needs and Concerns.....	25
9.4.1	Assess Needs of Target Beneficiaries and Provide Incentives .....	25
9.4.2	Take into Account the Priorities of the Ministries.....	26
9.4.3	Explore and Develop Incentives for the Private Sector .....	27
9.5	Recommendation 5: Include the Ministry of Education .....	27
9.6	Recommendation 6: Integrate Learning in Project Implementation .....	27
9.7	Recommendation 7: Review Appropriateness of M&E System and Process.....	28
9.7.1	Continuous Monitoring for Strategic Adaptation and Learning .....	28
9.7.2	Impact Evaluation.....	28
9.8	Recommendation 8: Consolidate Impact for Long-Term Sustainability .....	29
	<b>Bibliography and Annexes.....</b>	<b>30</b>
	<b>Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the Project Implementation Review.....</b>	<b>31</b>
	<b>Annex 2: Schedule for Project Implementation Review .....</b>	<b>43</b>
	<b>Annex 3a: Stakeholders interviewed during the review .....</b>	<b>44</b>
	<b>Annex 3b: Focus group with implementing NGO partners on 12 September 2012.....</b>	<b>45</b>
	<b>Annex 4: Participants at stakeholder workshop on 13 September 2012 .....</b>	<b>46</b>
	<b>Annex 5: Powerpoint presentation from ILO/IPEC on project progress .....</b>	<b>48</b>

## **Abbreviations**

<b>CMES</b>	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation System
<b>CTA</b>	Chief Technical Advisor
<b>EIA</b>	Evaluation and Impact Assessment section of ILO-IPEC
<b>FCD</b>	Foundation for Child Development
<b>GLP</b>	Good Labour Practice
<b>HCL</b>	Hazardous Child Labour
<b>ILO</b>	International Labour Organisation
<b>IPEC</b>	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
<b>LPN</b>	Labour Rights Promotion Network Foundation
<b>MoE</b>	Ministry of Education
<b>MoL</b>	Ministry of Labour
<b>DoF</b>	Department of Fisheries
<b>NCYD</b>	National Council for Child and Youth Development
<b>PIR</b>	Project Implementation Review
<b>PPAT</b>	Planned Parenthood Association of Thailand
<b>TFFA</b>	Thai Frozen Foods Association
<b>UN</b>	United Nations
<b>USDOL</b>	United States Department of Labor

## Executive Summary

The ILO-IPEC project “Combating the worst forms of child labour in shrimp and seafood processing areas of Thailand” (2010-2014) is funded by the US Department of Labor with a budget of 9 million dollars. The development objective of the project is “To eliminate child labour in shrimp producing and processing areas in Thailand while ensuring decent working conditions throughout the industry”. The project involves stakeholders from both public, private and civil society sectors and includes activities such as awareness-raising, capacity building, relationship building, evidence-based policy influencing, and service provision through action programmes at both national, provincial and local levels. Project management has adopted a flexible approach to project implementation with gradual strategic adjustments, taking into account factors such as the initial scepticism of Thailand’s government and the floods which have constituted major obstacles to implementation.

The purpose of this project implementation review (PIR) is to reinforce strategic focus, improve project performance and impact, ensure accountability and stimulate learning through the facilitation of strategic consultation with key stakeholders to help determine the extent to which on-going project management and implementation is effectively leading to fulfilment of the project objectives.

The systemic nature of the project design and the phased approach to implementation has caused confusion among key stakeholders who have expressed concern about the perceived lack of strategic direction and project outcomes as well as the delayed activities. However, the facilitator assesses the project design to be highly relevant and appropriate, and suggests that the project sequencing consists of three phases: 1. Developing a shared stakeholder understanding of the problem; 2. Implementation of core project activities; 3. Consolidation and phase out. The first phase should be seen as a preparation phase for implementation and can therefore only be expected to deliver on activities considered as preparatory.

Initial achievements during the first project phase include awareness-raising of and trust-building with key stakeholders, child labour baseline surveys and industry mapping to locate child labour in the supply chain and determine the profiles of the beneficiaries to be targeted in the second project phase, creation of a sector specific hazardous child labour list, and support for action programming to the five implementing NGO partners.

Following the stakeholder workshop, ILO-IPEC management and US Department of Labor agreed on applying three lenses for strategic focus in the remaining project period: concentrate on aspects of direct influence to project stakeholders in the shrimp and seafood processing industry; build on the outcomes of the baseline study and pilot the good labour practice programme as an industry-based approach impacting directly on child labour in the shrimp and seafood processing supply chain; start immediate implementation of the action programmes.

The facilitator recommends that project management aims to (further details on each of these recommendations are given in chapter 9):

1. **Maintain and Refine Strategic Focus:** Project management maintains strategic focus, ensures realistic planning, and continuously makes the connection between the contributions from the project activities and the identified priority areas; good labour practice programme development; provision of an appropriate range of education and livelihood services; child labour monitoring; documentation, analysis and conceptualisation of good practice models.
2. **Respond to Implementing Partner Concerns:** Project management needs to provide the necessary support to implementing partners to enable them to deliver quality services to the planned number of

beneficiaries within the project time frame. Support also needs to be provided to enable them to effectively monitor the delivery and effect of these services.

3. **Build capacity and Provide Support to Stakeholders:** More strategic considerations need to be put into the types of capacity building and the thematic areas that ought to be proactively and specifically targeted for each stakeholder (or group of stakeholders) involved in the implementation. The principal capacity building needs identified during the stakeholder review are beneficiary monitoring, service provision strategy and organisational development and resource mobilisation for direct action implementing partners and capacity building for labour inspectors.
4. **Respond to Stakeholder Priorities, Needs and Concerns:** Project management needs to ensure that priorities of beneficiaries and stakeholders are responded to in a way that is compatible with the current project strategy, resources and capacity. This includes the specific needs of targeted beneficiaries, and the expressed needs of the Department of Fisheries, the Ministry of Labour and of the TFFA.
5. **Include the Ministry of Education:** Project management needs to place more emphasis on promoting the inclusion of the Ministry of Education in project supported fora and activities.
6. **Integrate Learning in Project Implementation:** The capturing of learning and good practices needs to be integrated into the project's way of working, both at the level of the implementing partners involved in service provision and at the level of private and public sector actors who are likely to become involved in good labour practice development. It is important for all parties that are actively involved in implementation to initiate a process of regular documentation, recording of learning and development of good practice models from the beginning of the second project phase (implementation of core project activities).
7. **Review Appropriateness of M&E System and Process:** Project management needs to integrate monitoring and learning as part of the implementation process. The CMES will need to be revised in accordance with the revised logical framework that will be developed as an outcome of this PIR. It is recommended that an impact assessment of the project is factored into the evaluation process post-project, as the greatest impact of such a complex and systemic project is likely to materialise in the longer term. The intervention to be assessed by the IE should be decided based on a more detailed assessment of the needs of the beneficiaries. The IE should include a qualitative component.
8. **Consolidate Impact for Long-Term Sustainability:** Project management should consolidate impact for sustainability by promoting: adherence of line ministries to the principles of good labour practice and the mission of eliminating child labour; organisational sustainability of implementing partners acting as drivers of the process, the creation of local, active networks with representation by all key stakeholders, and the establishment of good practice models that allow for replication and scale-up.

## **1. Background**

1. The ILO-IPEC project “Combating the worst forms of child labour in shrimp and seafood processing areas of Thailand” (2010-2014) is funded by the US Department of Labor with a budget of 9 million dollars. The development objective of the project is “To eliminate child labour in shrimp producing and processing areas in Thailand while ensuring decent working conditions throughout the industry”. The project is perceived as innovative by the US Department of Labor and the ILO-IPEC, because it combines more traditional ILO activity areas (such as policy influencing and service delivery) with a sectoral focus on an industry with a possible high concentration of child labour which is of economic significance to Thailand. This has helped create incentives for key stakeholders to participate. From the outset, expectations were high, but this turned out to be a sensitive project: child labour in the shrimp and seafood processing industry was not recognised as a problem by the Thai government who feared that it might impact negatively on international trade relations, and support to migrant children and their families (the principal beneficiaries of some parts of the project) was not a government priority.
2. A number of factors contributed to significant delays in project delivery which characterised the first project period: a long recruitment process to establish the project team, extensive consultation processes with government agencies at national and provincial level to create acceptance of the project and its activities, the impact of the floods in the second semester of 2011, the organisation of several strategic planning meetings to support future implementing NGO partners in proposal development etc.
3. It was therefore felt by the US Department of Labor and ILO-IPEC Geneva that it would be helpful to organise a project implementation review already in September 2012 (instead of in December 2012) to provide an opportunity for key stakeholders to discuss what would be the best way forward for the project.

## **2. Project Implementation Review: Purpose and Methodology**

### **2.1 Purpose of Project Implementation Review**

4. The purpose of this project implementation review is to reinforce strategic focus, improve project performance and impact, ensure upward and downward accountability and stimulate learning through the facilitation of strategic consultation of key stakeholders to help analyse to what extent on-going project implementation and management is effectively leading to fulfilment of the project objectives. The project implementation review aims to facilitate analysis of the project design, implementation, outcomes and sustainability, and decision-making about the remaining project period, in order to improve delivery and increase sustainability. It brings the main stakeholders together to examine and discuss critical issues identified by the external facilitator through consultation with the stakeholders. If it is agreed that changes are required to the strategy or to the implementation process, these should be based on a common understanding among the stakeholders. Following the stakeholder review process, the facilitator will provide an overall assessment of the project implementation process and outcomes followed by recommendations about how to adjust the project strategy and implementation plan. These should be seen as complementary to the outcomes of the stakeholder review process. The findings and conclusions of the review will constitute the basis for decision-making by the US Department of Labor, national stakeholders, ILO-IPEC Geneva (ILO Headquarters), and project management in ILO-IPEC Thailand to adjust the project strategy and implementation plan.



## **2.2 Review Sequencing**

5. The consultation with stakeholders as well as the facilitation of their exchanges by the external facilitator have taken place in the following sequences:
  - Individual interviews with key stakeholders, individually or in groups, before and during the field mission (including representatives from the US Department of Labor, staff from ILO-IPEC Geneva and Thailand, government officials from key ministries, and representatives from business associations)
  - An internal ILO-IPEC project meeting (with the presence of a representative from the US Department of Labor)
  - A focus group with NGOs acting as implementing partners of the action programmes
  - A stakeholder workshop with participation by all key stakeholders
  - A follow-up meeting for the principal decision-makers about the future project strategy and implementation, with revision of the existing logical framework established for the project.
  - Production by the facilitator of a report draft reflecting the perspectives of the different stakeholders, synthesising the PIR findings and conclusions and providing an independent assessment with recommendations.
  - Integration of the comments on the draft report from the different stakeholders in the final report.

## **2.3 Methodological Considerations**

6. This project implementation review was facilitated by the international consultant/external facilitator with assistance from the local consultant and with methodological support from the Senior Evaluation Officer from the Evaluation and Impact Assessment section in ILO-IPEC Geneva, who were all present in Thailand during the week of the stakeholder review, as well as valuable support from the ILO-IPEC Thailand project team.
7. Leading up to the field mission, the external facilitator conducted distance interviews with representatives of ILO-IPEC Geneva and US Department of Labor to give these key stakeholders an opportunity to highlight critical issues to be taken into account during the mission. Annex 3 lists the stakeholder representatives interviewed as part of the review.
8. Due to the concerns expressed by stakeholders during the interviews and focus groups leading up to the stakeholder workshop about delays in implementation, lack of clarity about where the project was heading and expectations that this project implementation review would provide a shared sense of direction, the facilitator opted for a process that focused more on in-depth and consultative strategy development than detailed assessment of project achievements. In this review, the overall assessment of project achievements concerns as much the processes that have been instrumental in driving forward the project in the first phase, as actual implementation outcomes, most of which are expected to materialise in the second (imminent) implementation phase.
9. As pointed out by the project manager in his introduction at the stakeholder workshop, some stakeholders were under- or unrepresented during the workshop, most importantly the beneficiaries: children engaging in or at risk of engaging in hazardous child labour (and their families). The trade union and the business association (TFFA) representatives who were present could only indirectly speak for the (unregistered) migrant workers and operators of informal peeling sheds in the shrimp and seafood processing industry, as these member organisations are mandated by their members

who are formally registered and do not encounter the same challenges. On several occasions, Ministry of Labour and Department of Fisheries drew attention to the fact that Ministry of Education was not represented, despite the project's increasing strategic emphasis on education.

10. The group sessions significantly contributed to shaping the outcomes of the stakeholder workshop. While the majority of the members in each group were directly involved in the activities covered under the immediate objective in question, workshop participants with other backgrounds and areas of specialisation were purposefully introduced in the groups in order to stimulate discussion. Stakeholder representatives that did not usually have the occasion to meet were therefore exposed to other views and perspectives. A positive side-effect was that some stakeholders walked away with a better understanding of the problems to be addressed and increased awareness about what might be the most effective and appropriate solutions. Also, it provided a platform for thinking differently. In group 2 for example a community network model was outlined as a result of the discussion. And in group 3, where the majority of the members were implementing partners, they were able to take previous exchanges further through a discussion of priorities within the action programming which has recently taken place.
11. The follow-up meeting with decision-makers ended up becoming more practically oriented than expected and resulted in a revision of the logical framework matrix rather than a strategic decision-making session. This was due to the fact that the decision-makers took on board immediately the clear guidance provided during the stakeholder workshop about the need for strategic focus, reinforced linkages in the project and a more realistic implementation plan, and produced three strategic lenses which would help sharpen the focus.
12. During the analysis of the data following the stakeholder review process, the review facilitator found it necessary to interview the provincial coordinators in order to assess capacity issues in relation to project implementation and consolidation. She therefore requested assistance from the national consultant who had been supporting the review process in Thailand and she accepted to conduct the two interviews.

### **3. Understanding the Project**

13. It is essential for all stakeholders to grasp the complex and systemic nature of this project in order to make appropriate contributions to strategy development and implementation. During the interviews conducted by the facilitator prior to the stakeholder workshop, some stakeholders raised questions about the underlying logic of the project and the connections between its different components. For example, to some it is unclear whether the emphasis should be placed on pursuing the elimination of child labour or ensuring decent working conditions in the shrimp and seafood processing industry (as stated in the general project objective). It was also felt that the assumptions about how the different components of the project were related and could be expected to impact on each other were not convincing. Finally while the problem analysis and the linkages/connections in the project system appear to be understood by project staff, that is not the case for the majority of the stakeholders, despite numerous consultations and exchanges -perhaps because each stakeholder is looking at the problem from their own perspective which is biased by their motivation (or hesitation) to engage in the project.
14. Below, an overview of the project approach and objectives is provided. This was elaborated on by the senior child labour specialist in her presentation at the stakeholder workshop. In addition, the immediate objectives were revisited during the group sessions in the afternoon (see 4.1 below).

### 3.1 Making the Connections between the Project Objectives

15. The Development Objective of the project is: “To eliminate child labour in shrimp producing and processing areas in Thailand while ensuring decent working conditions throughout the industry”.
16. This development objective may on the surface appear to require separate solutions to two separate problems: child labour and poor working conditions. However, it is important to highlight that the elimination of child labour is likely to take place through the combination of prevention of child labour for children at risk and the withdrawal from the market place of children engaging in child labour. A variety of different approaches need to be adopted at different levels (national, provincial and local) order to facilitate these processes.
17. This logic is reflected in the three immediate project objectives:
  - **Immediate Objective 1:** Policy and implementation frameworks strengthened to protect the rights of Thai, migrant and stateless children in relation to labour, education, employment and social protection.
  - **Immediate Objective 2:** Enterprises across the shrimp industry supply chain comply with national labour laws, with special emphasis on child labour and forced labour, and institute good practices in working conditions.
  - **Immediate Objective 3:** Area-based education, social protection and livelihoods services provided to migrant and Thai children and their families in targeted shrimp industry areas.
18. However, at this level it can also be a challenge to see the connections between the three immediate objectives. This project has been explained as a “tricycle”, with three separate processes taking place in parallel to achieve each immediate objective, as illustrated in the theory of change where one can draw clear vertical lines in the visual representation between the assumed causal relationships established within each immediate objective, based on the assumption, that these efforts would eventually (hopefully within the four year project period) begin to contribute to addressing the two problems contained in the development objectives (the existence of child labour and poor working conditions). During the initial review process, some stakeholders expressed concern during project implementation that the emphasis on improving labour practices might reduce the impact of the project in terms of reducing child labour.

### 3.2 A Complex and Systemic Project Approach with Innovative Components

19. The three immediate objectives are at the core of the project approach which has been characterised as innovative, because it combines “traditional” (service delivery to constitute evidence-base for policy influencing) and “new” ILO/IPEC project components (targeting child labour in a specific sector through industry mapping and value chain analysis) in a manner which has been perceived as highly sensitive in Thailand, due to its focus on child labour and working conditions in one of the principal sources of export in Thailand: the shrimp and seafood processing industry. ILO-IPEC is supporting area-based direct action to eliminate child labour and builds on these interventions to engage in evidence-based policy influencing at micro, meso and macro levels. Together with value chain approaches, evidence-based policy influencing and the piloting of good practice models for replication remain among the development trends of today, as do systemic and complex projects which aim to provide a range of solutions to address one core problem.
20. There is inherent complexity contained in the “tricycle approach” emerging from the systemic project design involving stakeholders from both public, private and civil society sectors and implementing activities (awareness-raising, capacity building, relationship building, evidence-

based policy influencing as well as service provision in the area of education supported by livelihood activities) at both national, provincial and local levels.

21. In order to tackle the complexity of the project, and in particular to deal with the diverging views and the varying levels of capacity of the key stakeholders involved, the CTA and his team have adopted a an approach to project implementation which enabled strategic adjustments along the way. They have addressed factors such as the initial scepticism of the Thai government and the need to provide additional support to the implementing Action Programme partners for proposal writing. This flexible approach has also enabled the team to adjust to factors external to, but directly affecting, the project such as initial delays in the recruitment of project staff who therefore had to accelerate the process of strategy development and stakeholder mobilisation from the outset, as well as the floods which constituted major obstacles to implementation.

#### **4. The Stakeholder Workshop**

22. The stakeholder workshop included the following components:

- Presentations by the project manager and senior child labour specialist
- Presentation by the project implementation review facilitator
- Reactions to the presentations facilitated in plenary.
- Group sessions around the three immediate objectives.
- Reporting back from the groups in plenary, feedback and concluding remarks.

##### **4.1 Project Team Presentations: Core Principles and Project Evolution**

23. The senior child labour specialist who acts as technical advisor for the project took the audience back to the origins and core principles of the project design:
  - This project aims to eliminate child labour, and that is clearly stated in the development objective.
  - As child labour cannot be eliminated in a vacuum, it was decided to approach the issue through three distinct, but integrated components - a “tricycle” whose three wheels must all move in the same direction.
  - An innovative core principle of the project design is to concentrate it on the supply chain in a specific industry, namely the shrimp and seafood processing industry. (The baseline studies about child labour and the industry mapping will help analyse what is driving child labour and where it is located.)
  - The area-based approach consists in targeting vulnerable children in areas with a high concentration of shrimp and seafood processing businesses.
  - The target group includes children at risk of entering into child labour, children engaging in child labour, and young workers working in hazardous conditions.
  - Support to direct beneficiaries include, among other things, education for children at risk and the promotion of safe work for youth.
24. The project manager then provided an overview of project activity that had taken place, since the project officially started in December 2010 (see PowerPoint presentation enclosed in annex).

## **4.2 Facilitator Presentation: Stakeholder Contributions and Emerging Findings**

25. The presentation made by the facilitator is detailed below, as the purpose was to provide workshop participants with a synthesis of stakeholder contributions so far and the facilitator's emerging findings in order to stimulate discussion in plenary and in smaller groups.

### *4.2.1 Three Distinct Project Phases*

26. The facilitator suggested, based on her studies of project documentation and initial consultation with stakeholders, that this project is likely to take place in three distinct project stages. In response to stakeholder concerns about delays of planned activities as well as a perceived absence of concrete results, she pointed out that the nature of the project and the sensitivity of the child labour issue was such, that it has been necessary to adopt a phased approach. This included a long preparation phase as an integral part of the project (in addition to the project design phase) which concentrated on developing a shared understanding of the problem among stakeholders and could only be expected to deliver on activities considered as preparatory. It was critical to recognise that this project implementation review marks a milestone by recognising that the first project phase is now completed, and the next phase has to be set in motion as soon as possible.

### ***PHASE 1: Developing a Shared Understanding of the Problem among Stakeholders***

- Awareness-raising about child labour
  - Relationship building and dialogue with key stakeholders
  - Capacity building about good labour practices
  - Mapping and baseline studies
27. These activities have already taken place, and the second stage will build on these. Awareness-raising, relationship-building, and capacity-building are processes that have been initiated in the first phase and will continue as appropriate. The mapping and baseline studies may be refined, but the principal findings can be used as a basis for decision-making about prioritisation of thematic areas and intensity of the activities planned in each area.

### ***PHASE 2: Implementation of Core Project Activities***

- In-depth problem analysis to develop most appropriate and effective solutions
  - Define areas of priority and unpack the nature of the activities to be implemented
  - Clarify roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders, timing of activities and resource distribution
  - Start implementation NOW... with particular emphasis on service provision to beneficiaries
28. Despite the fact that intense networking and consultation with stakeholders have taken place since the beginning of the project, there is a widespread feeling among stakeholders of lack of clarity about the nature of the problem which the project aims to solve, and how to solve it. Therefore, the project would benefit from participatory in-depth problem identification and analysis with the stakeholders that are directly concerned in order to select those activities that are essential to addressing the problem and attribute roles and responsibilities (beyond project staff) in order to start immediate implementation. The group work during the stakeholders' workshop was seen as a first step in this process (see 5.3).

### ***PHASE 3: Consolidation and Phase Out***

- Increase emphasis on learning and knowledge development about good practices and effective models
  - Intensify efforts to ensure sustainability: establish active cross-sectoral networks, strengthen stakeholder capacity and reinforce incentives
29. Consolidation and phase out needs to be integrated as a smooth transition from the second stage. Learning and knowledge development based on documentation is critical for this project which aims at developing a strong evidence-base to influence policy and practice. This will require the design of a systematic learning process with regular analysis of experiences to develop lessons learnt, improve the emerging models and document them.
30. In addition, it is vital in order to ensure sustainability of project impact that stakeholders take ownership of different aspects of the project, in particular to help improve, replicate and scale up the models developed during the project. Considering that most key stakeholders are already engaging in the project, this is a question of ensuring that each stakeholder takes responsibility for the implementation and consolidation of specific activities/the development of one particular model from the outset, with support from the project team.

#### *4.2.2 A Complex Project Requiring Strategic Focus and Realistic Planning*

31. The facilitator defined the project approach as complex, systemic and flexible. While showing great potential in terms of addressing and providing solutions to the identified problem, the nature of the project and the flexible and adaptive approach to implementation adopted by the local project team appeared to have caused much confusion and frustration among all key stakeholders who struggled to understand what exactly the problem was and where the project was heading. This posed a challenge for project management to work to achieve stronger strategic focus and more realistic planning, and to engage stakeholders actively in project implementation in order to produce concrete and tangible results in the next stage of the project.

#### *4.2.3 Thematic Priority Areas*

32. Two thematic priority areas were identified during the initial stakeholder interview round, and subsequently confirmed during plenary and group discussions at the stakeholder workshop:
1. Immediate initiation of service provision through action programmes, with a particular focus on education and supporting livelihood activities.
  2. Creation and launch of the Good Labour Practice programme complemented by child labour monitoring at local level.
33. However, according to the observations of the external facilitator several questions remained unanswered:

#### ***Service Provision through Action Programmes***

- What types of education for what categories of children?
- What types of livelihood activities for whom and for what purpose?
- How to establish a local network around each action programme to facilitate access to and help improve existing services (What actors? Which incentives for engagement and co-operation?)

34. These questions had emerged during the focus group discussion with the Action Programme partners, who had all developed proposals for the action which they planned to implement, but still were not entirely clear about the specific education and livelihood activities to be carried out by themselves or through referrals. They were expecting that answers to these questions would emerge during the initial phase of the Action Programme implementation.

### ***The Good Labour Practice Programme***

- What should it look like? Who should be involved and how?
  - How can it be supported most effectively by child labour monitoring at local level?
35. This point had been highlighted by the CTA in the hope that one outcome of the stakeholder workshop would be clarity about the extent to which the pursuit of a good labour practice programme should be considered as a priority in the remaining project period.

#### ***4.2.4 Strategic Adaptation: Purpose and Process***

36. The facilitator ended her presentation by outlining the purpose of the strategic adaptation process required in order to help the project management team ensure that the project:
- Meets the project objectives and the needs of the beneficiaries
  - Takes into consideration the priorities of different key stakeholders
  - Ensures effective implementation and maximises impact and quality of the interventions
  - Consolidates sustainability and learning
37. In order to make decisions about the way forward, there was therefore a need to:
- Revisit project objectives and make the connections between different streams of activities
  - Prioritise thematic areas of intervention, and identify potential synergies and critical stakeholder contributions
38. In order for stakeholders to contribute to the process of developing a stronger strategic focus, and identify areas of priority to develop a realistic implementation plan for the remaining project period, the facilitator proposed to help workshop participants revisit the problem which the project aims to address, reconnect with the immediate project objectives and unpick the different aspects of the problem to be solved.

### **4.3 Group Work around the Immediate Objectives**

39. The afternoon sessions consisted in group work in three groups formed to prioritise thematic areas and related activities to be carried out under each immediate objective (see 4.1, page 8) and identify linkages between the different objectives. Each group discussion was guided by a facilitator to help keep it on track. The group sessions were followed by group presentations in plenary to share the suggestions for prioritisation which had emerged from these discussions. Below is an overview of the priority areas and issues identified by the group members during the group discussions.

#### 4.3.1 Group Discussion about Immediate Objective 1

##### ***Policy and implementation frameworks strengthened to protect the rights of Thai, migrant and stateless children in relation to labour, education, employment and social protection.***

40. The priority areas identified by Group 1 clearly illustrated the need for strong linkages between the immediate objective 1 and 2 in ensuring that policy development leads to effective and appropriate implementation. For example, informal peeling sheds need to be registered for the legislation to be enforced and the policies to be implemented. But the group noted that registration would have to be addressed under immediate objective 2. It also highlighted the need to build on existing policies and on the task force action plan. The priority areas were as follows:

##### ***Good Labour Practices***

41. **Understanding the nature of hazardous child labour:** It was felt by the group that the hazardous child labour list under development, which specifically concerns shrimp and seafood processing was a very important initiative which would be complementary to the national hazardous child labour (HCL) list and that such insights were required to facilitate good labour practices.
42. **Stimulating voluntary compliance through the good labour practices programme (GLP):** This was seen as an alternative approach for the improvement of working conditions for children working legally, which was complementary to legislation as well as the Thai Labour Standard (TLS). However, this was again seen to concern practice rather than policy and therefore should be covered by objective 2. The way good labour practices were described by the group (e.g. minimum wages, reference to hazardous child labour list, occupational safety and health, welfare and housing) revealed that there is still some lack of clarity about what issues the good labour practice programme would address. A pertinent question was also raised about which organisation should be responsible for GLP programme. Neither Ministry of Labour nor Department of Fisheries felt it would be appropriate for them to take the lead on this initiative.
43. **Strengthening labour inspection management:** A request for extra resources requires documentation of the need. It was felt by the group that if extra resources were to be given to labour inspection management, this would require a needs assessment to document the need.

##### ***Education***

44. While the appropriate education policy is now in place, implementation is still weak. There is a need for advocacy for policy implementation at national level to support strengthening of policy implementation at local level. This includes training of education/school management staff, among other things to facilitate attitudinal/ behavioural change. A capacity needs assessment of institutions managing and providing educational services should be undertaken. Finally, informal education should be strengthening through the establishment of migrant learning centres and by encouraging factory owners to promote education of the children of workers.

##### ***Social Protection***

45. Companies that are willing to support child care services (pre-school) located in peeling shed clusters as a corporate social responsibility initiative could be stimulated through tax incentives. Furthermore, support for family planning should be provided to migrants.



#### 4.3.2 *Group Discussion about Immediate Objective 2*

***Enterprises across the shrimp industry supply chain comply with national labour laws, with special emphasis on child labour and forced labour, and institute good practices in working conditions.***

46. The group members immediately started to try to locate and unpick the nature of the problem to be addressed, as this appeared to be unclear to most group members, apart from the two researchers who had been involved in the mapping exercise and were present in the group. After a quick reconstruction of the supply chain in the shrimp and seafood processing industry, the problem was located at the level of the informal peeling sheds, most of which operate at community level.

#### ***Registration of Informal Peeling Sheds***

47. Getting the informal peeling sheds to register was seen as a priority. In addition, after some discussion about labour inspections in informal sheds whose operators were villagers and feared sanctions from the state, it was formulated as a priority to ensure that labour inspections at community level took place appropriately.

#### ***A Local Network of Actors***

48. The group identified the provincial governor as a key player in the efforts to drive and coordinate initiatives addressing immediate objective 2. However, the group also concluded that it was critical to establish a local network of actors, with representatives from the state, the industry, civil society organisations and the community that could influence the practices in the informal peeling sheds (government officials can provide information about labour standards, rules and regulations, although legislation only applies to formal peeling sheds), employers from the industry can share experiences and knowledge, NGOs can share knowledge about child labour, and the community can help facilitate appropriate communication and interaction to create trust and pave the way for child labour monitoring.

#### ***Awareness-raising about Child Labour Issues and Appropriate Behaviour in the Communities***

49. Awareness-raising was needed in two respects: First of all, it was necessary to raise awareness among local actors such as community members (in particular, peeling shed owners and parents of working children), local service providers and local authorities about child labour and good labour practices, as well as existing legislation concerning child labour and labour standards. Secondly, government officials (labour inspectors in particular) needed to develop a more constructive attitude when accessing the informal peeling sheds in the communities and demonstrate that they wished to help improve the situation before moving to the next step of sanctioning the peeling shed owner. It was also suggested that it might be helpful to send cross-sectoral teams to the peeling sheds to provide advice, as opposed to sending labour inspectors alone, with the sole purpose of enforcing the law.

#### 4.3.3 *Group Discussion about Immediate Objective 3*

***Area-based education, social protection and livelihood services provided to migrant and Thai children and their families in targeted shrimp and seafood industry areas***

50. Most of the action programmes have just been finalised and are now ready for implementation. The implementing partner NGOs therefore reaffirmed the relevance of working within the three identified areas of intervention: provision of education, social protection and livelihood services.

The group then decided to prioritise the activities which were likely to have the most significant impact in addressing child labour/HCL issues in the shrimp and seafood processing industry.

### ***Provision of Education Services***

51. While different interventions are planned for migrant and Thai children from different age groups i.e., 0-5 (creative space/day care); 5-14 (transitional education within and outside the formal school system) and 15-17 (non- formal education and life skills, the group felt that working with children in the age group of 5-14 will have the greatest impact. In addition to supporting access to formal education, partner NGOs felt they need to strategically advocate with Ministry of Education and provincial/education service areas to increase admittance of migrant children into the formal school system. This would be done with the support and coordination from the National Council for Child and Youth Development (NCYD) who will also develop a handbook on how to facilitate the introduction of migrant children into the formal education system.

### ***Social Protection***

52. Intervention plans in the action programmes include mainly life skill/awareness training for youth workers and legal aid for migrant children and families. It was discussed in the group that attention should be given to ensuring appropriate working conditions for youth workers through life skills/awareness training and monitoring activities. Since this requires efforts and engagement by different stakeholders (e.g. the youth and their families, employers, Ministry of Labour, as well as NGOs.), the group suggested engaging Provincial Centre for Children and Women Workers to support the campaign on safe work for youth and help activate relevant stakeholders. Again, NCYD would be the facilitating forum at provincial level to consider this. There was also a suggestion that ILO may have a role in directly linking with the provincial body to help promote safe work for youth campaign.

### ***Livelihood Activities for Thai and Migrant Youth and Their Families***

53. It was noted that different interventions are being planned through the action programmes in different targeted areas to support Thai and migrant youth and their families in job-related skills development, financial support for education and emergency situations as well as reproductive and occupational health awareness training. It was felt that ideas sharing about different funding/saving schemes within the migrant communities could help ensure sustainability.

## **4.4 Stakeholder Comments in Plenary**

- The representative from the Ministry of Labour drew attention to the existence of national committees, legislation, policies and action plans, in particular the working group (under the task force) which had received budgetary support from IPEC, and expressed concern about the risk for duplication of government efforts by the IPEC project through parallel mechanisms, for example concerning the formulation and promotion of labour standards. Rather, support is needed to assist the Ministry of labour in its enforcement of labour laws by building the capacity of the labour inspectors.
- The representative from NCYD responded by saying that it was important to build on existing national guidelines and previous IPEC experiences. However, “change is good”, and strategic plans should be adjusted as required. In addition, she picked up on the tricycle analogy proposed by the senior child labour specialist to describe the project, and suggested that the Action Programmes should be considered as the front wheel, with industry and policy as back wheels, and that it was important to determine, who was the driver. She commented that project linkages

were easy to perceive at action programme level, but the connections to industry and policy were less clear. It was necessary to reinforce the ways in which they feed into each other. She therefore suggested that the action programmes would be used as an evidence-base to help shape policy and practices in the concerned industry and ministries in relation to child labour.

- The representative from the Trade Unions felt that the critical issues in relation to child labour were that the legislation is not directly applicable, and that the lack of education pushes children who do not go to school into child labour situations.
- The absence of the Ministry of education was felt at the stakeholder workshop, and several stakeholders, including NGO representatives as well as the representatives from the Ministry of Labour and the Department of Fisheries, urged the project to include the Ministry of Education more actively in the project, especially in the light of the increasing emphasis on education. It should be noted that the project management representatives from ILO/IPEC Thailand and Geneva attended a meeting at the Ministry of Education during the week of the stakeholder review.
- The representative from the Labour Rights Promotion Network Foundation (LPN) made the point that it was important to address the specific needs of each specific group of children (and their parents). For example a separate approach could be developed for children at risk, children that are working illegally, but not in hazardous conditions, and children working in hazardous conditions. Models for awareness-raising about child labour or livelihood models aiming to improve the quality of life for the children could also be explored.
- The representative from the US Department of Labor (the donor) recognised the need to develop different models for different beneficiary groups, and emphasised that the child labour issue concerned both the Thai and migrant population and could be found in peeling sheds with links to the national and international supply chain respectively. She also highlighted the importance of communication and of bringing the local authorities into the networks established to address the child labour problem. Finally she raised the issues of providing an incentive in order to get informal peeling sheds to register.
- The representative from the Department of Fisheries felt that it was essential to reinforce the link between policy development and policy implementation. In addition, she questioned whether the number of beneficiaries targeted and the number of activities currently planned was realistic. She expressed her interest in the good labour practices programme and mentioned that it would be useful to establish a peeling shed model. She also introduced the idea of bringing in extension workers to help provide advice on good labour practices to informal peeling shed owners.

#### **4.5 Concluding Remarks**

54. The facilitator invited the project manager and the representative from ILO-IPEC Geneva to share their impressions of and reactions to the exchange of views and ideas which they had participated in throughout the day.
55. The project manager stated that the stakeholder review process had been useful, because it appeared to support the strategic direction in which the project was moving, but highlighted the need for strategic focus and realistic planning, and drew attention to specific issues that needed to be addressed as a priority
56. The representative from ILO-IPEC Geneva highlighted that the group discussions clearly illustrated the connections between the three immediate objectives which to some were difficult to grasp. He then concluded the stakeholder workshop by taking on board the need expressed by stakeholders to speed up implementation and sharpen the strategic focus and providing an immediate response.

Together with the ILO-IPEC project manager and the representative from the US Department of Labor, he had developed three new lenses for the 3 immediate objectives:

- Under IO1 they proposed to focus on aspects that are of direct influence to project stakeholders in the shrimp and seafood processing industry. The specific implications of this “lens” were to be worked out in a detailed management meeting that revised the project logical framework.”
  - Under IO2 they proposed to build on the outcomes of the baseline study, and pilot the good labour practice programme as an industry-based approach concentrating on aspects with direct impact on child labour in the shrimp and seafood processing supply chain.
  - Under IO3 they proposed to “lead with action” and get the Action Programmes going immediately, as they did not feel that the stakeholder review had provided any reasons or justification for major changes or renegotiations.
57. Finally, he emphasised the importance of focusing on what would achieve the greatest impact in the shortest time. Apart from starting implementation immediately and documenting experiences from implementation in parallel, this meant transitioning into project phase 3 (consolidation) which in his opinion would focus on knowledge development based on documented experiences, including model development (e.g. a model for combating child labour in value chains) for replication and deriving lessons learnt.

## **5. Follow-up Meeting for Project Decision-makers**

58. The follow-up meeting for the decision-makers turned out to be of a quite operational nature. Based on the strategic reflections shared in the concluding remarks during the stakeholder workshop, the decision-makers (representatives from ILO-IPEC Geneva, ILO-IPEC Thailand and The US Department of Labor) decided to go ahead and revise the logical framework with a view to facilitate the creation of the outcome measurement framework to be applied from 2013. There was consensus about the need to continue the process of sharpening the strategic focus and determining areas of priority by adjusting/tightening the formulation of some immediate outcomes and outputs, and reducing the number of outputs to those considered as critical to achieving the 3 immediate outcomes, seen through the three new “lenses” presented in the concluding remarks at the stakeholder workshop in order to establish a realistic implementation plan for the remaining project period and assess the need to reallocate resources.

### **5.1 Principal Modifications to Logical Framework**

59. The purpose of the revision of the logical framework was to clarify and agree on what outputs the project is responsible and accountable for, and to ensure that the three new lenses were applied consistently to all immediate outcomes and outputs. This should be seen as a start of a process triggered by, but not included in, the project implementation review. From the perspective of the external facilitator, citing the modifications below is important to illustrate that views shared during the stakeholder workshop were immediately taken into account by project decision-makers.
- Some of the principal modifications to the logical framework were as follows: the number of outputs was reduced, and the description of some of the remaining outputs was revised to reflect the tightened strategic focus represented by the “lenses”.
  - The delimitation to efforts directly targeting the shrimp and seafood processing sector was highlighted as required at all levels in the logical framework (outcomes, outputs, activities).

- Consultation/cooperation with the Ministry of Education was integrated in several activities, in recognition that this is an important stakeholder whose contribution needs to be taken into account, in particular with the increased project focus on access to different forms of education (of high quality and adapted to the needs of the target beneficiaries) for both Thai and migrant children.
  - The emphasis on the promotion of good labour practices has become stronger and located under immediate objective 2, together with related occupational safety and health activities (e.g. the safe work for youth campaign), to highlight the necessity to improve practices rather than confining the decent work to a policy issue.
  - An output specifically concerning hazardous work and safety and health conditions for young workers (15-17) at the workplace was added, in recognition that this age group needs to be reached primarily through improved working conditions at their workplaces the shrimp and seafood processing industry (as opposed to e.g. vocational skills training which is mainly relevant for those young workers that wish to leave the shrimp and seafood sector).
  - The emphasis on migrants was reduced in order to ensure that the project addresses the needs of both migrant and Thai children and their families.
  - A differentiation of livelihood activities for migrant and Thai families is reflected in the description of certain activities in the logical framework.
  - The emphasis on documentation and the development of good practice models has become stronger.
60. It should be noted that the development of the outcome measurement framework from the logical framework has proved to be a useful process for the project management team to understand in-depth and take ownership of the project, and it is likely that this revision of the logical framework will also be a valuable means for the project team to develop a shared sense of direction.

### ***Other Issues Raised***

- The need to develop an appropriate child labour monitoring model (drawing on previous ILO-IPEC experiences)
- The need to explore how to measure impact of project interventions in a feasible manner, both in terms of quality and quantity, and make the most of the impact evaluation.

## **6. Initial Project Achievements**

61. Due to the sensitivity of child labour issue, the project team has focused its efforts during the initial period of the project in developing a shared understanding of the problem with key stakeholders especially the government and the industry. The external facilitator would like to highlight the following achievements as significant for the remainder of the project implementation process:

### **6.1 Awareness-raising of and Trust-building with Stakeholders**

62. While the majority of the stakeholders that have been consulted during the review have been promoting and defending their positions, it is clear that effective networking, awareness-raising, and consultation has taken place, with a wide range of stakeholders, in particular government agencies at national and provincial levels (resulting in the formulation of MoUs and action plans with the Thai Government), and actors from the shrimp and seafood processing industry. This can be

considered one of the major achievements of the project so far. In the next stage, the logical progression would be to see these stakeholders co-operate on implementation of activities in practice. This was confirmed during the project implementation review by the special attention paid by several stakeholders to the weak link between policy development and implementation, the proposed multiple stakeholder models at community level outlined during the group sessions, and the clear need for the action programmes to tap into and influence existing forms of service provision.

63. As the child labour issue is highly sensitive and the existence of an actual child labour problem has been (and still is) called into question by the Government of Thailand, much consultation took place between the IPEC project management and different government agencies, before the baseline studies and industry mapping exercises were carried out in recognition that the child labour problem needed to be located and analysed in order to address it appropriately.
64. While the project team has succeeded in engaging the Department of Fisheries and the Ministry of Labour actively in the project, although at different paces, officials from the Ministry of Education have expressed to the project team that engaging in the elimination of child labour is not a priority for them, despite initial involvement of the MoE in the project development process, representation in the task force and regular information meetings with the project team.

## **6.2 Child Labour Baseline Surveys in Targeted Areas**

65. This initiative was intended to produce information that can be used to identify project beneficiaries and assess the extent of child labour (illegal and hazardous) in the shrimp and seafood processing industry in targeted areas. The information is now available, analysis is on-going, and the project is preparing to present it to stakeholders. It will be critical to present demographic findings concerning potential target beneficiaries e.g. the ratio between children under and over 15, Thai and migrant children, boys and girls, in the Central and South region respectively, as well as the prevalence of child labour in the shrimp and seafood processing industry compared to other sectors, as this may have significant implications for further prioritisation of activities in terms of thematic areas and level of intensity.

## **6.3 Industry mapping**

66. The industry mapping exercise has taken place in partnership with the business association TFFA and the Department of Fisheries. It has provided the project and its stakeholders with a better understanding of the shrimp and seafood supply chain in the target province with the highest concentration of shrimp and seafood processing businesses, Samut Sakhon. This is an important step forward, which can be used as a basis for the development of an effective child labour monitoring system and the creation of an appropriate Good Labour Practice Programme.

## **6.4 Hazardous Child Labour List**

67. The efforts to draft a specific Hazardous Child Labour list for shrimp and seafood industry (still to be validated) and the revision of National HCL list by the sub-committee on HCL under the National Committee against Child Labour are considered as significant progress by stakeholders. From the project perspective, this list is particularly useful for young workers aged 15-17 which constitutes the largest beneficiary group. The list may help identify conditions and types of hazardous work which youth workers are not allowed to engage.

## 6.5 Action Programming

68. Most action programme proposals have been finalised and agreed on. Only the proposal from Stella Maris is still under development. The proposal development phase has required extensive capacity building by project staff of the implementing NGO partners (for some more than others). Two thematic seminars on education and livelihood have been held and another two on beneficiary monitoring and project management are planned for October 2012. The focus group meeting with the facilitator revealed that these meetings had also constituted a platform for implementing partners to discuss division of roles and responsibilities and contributed to their overall understanding of the linkages in the project, in particular in relation to immediate objective 3.

## 7. Assessment of Initial Project Achievements

69. This chapter presents a brief assessment of initial project achievements by the external facilitator.

### 7.1 Relevance and Appropriateness of Project Design and Strategy

70. The project design and approach is highly relevant and appropriate, because it aims to address the complex issues in relation to the elimination of child labour at different levels, involving a number of important stakeholders at each level, from both the public sector, the private sector and civil society. However it has proved to be difficult for stakeholders to understand the nature of the problem addressed by the project and grasp the linkages and connections between the different types of action. And even project staff has so far been working on three separate streams of activities towards the three immediate objectives (ref. theory of change, tricycle analogy). However, the group exercise during the stakeholder workshop was a demonstration that bringing stakeholders together, who so far had been concentrating on activities under one immediate objective, facilitated increased awareness about the project and the emergence of new perspectives and alternative solutions. It would not only be beneficial for stakeholders to work more intentionally on the linkages in the project (e.g. the link between policy and practice), but also to further develop a common sense of direction based on the newly agreed strategic focus which will have significant consequences for the prioritisation of activities to be implemented as well as the level of intensity of implementation of each activity, as reflected in the revision of the logical framework by project management with the representative from the US Department of Labor.

### 7.2 Project Implementation Effectiveness

71. Much effort has gone into the initial project achievements which may be considered as preconditions for actively implementing the activities under the different immediate objectives. With reference to the three project phases mentioned during the facilitator's presentation at the stakeholder workshop:
1. Developing a shared stakeholder understanding of the problem
  2. Implementation of core project activities
  3. Consolidation and phase out
72. The facilitator assesses that the phased approach which has been adopted to the implementation in response to contextual factors, such as the floods in 2011 and stakeholder concerns, is appropriate. She recommends that the **first project phase** which is currently phasing into the implementation phase is accepted as a **necessary step on the way**. What could be perceived as delays, under-spending, and delivery of a limited number of project outputs according to the original

implementation plan and logical framework, should be reconsidered in the light of the revised strategy and logical framework.

73. During the stakeholder review (interviews, focus groups and stakeholder workshop), the facilitator has been in a position to observe first-hand the **impressive outcomes of the networking, consultation and awareness-raising efforts** by the ILO-IPEC project team. All key stakeholders have developed an understanding of the principal aspects of the project and the issues it is seeking to address, and trust has been built between the project staff and the majority of the stakeholders. In turn, some Ministry representatives have raised questions about the validity of the research undertaken to identify the location and scope of child labour in Thailand. At this point, the facilitator is unable to assess the quality of the **highly relevant research** which has been conducted (child labour baseline survey and industry mapping), but would recommend that an independent research institution validates the methodology, and that the timing of the dissemination of the data gathered as well as the way it is presented is carefully considered, as some findings may be very sensitive.
74. **Some capacity building support provision** has taken place during the first phase, not least in order to ensure that the action programme development was finalised. In this respect, the labour inspection meeting, organised by the project to identify capacity needs, was a useful initiative. However, such self-assessment needs to be accompanied by perspectives from other stakeholders, as reflected by the discussion in group 2 at the stakeholder workshop which drew attention to the critical combination of awareness-raising and skills development that may help ensure that labour inspectors contribute constructively to addressing child labour issues at community level.
75. **Direct service delivery** has been **postponed** to phase two (implementation of core project activities), and at this point the major achievement is that the action programming is practically finalised, and the provincial offices are ready to receive the provincial coordinators who will be supporting the implementing partners of the action programmes.

## **8. Capacity and Resource Implications of Review Findings**

### **8.1 Support Required to the Provincial Coordinators**

76. The two provincial coordinators will be playing a pivotal role in the implementation phase, in particular with respect to the action programmes, providing capacity development support and assisting with coordination and relationship-building. During the project implementation phase, special consideration will need to be paid to ensuring that the two provincial coordinators fulfil their functions as effectively as possible. It is therefore of vital importance that they receive the required support. Below is the list of functions which the provincial coordinators have described as part of their role.
- Raise awareness about child labour and gain stakeholder commitment to address child labour issues in order to build stakeholder ownership of the project
  - Foster linkages and coordination between governmental agencies and NGOs in order to support different project activities/interventions, in particular by working through the Provincial Operational Centre for Women and Children Workers.



- Support the capacity development of stakeholders, e.g.:
    - Develop skills of individual partners such as labour inspectors, e.g. through collaboration with provincial/local work safety centres or with support from the central ILO unit, if there are requests from other provinces as well.
    - Help ensure effective service delivery by provincial government agencies such as the provincial public health office, provincial office for social development and human security, education service area offices.
    - Strengthen the capacity of implementing NGO partners to facilitate access to services for their beneficiaries and provide direct service delivery (see strengths and weaknesses below)
    - Provide advice to private sector stakeholders from industry and agriculture about how to address child labour-related issues, and encourage them to support service delivery such as day care and informal education programmes (corporate social responsibility)
    - Develop better understanding among different stakeholders on supply chain monitoring.
77. In order to do this the provincial coordinators will need various forms of support, in particular during the first year, as there is consensus among stakeholders that implementation needs to start immediately.
78. Considering the number of functions which the provincial coordinators are supposed to play, they cannot be expected to provide capacity development support to stakeholders in technically specialised areas. It would therefore seem appropriate to set aside a budget for bringing in internal (ILO) and external specialists, not only to coach the provincial coordinators, but also to provide specialist inputs at key events and support key stakeholders as needed for short periods of time, in thematic areas such as:
- Coaching on how to support the organisational development of the implementing partners in order to help them build on their core competencies and ensure impact and sustainability of their activities post-project.
  - Negotiation and conflict management to facilitate interaction with stakeholders.
  - Assistance in dealing with various forms of child labour, including informal work situations, promoting good labour practices in the provinces.
  - Assistance in supporting supply chain monitoring and child labour monitoring at local level.
79. The intense efforts at coordination and relationship building may require additional support at least during the first year of the implementation phase, as both provincial coordinators are to cover several provinces. In addition to backstopping support from the Bangkok office for reporting and financial management, the recruitment of part-time or full-time assistants for administration and support to the coordination of activities at provincial level could be envisaged.

## **8.2 Strengths and Weaknesses of the Action Programme Partners**

80. The implementing partners of the action programmes have varying levels of capacity and specialisation in the thematic priority areas of the project which include the provision of access to services and direct service delivery within the fields of education and livelihood.

81. Most of the NGOs have the following strengths:
- In-depth understanding of child labour issues and extensive knowledge about the target beneficiaries.
  - The technical capacity to provide appropriate quality services to the targeted beneficiaries in their areas of core competency.
  - Established relationships with stakeholders at provincial level who will be instrumental in facilitating the implementation of the action programmes.
  - Previous collaboration with ILO-IPEC.
82. In addition, NCYD, LPN, FCD may be considered as change agents and catalysts for the promotion of child labour issues, and they have a strong ability to network and build relationships with other stakeholders, including public sector institutions and private sector organisations, in order to improve access to services and lobby employers to improve their practices.
83. In turn, many of the NGOs have spent a lot of time on their proposal development, with intensive support from the IPEC project team, and Stella Maris who is a newcomer in ILO/IPEC project implementation, is still revising their proposal for the Action Programme. It is possible that they may need further support in the field of strategic planning and organisational development (including resource mobilisation for long term organisational sustainability which should not be assumed for all of these NGOs).
84. The facilitator would like to draw attention to a few issues in relation to beneficiary needs for service provision. It will be essential for the implementing partners to identify relevant target beneficiaries and analyse their needs in-depth. However, it takes time to analyse all aspects of a child's life and provide a customised package of services, and in order to be considered as beneficiaries these children must subsequently receive services for at least six months. There is a risk that the NGOs will be biased towards recommending provision of their own core services, as the most obvious and easy solution, while the most appropriate response to beneficiary needs may lie in a combination of facilitated access to services provided by other stakeholders and the creation of services adapted to the children's special needs.
85. In turn, considering the variety of services which the implementing partners may need to propose to their beneficiaries in order to respond to their needs, there is also a risk that some will attempt to diversify their direct service delivery beyond their core competencies (in some cases, at the expense of the quality of the services provided). It will be critical that the provincial coordinators support the NGOs in determining where existing services may be sufficient, if the emphasis is placed on increasing access, and identifying opportunities for the creation of new or more appropriate services by other stakeholders - and where they themselves need technical support to further develop their "menu" of proposed services.
86. It may also become an issue that most of the NGOs do not have a culture of documenting good practice. Technical support will be required from NCYD for the integration of learning systems and processes into their ways of working, and from project staff/other ILO specialists for the identification and conceptualisation of emerging good practice models.
87. Two definite advantages for the planned implementation of the action programmes are constituted by the group dynamics which is emerging as a result of the thematic meetings during which the roles and responsibilities of each NGO have been discussed and the catalyst role which NCYD will be playing by taking the lead in facilitating exchanges of experiences and lesson-learning. NCYD

will further support linkages and knowledge sharing between different stakeholders around service provision and act as a policy driver (including engagement with national and provincial bodies). In this way, the link between policy and service interventions through different Action Programs is likely to be ensured.

### **8.3 Resource Management**

88. As a consequence of the strategic adaptation which is to take place (based on findings from the project implementation review and the revised logical framework), additional human resources (internal or external) will be needed to support:
- Project activity in the education sector (education specialists, internal and/or external)
  - Documentation and communication about project activity (specialist in learning and knowledge management)
  - Development of the Good Labour Practice Programme (with support from internal and external specialists).
89. In order to protect the dynamism, effectiveness and cooperative spirit of the small project team of experienced and competent staff members, and considering the urgency of accelerating implementation, it is critical to ensure that any new recruits are experienced and already have an in-depth understanding of child labour issues, as they will have to be operational right away.
90. According to the project manager, reallocation of funding on the budget is likely to favour the action programmes and the documentation of emerging models as well as support to communication about these models, research results and dissemination of other essential project information.

### **8.4 Institutional Set Up**

91. Considering the complex and multi-dimensional nature of the project, there needs to be a clear institutional structure and coordination mechanisms in place to support project implementation, ensure timely/appropriate communication on project progress and directions as well as effectively connecting different components of the project.
92. At national level, the project is tapping into existing institutional structures to influence policy development, including the National Committee against Child Labour and its sub-committees. These bodies are playing important roles in contributing to the project objectives as well as serving as a platform for national policy influencing around child labour issues by the project stakeholders. The project links with the Bureau of Occupational Safety and Health and Labour Protection Bureau under DLPW. The former engages with the agenda on safe work for youth campaign while the latter is responsible for the Working Group on the Worst Forms of Child Labour and the work on HCL list.
93. Several national stakeholders have emphasised the value of the child labour working group in the task force and recommended that it continues to play a central role. Meanwhile, they have also expressed the need for more frequent meetings and more active leadership to drive the process forward of addressing child labour issues in Thailand. It could be envisaged that the Ministry of Labour could delegate certain thematic areas to the Department of Fisheries and TFFA, who are both eager to participate and produce tangible results. And it would seem appropriate to bring a new stakeholder on board: the Ministry of Education.

94. At provincial level, the aim of project management is to mobilise the Provincial Coordination Centres for Women and Child Workers, which are tasked with the implementation of the National Plan of Action on Child Labour, to facilitate multi-stakeholder cooperation:
1. To monitor child labour and engage in lobbying/provide advisory support to help improve working conditions in the shrimp and seafood processing industry, in particular in the informal community-based peeling sheds.
  2. To increase access to services for target beneficiaries (e.g., provincial public health office, provincial office for social development and human security, Education Service Area offices).
95. The Provincial Coordination Centres are chaired by the provincial Governor, and the provincial unit of Ministry of Labour has taken on the secretariat function. The Provincial Operation Centre may need budgetary support from the project in order to organise regular stakeholder meetings, as it may otherwise become a potential bottleneck. It might also be an option to establish a government-private sector committee as an alternative mechanism, possibly including the provincial Chamber of Commerce, in addition TFFA's committee membership of the Centres, to encourage stakeholders from the industry to help push the agenda.

## **9. Recommendations for Project Implementation**

96. The recommendations below have resulted from the facilitator's consultation with stakeholders, individually and collectively, as well as her independent analysis of the current situation.

### **9.1 Recommendation 1: Maintain and Refine Strategic Focus**

97. Project management maintains strategic focus, ensures realistic planning, and continuously makes the connection between the contributions from the project activities and the identified priority areas: good labour practice programme development; provision of an appropriate range of education and livelihood services; child labour monitoring; documentation, analysis and conceptualisation of good practice models. Detailed recommendations in each of these areas are given below.

#### *9.1.1 Project Scope: Child Labour in the Shrimp and Seafood Processing Industry*

98. The sharpened strategic focus as well as the information from the child labour baseline survey should guide the future prioritisation of activities towards a narrower and more realistic project scope. While one cannot address child labour in a vacuum, and it is important to support mainstreaming of child labour considerations into policy development and implementation in line ministries such as Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (with Department of Fisheries) and Ministry of Education, the project needs to narrow its scope to children working in the shrimp and seafood processing industry, in line with the sharpened strategic focus (as opposed to the purist ILO-IPEC area-based approach, where child labour in any sector in the targeted area would apply). It may however prove to be more difficult to identify children at risk with direct sectoral links.
99. It has also been recognised widely by stakeholders, by the implementing partners of the action programmes in particular, that children cannot be targeted without taking into consideration the role (and hence motivation and constraints of their families. This justifies the inclusion of livelihood activities, such as informal savings schemes, life skills development etc.. However, the constraints

imposed on migrants with respect to entrepreneurial activity limit the options for that part of the target group.

### *9.1.2 Thematic Priority Areas*

100. Below the thematic priority areas emerging from the stakeholder review are listed and briefly explained. It is recommended that these thematic priorities are taken into account with immediate effect and planned activities adjusted/ removed/ added accordingly (a significant step forward was made in that respect during the follow-up meeting with decision makers, but more work is needed to further refine and develop each area). Activities in all four areas should be initiated in phase two and consolidated in phase three.

### ***Good Labour Practice Programme Development***

101. While there appears to be confusion among stakeholders, both at national and provincial level, about what a good labour practice programme would look like, there is broad consensus that this is likely to be a useful initiative that can help improve the working conditions, as long as it is complementary to existing Thai labour standards. This initiative is particularly important for young workers of legal working age (15-17) who need to be better protected in the workplace and withdrawn from hazardous work, and an incentive for businesses to retain their young workers in a sector with labour shortage.
102. The Good Labour Practice Programme may be seen as a complementary and voluntary alternative to compulsory labour inspections, initially replacing the third party monitoring mechanism envisaged in the original project document, but constituting a potential building block for an independent workplace monitoring system at a later stage, if the political environment becomes favourable to this idea. Combined with local efforts at child labour monitoring, this initiative might be better received by informal peeling shed owners in the communities, and it is felt by project management that facilitating the improvement of labour practices through awareness-raising, guidance and advisory support may be a more effective approach in Thailand. At the outset of this review, it was still uncertain to what extent the idea of the GLP programme should be pursued, but a wide range of stakeholders expressed enthusiasm about this particular aspect of the project during the review. The programme is still at the development stage, but it is expected by project management that it will have three main components: advisory and guidance materials, a supportive training scheme focused on primary processing, and a model enterprise standard (i.e. a standard for the model peeling shed), with the possibility of developing a certificate confirming compliance. The Department of Fisheries and TFFA are both interested in pursuing it further. It is likely that TFFA will take the lead in driving the programme development and implementation process, with guidance from project management and other ILO-IPEC child labour and decent work specialists. It is envisaged that working groups at provincial level (under Provincial Operational Centres) and national level can be established to help develop the GLP-programme.

### ***Provision of an Appropriate Range of Education and Livelihood Services***

103. It was confirmed during the stakeholder review that education is key to preventing children at risk from entering into child labour, and that livelihood activities may contribute as a motivating factor for parents to keep their children out of child labour situations. It may also help ensure that young workers do not accept hazardous working conditions. However, it would appear that more investigation needs to take place to identify the most appropriate forms of education and livelihood services: Due to legal constraints, migrant workers cannot participate in livelihood activities directly related to entrepreneurship and income generation. In turn, alternatives such as informal

savings schemes may be explored. Furthermore, considering that the project is now concentrating exclusively on child labour in the shrimp and seafood processing industry, it may prove to be a challenge to identify children at risk of entering into child labour in that particular sector. In turn, it is clear that emphasis of the project with respect to young workers over 15 needs to be placed on improving the working conditions in the sector and hence prevent them from engaging in hazardous labour rather than withdrawing them from the sector altogether and providing vocational skills training to introduce them in other sectors: labour shortage constitutes a major motivating factor for the industry to engage in enhancing their labour practices.

104. The implementing partners of the action programmes have all previously engaged in various forms of services provision within the areas of education, livelihood, some directly addressing child labour issues, and some concentrating on migrants. It will be essential to ensure that the action programmes which have been developed for this project are in line with the strategic focus on education and livelihood activities, and that these activities are adapted to the specific needs of the beneficiaries. It will be important to build positively on the current lack of clarity about exactly what type of activities will need to be provided in the thematic priority areas and how, by making gradual strategic adjustments, as the beneficiaries are identified and their needs analysed.

### ***Child Labour Monitoring***

105. Considering that the general objective of the project is to eliminate child labour and improve the working conditions for young people over 15, it is central to locate and monitor child labour. The initiated baseline surveys may serve as a useful basis for further identification of child labour situations. However, as child labour is not officially recognized as a major problem in Thailand, gathering information about child labour is a highly sensitive process. In addition, child labour in the shrimp and seafood processing industry is frequently located in informal workplaces at community level, in particular in informal peeling sheds whose owners have little incentive to share information about child labour. It would therefore appear that the most appropriate approach to child labour monitoring would be to combine efforts at community level (ref. previously tested community-based child labour monitoring models) with private sector monitoring of both the formal and informal links in supply chain (facilitated by TFFA) and encouragement to register with the Department of Fisheries. It will be of vital importance to explore and provide incentives (financial or otherwise) that may facilitate child labour monitoring and motivate employers to improve their practices and working conditions, but the provision of incentives is beyond the scope of the project. Child labour monitoring is therefore a good illustration of the need to establish where project responsibility ends, and stakeholders have to take ownership to drive the process.

### ***Documentation, Analysis and Conceptualisation of Good Practice Models***

106. Given the strong emphasis during the stakeholder review on documentation and dissemination of good practice models for replication to ensure wider impact, the facilitator suggests highlighting this area as a separate thematic priority area to give it the full attention it deserves with process design, dedicated capacity, resources and technical support both to programme staff and stakeholders contributing to implementation. It will be key to ensure that a learning process is designed which ensures that the implementation of activities is monitored regularly and that experiences are recorded, analysed and transformed into lessons on an on-going basis, in order to build up a knowledge base which can constitute a basis for conceptualizing and clearly articulating the features of the good practice models to be disseminated.

## **9.2 Recommendation 2: Respond to Implementing Partner Concerns**

107. Project management needs to provide the necessary support to implementing partners to enable them to deliver quality services to the planned number of beneficiaries within the project time frame. Support also needs to be provided to enable them to effectively monitor the delivery and effect of these services. Further details are given below.
108. Two expected challenges have been highlighted by the implementing partners. There is a general feeling that the number of beneficiaries has been imposed on them in the action programme partnership agreements. The NGOs are concerned about whether it is realistic to expect to be able to provide quality services in response to the needs of the planned number of beneficiaries, considering that the current implementation period has been reduced to two years.
109. This may be addressed:
  1. By supporting implementing partners to focus more on facilitating access to and improving existing formal and informal services provided by other service providers. This will require a strong emphasis on relationship-building, exchanges and coordination with other stakeholders as a basis for a well-functioning referral system.
  2. By providing capacity development support to the implementing partners to enhance the effectiveness, quality, and range of their own service provision (based on their core competencies and experience).
110. Furthermore, the NGOs fear that the required beneficiary monitoring system will be too time-consuming and complicated to apply. Some organisations (such as PPAT and LPN) are already operating with other beneficiary monitoring systems. Although the project has allocated a budget for this activity, it will still put a strain on staff capacity and time. It is worth exploring a couple of options in response to this concern:
111. While recognising that the frequency and the level of detail will be essential to capture the evolution of the situation of each beneficiary and report accordingly to the donor, might there be ways of simplifying the beneficiary monitoring process and system in order to make the data gathering less time-consuming and less complicated? Would it be possible to build on existing beneficiary monitoring systems? And how might the implementing partners be trained in effective and efficient beneficiary monitoring?

## **9.3 Recommendation 3: Build Capacity and Provide Support to Stakeholders**

112. More strategic considerations need to be put into the types of capacity building and the thematic areas that ought to be proactively and specifically targeted for each stakeholder (or group of stakeholders) involved in the implementation. The principal capacity building needs identified during the stakeholder review are beneficiary monitoring, service provision strategy and organisational development and resource mobilisation for direct action implementing partners and capacity building for labour inspectors. Further details are given below.

### *9.3.1 Capacity building of Direct Action Implementing Partners*

#### ***Beneficiary monitoring***

113. The need for assistance in developing a realistic and practically applicable approach to beneficiary monitoring was expressed collectively by the implementing partners. It is likely that the required

beneficiary monitoring will seem less insurmountable to them, once they have attended the meeting in October dedicated to this theme. However, training may not be sufficient. It may be necessary to send a monitoring specialist to each NGO to provide specific advice adapted to the organisation, its activities and type of beneficiaries about what information to gather and how.

### *Service provision strategy*

114. Support needs to be provided to the implementing partners for the development of appropriate service provision strategies. The education and livelihood services provided should be relevant to the target beneficiaries and of high quality. In some cases, this may mean placing the emphasis on facilitating access to existing services provided by other institutions rather than own service provision (here, support from the project team will be needed for relationship-building and networking). In other cases, it may mean that the implementing partners will themselves have to create new services in response to beneficiary needs (here, support from the project team is required to ensure that the services are in line with the project objectives and the core competencies of the NGO in question).

### *Organisational development and resource mobilisation*

115. In order to ensure the long-term impact of the project outcomes, it will be important to secure the organisational sustainability of the implementing partners by providing support to organisational development and resource mobilisation.

#### *9.3.2 Capacity building of labour inspectors*

116. This should focus on awareness-raising about child labour and appropriate communication/behaviour in the communities, as proposed by Group 2 during the stakeholder workshop. Also, it seems worth exploring how to manage the dual and potentially contradictory roles of the labour inspectors: control compliance with the labour laws and provide advice on good labour practices. Is it possible for the same government officials to manage these two roles? Or would it be better to develop the capacity of extension workers to act as advisors on good labour practices as suggested by the representative from the Department of Fisheries.

## **9.4 Recommendation 4: Respond to Stakeholder Priorities, Needs and Concerns**

117. Project management needs to ensure that priorities of beneficiaries and stakeholders are responded to in a way that is compatible with the current project strategy, resources and capacity. This includes the specific needs of targeted beneficiaries, and the expressed needs of the Department of Fisheries, the Ministry of Labour and of the TFFA. Further details are given below.

#### *9.4.1 Assess Needs of Target Beneficiaries and Provide Incentives*

118. The future target beneficiaries were not consulted during this review. Both the selection of and service provision to beneficiaries will need to be followed closely by the provincial coordinators to ensure that adequate support is given as required. While the experience and awareness of the implementing partners concerning the needs of their current beneficiaries should not be underestimated, it would seem appropriate to combine their intuitive needs assessment with a structured needs assessment with the same (or similar) categories to be used by all implementing partners, both as a baseline for the planned beneficiary monitoring and for benchmarking, and to make sure that the services offered to the individual beneficiaries are as relevant and appropriate as possible. It will also be important (despite the high number of beneficiaries) to budget time for a



meeting with each target beneficiary to analyse their needs in-depth and provide (access to) tailor-made services (e.g. for migrant and Thai children, children under and over 15, girls and boys etc.).

119. In order to prevent children at the risk of engaging in child labour or withdraw children engaging in child labour from hazardous working conditions, it is not only enough to raise awareness of employers and affect changes in the workplace. The children themselves and their families must also wish to change the situation. However, it was mentioned on several occasions during the review that migrant families (who represent a significant percentage of the target populations) frequently mobilise both adults and children in order to repay debts incurred as a result of their move to Thailand. Also there are situations where children under 15 help their family members, and it is not acceptable to the families that their children may be seen to engage in child labour. It is therefore important to explore the incentives and motivating factors for the target beneficiaries to change their situations.

#### *9.4.2 Take into Account the Priorities of the Ministries*

120. Both during the initial review meetings with the facilitator and the plenary sessions during the stakeholder workshop, several priorities were made quite explicit by the representatives from the Ministries which need to be taken into account:

#### ***Promotion of Good Labour Practices***

121. The representative from the Department of Fisheries was interested in practical tools to help affect tangible change in the area of good labour practices, and emphasized the usefulness of establishing a peeling shed model and further developing the hazardous child labour standards. She also wished to receive confirmation of the extent and location of child labour based on the results of the child labour baseline survey. Considering that the principal child labour problem in the shrimp and seafood processing industry in Thailand seems to lie at the level of the informal peeling shed, it seems appropriate to develop guidelines for good practice in peeling sheds.

#### ***Capacity Building of Labour Inspectors and Avoidance of Duplication***

122. The principal concerns of the Ministry of Labour are:
- The weak capacity of labour inspectors (i.e. for understanding and application of the labour law, primarily due to general lack of training as a consequence of the gap between senior and junior inspectors. It will be essential from the perspective of the project to strengthen the capacities of labour inspectors in order to ensure that labour inspectors support the project objective (and to avoid counterproductive action). However, rather than focusing on labour inspectors' understanding and application of national legislation (which should be the responsibility of Ministry of Labour) the facilitator would recommend complementary skills development focusing on interaction with the community, and the peeling shed owners in particular.
  - The potential duplication by the project of efforts by national institutions and existing systems and guidelines references such as the Thai Labour Standards and the work of the national task force. It will be important to ensure and demonstrate that initiatives implemented/facilitated by the project (e.g. the Good Labour Practice Programme, the sector specific hazardous child labour list) are complementary to on-going national activities and existing national systems.

#### 9.4.3 *Explore and Develop Incentives for the Private Sector*

123. During the review, the private sector has been represented directly by TFFA, and indirectly by Department of Fisheries who is a public stakeholder but provides the legal framework for and promotes industry which this project focuses on, namely the shrimp and seafood processing industry in Thailand. Both stakeholders are concerned about the image of the industry (national and international) following international claims that it employs children and exposes young workers to hazardous working conditions. Furthermore, they are both eager to participate in initiatives that can help improve the image of the industry, such as the good labour practice programme, enterprise standards, and corporate social responsibility (e.g. financial support to schools and day care). In turn, they feel that the location and nature of child labour in relation to the shrimp and seafood processing industry needs to be further investigated, before they can engage actively. If the highest concentration of child labour is found in the informal peeling sheds as suspected, special measures will need to be taken (such as the provision of financial incentives from Department of Fisheries) to promote registration. TFFA will also find it easier to help facilitate gradual improvement of labour practices for those businesses that are members (and hence within the sphere covered by TFFA's mandate.) However, the facilitator would like to encourage the project to explore constructive incentives/motivating factors (as opposed to government control and sanctions) that might convince the informal peeling shed owners to register and improve their practices.

#### **9.5 Recommendation 5: Include the Ministry of Education**

124. Project management needs to place more emphasis on promoting the inclusion of the Ministry of Education in project supported fora and activities.
125. The representatives from the Ministry of Labour and the Department of Fisheries (and several NGO representatives) expressed concern about the absence of the Ministry of Education at the stakeholder workshop, in particular in the light of the increased emphasis on education emerging from the stakeholder review. It will be essential to include the Ministry of Education more actively in the project in the near future. While officials at national level have clearly expressed that eliminating child labour in the shrimp and seafood processing industry in Thailand is not among their priorities, it will be important to keep nurturing the relationship and identify possible change agents to engage with. As soon as the project begins to engage at provincial level, it will be critical to involve school administrators and teachers in exchanges on education as an effective means to combat child labour. In addition, the project team will need to involve both national and provincial representatives from the education sector and local NGOs in improving access to education work for migrant children. Finally, the planned impact evaluation of project activities concerning education may be used as a mechanism to place child labour on the education agenda and bring in representatives from the Ministry of Education at national level to engage in a more concrete manner.

#### **9.6 Recommendation 6: Integrate Learning in Project Implementation**

126. The capturing of learning and good practices needs to be integrated into the project's way of working, both at the level of the implementing partners involved in service provision and at the level of private and public sector actors who are likely to become involved in good labour practice development. It is important for all parties that are actively involved in implementation to initiate a process of regular documentation, recording of learning and development of good practice models from the beginning of the second project phase (Implementation of Core Project Activities).

## **9.7 Recommendation 7: Review Appropriateness of M&E System and Process**

127. Project management needs to integrate monitoring and learning as part of the implementation process. The CMES will need to be revised in accordance with the revised logical framework that will be developed as an outcome of this PIR. It is recommended that an impact assessment of the project is factored into the evaluation process post-project, as the greatest impact of such a complex and systemic project is likely to materialise in the longer term. The intervention to be assessed by the IE should be decided based on a more detailed assessment of the needs of the beneficiaries. The IE should include a qualitative component. Further details are provided below.

### *9.7.1 Continuous Monitoring for Strategic Adaptation and Learning*

128. It will be essential to integrate monitoring and learning as part of the implementation process. This will allow for strategic adaptation, and in addition it will facilitate gradual recording of good practices. The comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system (CMES) which is still under development, and has yet to be applied and tested, may contribute to this, if a regular monitoring process is planned and linked directly to reflection and learning, e.g. by producing a monthly learning sheet with analysis of monitored changes and reflection on adjustments to be made as a consequence.
129. An initial positive effect of the work on the CMES has been that it has stimulated the project team to engage in a healthy process of reflection concerning the appropriateness and coherence of the project design, activities and indicators. Considering the late recruitment of project staff and the need to accelerate activities from the outset, this has been of particular value, as it has helped the team gain strategic focus. The theory of change and the outcome measurement framework are two CMES components that may help the project team maintain a strategic overview throughout the project period. It will be important to adjust these in the light of the revised logical framework produced during the follow-up meeting by the project decision-makers after the stakeholder workshop, and the project revision request to be submitted to USDOL by ILO-IPEC Thailand. As part of the adjustments, the facilitator suggests reviewing the indicators to ensure that they cover adequately qualitative outcomes of processes facilitated as part of the project, including awareness-raising, relationship-building, capacity development and evidence-based policy influencing.
130. Finally, in addition to planned evaluation initiatives, the facilitator recommends that an impact assessment of the project is factored into the evaluation process post-project (budgeted and planned), as the greatest impact of such a complex and systemic project is likely to materialise in the longer term.

### *9.7.2 Impact Evaluation*

131. Based on the findings from the stakeholder review, it is relevant to concentrate the impact evaluation required by the US Department of Labor on education, and with the increasing focus on good practice model development, this also appears to be an appropriate choice. However, given that only one NGO, namely LPN, has started implementing activities, it may be premature to select their transitional education model as the object of the impact evaluation. It seems reasonable to wait until the majority of the beneficiaries have been selected and their needs assessed to determine the nature of the model(s) whose impact should be evaluated. In addition, it is key to include a qualitative component in the impact evaluation: while it is essential to evaluate the changes that have taken place in the evaluated beneficiary group compared to the control group, and the extent to which these can be attributed to project implementation, it will also be important to analyse the relevance of the model applied, the quality of the services provided, and the change processes that

have been facilitated as a result, for the concerned children and their families, as well as for other actors involved in changing the situation (e.g. teachers, employers...). Therefore it is of critical importance to develop an in-depth understanding of the needs of the beneficiaries in the sampled groups (including the number of children in need of the different types of interventions) and the approaches adopted to address those needs, in order to clearly conceptualise the models that are evaluated and assess their effectiveness.

## **9.8 Recommendation 8: Consolidate Impact for Long-Term Sustainability**

132. Project management should consolidate impact for sustainability by promoting: adherence of line ministries to the principles of good labour practice and the mission of eliminating child labour; organisational sustainability of implementing partners acting as drivers of the process, the creation of local, active networks with representation by all key stakeholders, the establishment of good practice models that allow for replication and scale-up. Further details are given below.
133. Four factors will contribute to consolidating impact, and can hence be considered as critical success factors for sustainability:
  - Adherence of line ministries to the principles of good labour practice and the mission of eliminating child labour (Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, and Ministry of Education). The motivation of these ministries to support the work of the ILO-IPEC may be stimulated by continuous dialogue and relationship-building, both to clearly establish the roles and responsibilities of each ministry, as the project evolves, and to explore how their involvement in the project may help promote their interests/ improve the situations of their respective target groups.
  - Organisational sustainability of implementing partners acting as drivers of the process. It will therefore be important for ILO-IPEC not only to accompany the implementing partners in their service provision efforts, but also provide support to organisational strengthening and resource mobilisation.
  - The creation of local, active networks with representation by all key stakeholders. It will be important for ILO-IPEC to help establish such networks both at national and provincial levels and ensure inclusion of resource persons interacting directly with employers and employees involved in child labour situations and the concerned communities in order to develop and apply appropriate strategies to combat child labour.
  - The establishment of good practice models that allow for replication and scale-up. In order for good labour practices to become integrated in shrimp and seafood processing businesses in Thailand, it will be important to support the concerned ministries in ensuring that such practices are promoted and enforced in all provinces in the longer term. In addition, good practices developed by the implementing partners in the pilot provinces need to be analysed and conceptualised into models for replication and scale up in other provinces.

## Bibliography and Annexes

Below, the principal consulted sources are listed.

1. Terms of reference for the project implementation review
2. Project document (Ref.: THA/10/50/USA): Combating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Shrimp and Seafood Processing Areas in Thailand, 17 December 2010
3. Guidelines for the Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation System, July 2012 (draft)
4. Action Programme Summary Outlines on Child Labour
  - AP-001 LPN
  - AP-002 NCYD
  - AP-003 FCD
  - AP-004 Raks Thai
  - AP-005 PPAT
5. Technical Progress Reports and Project Updates
  - TPR, April 2012
  - TPR, October 2011
  - Project Update, First Semester, June 2012
6. PowerPoint Presentations
  - IPEC Thailand Project Update, 11 September 2012
  - Preliminary Findings – Baseline Survey on Child Labour in Selected Areas, 11 September 2012
7. Meeting Notes
  - Addressing Labour Issues in Aquaculture, Shrimp and Seafood Processing Sectors in Thailand – Role of the Department of Fisheries, 16 March 2012
  - Meeting with the Working Group on Hazardous Child Labour List for the Shrimp and Seafood Processing Industry in Thailand, 19 May 2012
8. Annexes:
  1. Terms of reference for the project implementation review
  2. Schedule for project implementation review
  3. List of participants at focus group for implementing NGO partners
  4. List of participants at the stakeholder workshop
  5. PowerPoint presentation from ILO-IPEC Thailand about project progress



International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour

ILO/IPEC

Terms of Reference

For the

Project Implementation Review of

“Combating the worst forms of child labour in shrimp and seafood processing areas of Thailand”

ILO Project Code	THA/10/50/USA
ILO Iris Code	102507
Country	Thailand
Duration	48 months
Starting Date	30 December 2010
Ending Date	31 December 2014
Project Language	English/Thai
Executing Agency	ILO-IPEC
Financing Agency	United States Department of Labor (USDOL)
Donor contribution	USDOL: US\$ 9,000,000

---

## I. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

1. The International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) is a technical cooperation programme of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The aim of IPEC is the progressive elimination of child labour, especially its worst forms. The political will and commitment of individual governments to address child labour - in cooperation with employers' and workers' organizations, non-governmental organizations and other relevant parties in society - is the basis for IPEC action. IPEC support at the country level is based on a phased, multi-sector strategy. This strategy includes strengthening national capacities to deal with this issue, legislation harmonization, improvement of the knowledge base, raising awareness on the negative consequences of child labour, promoting social mobilization against it, and implementing demonstrative direct action programmes (AP) to prevent children from child labour, to remove child workers from hazardous work, and to provide them and their families with appropriate alternatives.
2. The operational strategy of IPEC has over the years focused on providing support to national and local constituents and partners through their projects and activities. Such support has to the extent possible been provided in the context of national frameworks, institutions and processes that have facilitated the building of capacities and mobilisation for further action. It has emphasized various degrees of a comprehensive approach, providing linkages between action and partners in sectors and areas of work relevant for child labour. Whenever possible specific national frameworks or programmes, such as national plans, strategic frameworks, have provided such focus.
3. From the perspective of the ILO, the elimination of child labour is part of its work on standards and fundamental principles and rights at work. The fulfillment of these standards should guarantee decent work for all adults. In this sense the ILO provides technical assistance to its three constituents: government, workers and employers. This tripartite structure is the key characteristic of ILO cooperation and it is within this framework that the activities developed by the project should be analysed.
4. Thailand ratified ILO Convention 182 on the WFCL in 2001 and Convention 138 on minimum age of work in 2004. Other positive aspects of government policy include compulsory schooling to age 15, accessible health care, limits on work for children age 15 to 17, agreements with neighbouring countries on regularising migrant workers and addressing trafficking, and a cabinet resolution to extend education to all children regardless of nationality or legal status.
5. The adoption of the National Policy and Plan on the Worst Forms of Child Labour (NPP) in 2009 marked a significant benchmark in the efforts of the RTG to combat child labour. Under the leadership of the Ministry of Labour the multi-agency National Committee on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour was established, with the Bureau of Labour Protection within the Department of Labour Protection and Welfare as secretariat. Under the NPP the establishment of Operational Centres for Women and Child Workers at provincial level has been approved by Cabinet to render the plan operational.
6. ILO Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) are being introduced in ILO to provide a mechanism through which to outline agreed upon priorities between the ILO and the national constituents, as well as partners within a broader UN and International development context. For further information please see <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/decent.htm>

7. The DWCP defines a corporate focus on priorities, operational strategies as well as a resource and an implementation plan that complements and supports partner plans for national decent work priorities. As such DWCP are broader frameworks to which the individual ILO project is linked and contributes to. DWCP are beginning to gradually be introduced in various countries. The DWCP document for Thailand 2012 – 2016 has been prepared in draft and can be viewed at

<https://www.ilo.org/intranet/english/bureau/program/dwcp/download/thailand2012-16.pdf>

### **Background to the project**

8. Thailand has made strong progress over the last two decades to reduce child labour, although its use still persists. Economic development and the impact of globalisation has generated an increased demand for cheap labour, which has led to increased use of migrant child labour, which makes up a high proportion of child labour. Child labour predominates in informal businesses across the economy, and some takes the worst forms as defined in C.182.
9. ILO-IPEC has been working towards the elimination of child labour in Thailand since 1992. ILO-IPEC support has included support to national policy development and implementation, research on the worst forms of child labour in six provinces and direct action focused on various target populations in selected provinces including child victims of trafficking, children used in begging, children in agriculture and child domestic labourers. ILO-IPEC has implemented seven USDOL-funded projects that have included activities in Thailand as well as projects supported by other donors focused on child labour, trafficking and labour migration. Most recently ILO-IPEC has implemented the WFCL Thailand Project (2006-2011) under USDOL funding.
10. The Development Objective of the project is “To eliminate child labour in shrimp producing and processing areas in Thailand while ensuring decent working conditions throughout the industry”.
11. The project has the following four immediate objectives:
- Immediate Objective 1: Policy and implementation frameworks strengthened to protect the rights of Thai, migrant and stateless children in relation to labour, education, employment and social protection.
  - Immediate Objective 2: Enterprises across the shrimp industry supply chain comply with national labour laws, with special emphasis on child labour and forced labour, and institute good practices in working conditions.
  - Immediate Objective 3: Area-based education, social protection and livelihoods services provided to migrant and Thai children and their families in targeted shrimp industry areas.
12. As of July 2012 the project has reported the following outcomes:
- Child labour surveys and industry mapping completed
    - Four provincial area-based child labour surveys conducted in key shrimp and seafood production areas. Data analysis ongoing
    - Industry mapping in Samut Sakhon finalised with 501 enterprises covered and positioned in a satellite map. Additional TFFA enterprises covered as well
  - TFFA policy against child labour and forced labour launched
    - Thai Frozen Foods Association launched its policy against child labour and forced labour on June 12<sup>th</sup> 2012 through the support of the project and participation in TFFA board meetings



- Sector specific draft HCL list produced
  - Draft hazardous child labour list for the sector has been produced through a consultative process involving risk assessments at the farm, processing and export levels
- Labour Inspection Capacity Building programme development process agreed with DLPW involving ILO LAB-ADMIN and ILO DWT in Bangkok
  - Labour Inspection Senior Management Meeting organized 28-29 June
- Comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system (CMES) and impact evaluation (IE) on education intervention planning advanced
- Provincial governors support secured
  - Successful discussions with all four governors of the project implementation areas.
- The programming of direct services has advanced so that education sector projects are to be launched and activated during 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of the year with minimum of 24 months implementation timetable.
- Special flood crisis assistance project established with NGO networks to support migrant workers and their families – November/December 2011.

### **Background to the project review**

13. ILO considers evaluation as an integral part of the implementation of technical cooperation activities. Provisions are made in all projects in accordance with ILO evaluation policy and based on the nature of the project and the specific requirements agreed upon at the time of the project design and during the project as per established procedures. The Evaluation and Impact Assessment (EIA) section of ILO/IPEC provides an independent evaluation function for all ILO/IPEC projects.
14. The project document states that there will be an implementation review and an independent final evaluation of the project. Following ILO/IPEC evaluation procedures a consultation process on the timing, scope and aspects to be addressed in the project implementation review (PIR) was started in July 2012 by EIA. Responses to the consultation process by key stakeholders justified holding a project implementation review with key stakeholders in September 2012.
15. The present Terms of Reference are based on inputs from key stakeholders received by IPEC-EIA in the consultation process and on standard issues to be covered by a project review with an external facilitator.

## **II. SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF MID-TERM PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW**

16. The scope of the review will be the ILO/IPEC child labour project in Thailand as a whole. The Implementation Review (PIR) will consist of a thorough assessment by the stakeholders, facilitated by the external facilitator, focusing on progress to date in the implementation of project activities. The review will use monitoring information already available.
17. The project review will review the following areas of project design, implementation, outputs and sustainability and make recommendations for the remaining period of the project that will improve delivery and sustainability of outputs and objectives:
  - Analyse implementation strategies for their appropriateness and potential effectiveness in achieving the project objectives;

- Review the institutional set-up, capacity for project implementation, coordination mechanisms and the use and usefulness of management tools including the project monitoring tools, work plans and planned impact evaluation
  - Assess the implementation of the project so far including the delivery rate of funds and project outputs to date. Identify factors affecting project implementation (positively and negatively) and discuss how project results and impact can be maximised
  - Examine the likelihood of the project achieving its objectives and if necessary propose revisions to the expected level of achievement of the objectives;
  - Review the strategies for sustainability and replication/up scaling
18. The PIR brings the main stakeholders together to examine and assess the areas identified above. If it is agreed that changes are required to the strategy or to the implementation process and timetable based on the review of experience to date, these revised strategies and schedules should be based on a common understanding among the stakeholders of the way forwards.
19. The role of the external facilitator is, based on the desk review of existing documents and preparatory consultations, to identify areas where discussion is needed in the stakeholders' meeting and to facilitate the discussion to reach a consensus on the way forwards. The external facilitator will also provide input and further analysis based on their perspective and their overall findings.
20. The results will be used by USDOL, national stakeholders, IPEC HQ, and field staff to adjust strategies of the project.

---

### **III. SUGGESTED ASPECTS TO BE ADDRESSED**

21. Through the consultation process with key stakeholders and based on prior analysis by the Evaluation and Impact Assessment (EIA) section, suggested aspects for the review to consider have been identified. These are presented in Annex 1. Other aspects can be added as identified by the review consultant in accordance with given purpose and in consultation with EIA.
22. One of the tasks for the consultant, as presented in more detail in the methodology section, is to decide which ones based on the information available, are the most important aspects for the stakeholders to address in order to achieve the purpose of the review. The selected aspects will need to be formulated into appropriate questions to facilitate discussion in order to clarify current status, discuss critical issues and reach consensus on the way forwards.

---

### **IV. EXPECTED OUTPUTS OF REVIEW**

23. The expected output of the project implementation review is a project review report prepared by the external facilitator based on the outcome of the stakeholder discussions and agreement. The report in draft form and in English should be presented to IPEC EIA one week after the project review meetings. After a methodological review by EIA, the report will be circulated to all relevant stakeholders for their comments. The comments will be consolidated by EIA and forwarded to the consultant. The review consultant should consider the comments in the final draft of the report.
24. The review report should not exceed 25 pages in length (excluding annexes). The structure of the report could follow the following outline:
- Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions and recommendations

- Background (including description of the project and review methodology)
  - Results from discussions on key issues associated with key questions
  - Conclusions/key lessons learned
  - Recommendations and suggestions
  - Appropriate annexes including TOR
25. The report should also, as appropriate, include specific and detailed recommendations by the external reviewer based on the analysis of project review responses. All recommendations should be addressed specifically to the organization/institution responsible for implementing it. The report should also include a specific section on lessons learned from this project, either potential practices that could be replicated or those that should be avoided.
26. Ownership of data from the review rests jointly with ILO-IPEC and the consultants. The copyright of the review report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of ILO-IPEC. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the review report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.
27. The external reviewer will also produce a background report based on initial desk review to serve as the basis for the discussions in the project review meeting and a programme for the project review workshop.

---

## V. PROPOSED REVIEW METHODOLOGY

28. The following is the suggested methodology for the independent review. The methodology can be adjusted by the review team if considered necessary for the review process and in accordance with the scope and purpose of the review. This should be done in consultation with the EIA section of ILO/IPEC. An external consultant will serve as facilitator to guide the project review participants through a discussion of their experiences.
29. The review should be carried out in adherence with the relevant parts of the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy; the ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-Based Evaluations 2012 ([http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_168289/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_168289/lang--en/index.htm)); the specific ILO-IPEC Guidelines and Notes; the UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards, Ethical Guidelines, Code of Conduct; and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard.
30. Gender concerns should be addressed in accordance with ILO Guidance note 4: “Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of projects”<sup>2</sup>. All data should be sex-disaggregated and different needs of women and men and of marginalized groups targeted by the programme should be considered throughout the review process.

**The following elements are the proposed methodology:**

I. Document Review and internal scoping

31. The review consultant will review the project document, work plans, project monitoring plans, progress reports, and other documents (see table below) that were produced through the project. In

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165986/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm)

addition, the review consultant will conduct electronic or telephone interviews with selected stakeholders. The review consultant will receive a briefing by the project team and conduct an internal scoping exercise.

32. Based on the areas listed under the purpose, the list of suggested aspects above, the document review, the briefings and interviews, the facilitator will identify key issues for discussion during the project review.

## II. Background Report and Project Review Meeting Programme

33. A background report will be prepared by the review consultant. The content of the Background Report will include:

- Achievements so far of the IPEC Project as documented and assessed by the external facilitator
- Summary of the key findings based on the purpose of the review, the suggested aspects to address and the initial scoping by the external facilitator
- Questions and issues identified for discussion at the review meeting

34. The review consultant will present the Background Report to the Stakeholder Review Meeting and will also develop a tentative proposed agenda for the stakeholder review meeting.

## III. Stakeholder Project Review Meeting

35. The project review will be conducted with internal and external participation. Potential participants include the project management including the CTA, implementing partners, IPEC desk officers and technical specialists, donor representatives, representatives from worker and employer organizations, government officials, representatives from donor agencies and implementing agencies/partners. The facilitator will work together with project management and EIA to ensure that the participants who can provide information to answer the review questions are invited to the project review meeting.

36. A rapporteur not associated with the project will take notes. Notes should be extensive and reflect the content of the discussion. Shortly after each activity, the team (facilitator and rapporteur) should summarize the information, the team's impressions, and implications of the information for the study. This will help ensure that the record is a valid representation of the discussion.

37. The project review will consist of a two-day meeting of the expanded management team, which will include representatives from ILO office in Thailand, Senior Child Labour Specialist SRO-Bangkok, ILO-IPEC HQ, EIA, the donor and the government, as well as from employers' and workers' organizations, and other stakeholders including executive and staff members of the implementing agencies who will be present in the relevant sections of the meeting. The consultant will be responsible to act as facilitator, and will rely on the technical assistance of the EIA section. The project will identify the stakeholders and provide a list of participants for this meeting.

## IV. Follow-up Meeting with Internal Key Stakeholders

38. It is suggested to hold a half day follow-up meeting with internal key stakeholders with decision-making authority regarding budgets, work plan and changes that has been suggested by the review meeting. This will focus on the implication of the proposed adjustment in strategy and establish the possible changes in project components, work plans, project monitoring plans. The participants of this meeting will be:

- ILO/IPEC Headquarters
- Senior Child Labour Specialist
- ILO Office Thailand
- Project staff
- Others as appropriate

39. A more detailed list of participants for the review meeting as well as for the follow-up meeting will be finalized with consultation between EIA and the project.

#### V. Review Report

40. Based on the background report and the inputs from the key stakeholders' discussions during the review and follow-up meetings, the review consultant will draft the review report. The draft report will be sent to IPEC-EIA directly by the consultant. IPEC-EIA will forward the independent review report to stakeholders for their inputs/comments to the report. IPEC EIA will consolidate the comments including methodological comments from EIA and forward them to the consultant for consideration in finalizing the draft report.

41. The consultant will finalize the report, taking into consideration the stakeholder comments.

#### **42. Composition of the review team**

43. The project review will be carried out by a consultant with extensive experience in the evaluation of development or social interventions, preferably including practical experience in assessing comprehensive policy/program frameworks or national plans. The facilitator should have an advanced degree in social sciences, economics or similar and specific training on evaluation theory and methods. Working experience on issues related to child labour, education and children's welfare will be essential. Full command of English as a working language will be required. The profile and responsibilities for the review consultant are found in the table below.

<b>Project Review Facilitator</b>	
<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Profile</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the project documents</li> <li>• Conduct interviews</li> <li>• Prepare a background report for discussion at the stakeholder meeting</li> <li>• Facilitate project review meetings</li> <li>• Draft the review report</li> <li>• Finalize the review report taking into consideration the comments of stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensive experience of facilitating stakeholder meetings</li> <li>• Good meeting process and consensus building skills</li> <li>• Development experience</li> <li>• Ability to write concisely in English</li> <li>• Experience and knowledge of evaluation, programme and project management</li> <li>• Experience with work at policy level and in multi-sectoral and multi-partner environment, including networking</li> </ul>

44. The following is the timetable for the review exercise:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Responsible</b>
Briefing, desk review, internal briefings, development of draft background paper and agenda for the meeting	27 – 31 August	5 work days (home)	Consultant with project & EIA support
Meetings with key stakeholders, finalise background paper, facilitate stakeholder review meeting, debriefing.	10 - 14 September	6 days (Thailand)	All key stakeholders as noted above
Prepare draft review report	17 - 21 September	4 days (home)	Consultant
Circulate draft report to stakeholders & consolidate comments	24 September - 12 October	Circulate draft report consolidate comments	IPEC-EIA
Finalize review report taking into views the consolidated comments	15- 19 October	2 days	Consultant

Total work days for consultant = 17

#### **Sources of Information and Consultations/Meetings:**

45. Sources of Information

<b>Available at HQ and to be supplied by EIA</b>	Project document EIA, ILO and UNEG guidelines
<b>Available in project office and to be supplied by project management</b>	Technical progress reports/status reports Baseline reports and studies Project monitoring plan Technical and financial reports of partner agencies Other studies and research undertaken Action Programme Summary Outlines Project files National Action Plans

46. Consultations/meetings will be held with:

- Project management and staff
- ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials
- Implementing partner agencies
- Government stakeholders (e.g. representatives from Department of Labour, Social Development etc.)
- Social partners Employers' and Workers' groups
- NGO representatives
- USDOL (by telephone if not attending personally)
- US Embassy staff

47. Final Report Submission Procedure

- The review consultant will submit a draft review report to IPEC EIA in Geneva

- IPEC EIA will forward a copy to key stakeholders for comments on factual issues and for clarifications
- IPEC EIA will consolidate the comments and send these to the review consultant by date agreed between EIA and the review
- The final report is submitted to IPEC EIA who will then officially forward it to stakeholders, including the donor.

---

## VI. RESOURCES AND MANAGEMENT

### Resources

48. The following resources are required:

- Consultant fees for 16 work days
- Travel to Thailand and DSA as per ILO rules and regulations if applicable
- Costs associated with the project review meetings
- Rapporteur for 5 days of work to record the meeting and to prepare a report of the meetings

49. A detailed budget is available separately.

### Management

50. The review consultant will report to IPEC EIA in headquarters and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with EIA should issues arise. IPEC project officials and the ILO regional office in Bangkok will provide administrative and logistical support during the review process.

## **Annex 1: Suggested aspects for the review to consider**

### **Project design and relevance**

- How has previous IPEC experience in Thailand was utilized during the design phase and how it is being used during the implementation of the project;
- Is the strategy and approach of the project still relevant? How is the strategy being implemented and coordinated? Have there been any changes in strategies?
- Are the project's original assumptions related to each of its Immediate Objectives (IO) still valid?
- Are the project's Indicators and Means of Verification still appropriate?
- Does the "theory of change" of the different project components still hold, including how each one directly links to the reduction of hazardous child labour in the shrimp and seafood processing sector? What is the level of understanding of different stakeholders?
- Based on the findings of the needs assessment, is the design of the project's direct service component relevant and appropriate to reduce hazardous child labour and improve livelihoods in the shrimp and seafood processing sector in a sustainable way?

### **Implementation and Achievement**

- Is the project progress to date as expected in relation to targets set within the project document, the delivery rate of funds, the project work plan, and the Project Monitoring Plan (PMP) identifying enabling factors and constraints;
- Please document the reasons for any major project delays. How could such delays be avoided in the future?
- What is the possible effect of any significant delays in implementation and to the sequencing of events?
- Have measures been adopted by the Project Management to overcome any constraints to implementation?
- Have delays in project implementation affected service provision to be provided to direct beneficiaries?
- How effective has the time spent by project staff working with the relevant government agencies and industry groups been as an approach for getting these groups on board? What has been learned from this process?
- Have appropriate monitoring and evaluation tools been developed and is the strategies in place for their utilization (comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system (CMES), the project work plan and the project monitoring plan (PMP))
- How has the development and use of the CMES contributed to the understanding of the project by project staff?
- What is the status and feasibility of conducting the planned impact evaluation (IE) of the education component? How interesting is this study to key stakeholders?
- Is the appropriate training and guidance provided to implementing organizations by IPEC? Other areas that needs to be covered?
- On the basis of the results of the household baseline survey, will there be enough children engaging (or at risk of) the worst forms of child labour in the shrimp and seafood processing industry in the targeted areas to meet project objectives for children withdrawn and prevented?
- Is the approach to management of information on child beneficiaries (the direct beneficiary monitoring and reporting (DBMR) system) appropriate and in place, and role of both the implementing agencies and the IPEC office clear?



- What groundwork has been laid to prepare communities for service provision and other project activities? How have communities responded? Have there been any unforeseen results that may require adjustments to project strategies?
- Are project partners (government, industry, service providers (NGOs)) able to fulfill the roles expected in the project strategy? Are there any capacity challenges?
- Is the appropriate administrative and technical support being provided to the project management by ILO Office in Thailand, IPEC HQ and Senior Child Labour Specialist at SRO-Thailand in the implementation of the Project activities? What else would be needed?
- Are the correct linkages made with other ILO project and other projects in the country?
- Is there a need to reallocate resources or adjust activities in order to achieve its immediate objectives? Are resources sufficient for the remaining project period?
- Is the process to engage relevant government agencies and industry groups working?
- What are the current challenges that the Project is facing in the implementation of the project and what efforts are made to overcome these challenges?
- What are the results achieved to date within each immediate objective?
- How have the Action Programmes that are being implemented contributed to the achievement of the immediate objectives?
- What is the status of prevention and withdrawal of children from hazardous work?
- What are the possible changes in project strategy or implementation that are needed in order to achieve the project objectives;

### **Sustainability**

- How can the results and outcomes of the project be sustained and further used? What is the current effort towards that? What are the measures and processes adopted?
- Are local ownership been promoted? Are the linkages to broader sectoral and national action been made?
- Is the phase-out strategy for the project in place and under implementation? Is sufficiently clearly articulated and progress made towards this goal?

### **Special concerns**

- What are the possible areas of research/specific studies that would contribute directly to the project and/or to the wider objective and outcome of the project to support further national action?

## Annex 2: Schedule for Project Implementation Review

### “Combating the worst forms of child labour in shrimp and seafood processing areas of Thailand”

Bangkok 10-14 September 2012

Date / Time	Participants	Content
<b>Monday 10<sup>th</sup> September</b>		
	PIR Consultant, IPEC Project team, DWT Child Labour Specialist, Regional Evaluation Specialist, IPEC-Geneva, EIA	Finalise schedule and arrangements for meetings and workshops Review of documents as required
	PIR Consultant,	Separate meetings with ILO Country Director, CL Specialist, Project CTA, IPEC Geneva
	PIR Consultant with introduction by project staff	
<b>Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> September</b>		
All day	PIR Consultant, IPEC Project team, DWT Child Labour Specialist, Regional Evaluation Specialist, IPEC-Geneva, EIA, USDOL, DWT Specialists	Presentation and discussion on project objectives and status Presentation on the wider context of the project by the Decent Work Team in Bangkok
<b>Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> September</b>		
	PIR Consultant	Meeting with USDOL
	PIR Consultant, with introduction by project staff	Meeting with Department of Fisheries (DOF)
	PIR Consultant, with introduction by project staff	Meeting with Thailand Frozen Foods Association (TFFA)
After lunch	PIR Consultant, with introduction by project staff. Possibly ILO and USDOL if this is a review sub-workshop	Group meeting with NGO direct action implementing partners in Bangkok and Samut Sakhon Area and with researchers involved in Baseline Surveys and Industry mapping in Samut Sakhon (a focus group review workshop)
<b>Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> September</b>		
	Stakeholders' workshop. Project to provide a list of invitees. The project Task Force + ECOT, unions, IPEC Project team, DWT CL Specialist, Regional Evaluation Specialist, IPEC-Geneva, EIA, USDOL About 45 participants	Sharing of the national context and how the project fits Comments on the project by key partners Presentation on current status of project Presentation on important issues identified by the PIR facilitator Discussion on the identified issues
<b>Friday 14<sup>th</sup> September</b>		
Morning		Visit to Department of Labour Protection and Welfare (DLPW)
Afternoon	PIR Consultant and representatives from IPEC- Thailand, IPEC-Geneva, EIA, USDOL	Revision of Logical Framework by project decision-makers, attendance by PIR consultant as observer
<b>Saturday 15<sup>th</sup> September</b>		
Morning	PIR Consultant and representatives from IPEC- Thailand, IPEC-Geneva, EIA, USDOL	Follow-up meeting, implications of stakeholder discussions, clarification and next steps

### **Annex 3a: Stakeholders interviewed during the review**

#### **Government of Thailand, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Department of Fisheries**

Dr Waraporn Prompoj (Senior Expert on International Fisheries Affairs)  
Mr Pratheth Sorrak (Director of Legal Affairs Division)  
Ms Sasiwipa Tinwongger (Fisheries Biologist)  
Ms Surisa Noiin

#### **Government of Thailand, Ministry of Labour, Department of Labour, Protection and Welfare**

Ms Thineeporn Wacheesith (Sr. Labour Protection Specialist)  
Ms Supee Sritongtap (Labour Protection Specialist)  
Ms Preeyaporn Atthaphong  
Ms Suchitra Yooyen (Labour Officer, Practical Level)  
Ms Chatthewe Aruen (Labour Officer, Practical Level)

#### **Thai Frozen Foods Association (TFFA)**

Mr Kunyaphan Raengkhum (Senior Advisor)  
Mr Praphan Simasanti (Advisor-Labour)  
Ms Wacharawan Chomdong (Specialist)  
Ms Nareerat Junthong

#### **United States Department of Labor**

Ms. Sharon Heller, Division Chief, Asia/Europe/MENA  
Ms. Kimberly Parekh, Project Officer  
Ms. Lauren Damme, International Relations Officer

#### **ILO-IPEC**

Keith Jeddere-Fisher: (Senior Evaluation Officer, Geneva)  
Mr. Wahid Rahman (Asia Desk Officer, Geneva)  
Mr Tuomo Poutiainen, (CTA for the project)  
Ms Simrin Singh (technical advisor to the project/child labour specialist in ILO-IPEC's Decent Work Team)  
Ms Aatcharaporn Chaowahem (provincial coordinator for the project)  
Ms Taneeya Runcharoen (provincial coordinator for the project)

**Annex 3b: Focus group with implementing NGO partners on 12 September 2012**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Office</b>
Mr Montri Pekan (Executive Director)	Planned Parenthood Association of Thailand (PPAT)
Ms Srisak Thaiarry (Executive Director)	National Council for Child and Youth Development (NCYD)
Mr Teerapan Penroj	National Council for Child and Youth Development (NCYD)
Mr Theeradet Kunsanong	National Council for Child and Youth Development (NCYD)
Mr Chetha Munkhong (Manager)	Foundation for Child Development (FCD)
Ms Sribua Kantawong	Foundation for Child Development (FCD)
Ms Watcharabhorn Sa-Nguansin (Program Officer)	Raks Thai Bangkok
Mr Brahm Press (Program Officer)	Raks Thai Bangkok
Ms Jidapa Meepian (Researcher)	Thailand Development Research Institute Foundation (TDRI)
Dr Kiatanatha Lounkaew (Director)	Dhurakij Pundit Research Center (DPURC) Bangkok
Ms Mia Sorgenfrei	ILO Consultant
Ms Vachararutai Boontinand	ILO Consultant

#### Annex 4: Participants at stakeholder workshop on 13 September 2012

No.	Name	Office
1	Ms Thineeporn Wacheesith (Sr. Labour Protection Specialist)	Women, Child labour and labour Protection Network Group DLPW/MOL
2	Ms Supee Sritongtap (Labour Protection Specialist)	Women, Child labour and labour Protection Network Group DLPW/MOL
3	Ms Chatthewe Aruen (Labour Officer, Practical Level)	Women, Child labour and labour Protection Network Group, DLPW/MOL
4	Ms Suchitra Yooyen (Labour Officer, Practical Level)	Women, Child labour and labour Protection Network Group, DLPW/MOL
5	Ms Preeyaporn Atthaphong	Women, Child labour and labour Protection Network Group,DLPW/MOL
6	Ms Srisak Thaiarry (Executive Director)	National Council for Child and Youth Development (NCYD)
7	Mr Teerapan Penroj	National Council for Child and Youth Development (NCYD)
8	Mr Theeradet Kunsanong	National Council for Child and Youth Development (NCYD)
9	Mr Montri Pekan (Executive Director)	Planned Parenthood Association of Thailand (PPAT)
10	Mr Sakhon Satalalai	Planned Parenthood Association of Thailand (PPAT)
11	Ms Sribua Kantawong	Foundation for Child Development (FCD)
12	Mr Prachaya Boonsong	Foundation for Child Development (FCD)
13	Mr Chaiwat Seangtam	Foundation for Child Development (FCD)
14	Ms Prasobsuk Boranmoon	Foundation for Child Development (FCD)
15	Ms Watcharabhorn Sa-Nguansin Program Officer	Raks Thai Bangkok
16	Mr Brahm Press Program Officer	Raks Thai Bangkok
17	Mr Sompong Srakaew	Labour Rights Promotion Network Foundation
18	Ms Patima Thungpuchayakul	Labour Rights Promotion Network Foundation
19	Mr Yongyuth Chalamwong	Thailand Development Research Institute Foundation (TDRI)
20	Ms Jidapa Meepian	Thailand Development Research Institute Foundation (TDRI)
21	Dr Kiatanantha Lounkaew (Director)	Dhurakij Pundit Research Center (DPURC) Bangkok
22	Ms Saitong Suppama (Vice President)	Labour Congress of Thailand (LCT) Samut Prakarn
23	Ms Ussarin Kaewpradap (International Affairs Division)	State Enterprises Workers' Relations Confederation (SERC)
24	Ms Phyu Myat Thwe	State Enterprises Workers' Relations Confederation (SERC)
25	Mr Charoensak Koontong (Vice President)	Thai Trade Union Congress (TTUC) Samut Prakarn
26	Ms Kanlaya Sridaorueng	National Congress of Thai Labour (NCTL) Samut Prakarn
27	Khun Chutigarn Orntuam	National Congress Private Industrial of Employees (NCPE)
28	Mr Kunyaphan Raengkhum (Senior Advisor)	Thai Frozen Foods Association (TFFA) Email: kunyaphan@thai-frozen.or.th
29	Mr Praphan Simasanti (Advisor-Labour)	Thai Frozen Foods Association (TFFA) Email: praphan_si@thaiunion.co.th
30	Ms Wacharawan Chomdong (Specialist)	Thai Frozen Foods Association (TFFA) Email: wacharawan@thai-frozen.or.th

No.	Name	Office
31	Ms Nareerat Junthong	Thai Frozen Foods Association (TFFA)
32	Ms Sharon Heller	United State Department of Labor
33	Ms Mia Sorgenfrei	ILO Consultant
34	Ms Vachararutai Boontinand	ILO Consultant vboonti@yahoo.com
34	Mr Keith Jeddere-Fisher	Evaluation and Impact Assessment Section
35	Mr Geir Myrstad	ILO/IPEC Geneva
36	Ms Jittima Srisuknam	ILO CO-Bangkok
37	Ms Simrin Singh	ILO/DWT Bangkok
38	Mr Tuomo Poutiainen	ILO/IPEC Thailand
39	Ms Aphitchaya Nguanbanchong	ILO/IPEC Thailand
40	Ms Taneeya Runcharoen	ILO/IPEC Thailand
41	Ms Aatcharaporn Chaowahem	ILO/IPEC Thailand
42	Ms Suttida Chaikitsakol	ILO Consultant
43	Ms Supaporn Runtasevee	ILO/IPEC Thailand
44	Ms Chananthorn Thusathien	ILO/IPEC Thailand
45	Ms Sasee Chanprapun	Interpreter (ILO consultant)
46	Mr Tawanchai Xoomsai Na Ayudhaya	Interpreter (ILO consultant)
47	Dr Waraporn Prompoj Senior Expert on International Fisheries Affairs	Department of Fisheries
48	Mr Pratheth Sorrak Director	Legal Affairs Division Department of Fisheries
49	Ms Sasiwipa Tinwongger Fisheries Biologist	Marine Shrimp Culture Research Institute Department of Fisheries
50	Ms Surisa Noiin	Department of Fisheries

## Annex 5: Powerpoint presentation from ILO/IPEC on project progress

ASIAN 2006  
DECENT WORK  
DECADE 2015

**"Combating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Shrimp and Seafood Processing Areas in Thailand"**  
11 September 2012



DECENT WORK  
A Better Way of Working

**Why a project and what kind?**

- Agreement to establish a child labour project to respond to concerns about child labour, forced labour and migrant welfare in the sector
- Started officially in December 2010 – up to until the end of 2014 with a budget of US\$ 9 million
- Partnership between ILO-DLPW-DOF-ECOT, TFFA, Farmers and Workers' Organizations and civil society groups
- Uses a combination of direct services area based and supply chain strategies. Covers shrimp and seafood processing (farms, harvesting, primary processing and factories) but also other economic activities.

ASIAN 2006  
DECENT WORK  
DECADE 2015

DECENT WORK  
A Better Way of Working

**Objective and Outcomes**

To eliminate child labour in shrimp producing and processing areas in Thailand while ensuring decent working conditions throughout the industry

**OUTCOME 1: Policy and Implementation Frameworks on Child Labour Strengthened to protect the rights of Thai, stateless and migrant children in relation to labour, education, employment and social protection**

**OUTCOME 2: Enterprises across the shrimp industry supply chain comply with national labour laws, with special emphasis on child labour and forced labour, and institute good practice in working conditions**

**OUTCOME 3: Area-based education, social protection and livelihoods services provided to migrant and Thai children and their families in targeted shrimp and seafood industry areas**

**Project Areas**



- Samut Sakhon,
- Surat Thani
- Songkhla
- Nakhon Si Thammarat

**PROJECT TIMELINE**

START UP

- ACTIVITY PLANNING
- PARTNERSHIPS
- BASELINE
- MAPPING
- CMES
- DIRECT SERVICES
- DEFINING HCL
- EDUCATION / LIVELIHOODS SERVICES
- PROVINCIAL PO/CLM
- HCL GUIDELINES
- HCL RESEARCH
- GLP TRAINING
- CAPACITY BUILDING
- IMPACT EVALUATION
- PIR
- POLICY INPUTS
- MODEL VALIDATION
- LESSONS LEARNED
- SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS
- NAP 2015
- EVALUATION

ILO IPEC THAILAND

30/12/10 - 31/12/14

Dec 2010 Jul 2011 Feb 2012 Sep 2013 Nov 2014 Jun 2014

**Key Events and Progress Made:**

- Partnership building
  - RGT - Exchange of Letters between ILO and DLPW to confirm project arrangements and direction in Jan/Feb 2012
  - Provincial Governors Offices engaged and supportive: Courtesy calls with all 4 Governors between Feb-May 2012
  - Provincial level discussion with DLPW on joint work under the auspice of the Provincial Operation Centers (POC) process

ASIAN 2006  
DECENT WORK  
DECADE 2015

DECENT WORK  
A Better Way of Working

**Key Events and Progress Made:**

- Trade Union consultations between Jan-June 2012 leading into a draft action plan on protection of migrant workers and their families co ILO TRIANGLE project on Migration.
- ECOT and TFFA involved with ECOT members meeting in May 2012 and with active joint planning and consultations meetings with TFFA members.

**TFFA launched their policy against child labour and forced labour in June 12<sup>th</sup> 2012.**

- Direct Action planning process between Feb-June 2012 with NGOs and community organizations on education, social protection and livelihoods support to Thai and migrant workers and families

ASIAN 2006  
DECENT WORK  
DECADE 2015

**DECENT WORK**  
Labour and Livelihoods

**Key Events and Progress Made:**

2. Knowledge base

**Baseline Research and Industry mapping:**

- Provincial child labour survey field work conducted with results being analyzed
- Industry mapping in Samut Sakhon conducted together with DOF and TFFA
- Plan for **Impact Evaluation project** to support testing of the transition education model in Samut Sakhon
- Plan for additional surveys on HCL in other agricultural sectors in 2013 by DLPW

ASIAN 2006  
DECENT WORK  
DECADE 2015

**DECENT WORK**  
Labour and Livelihoods

**INDUSTRY MAPPING SURVEY**

586 facilities mapped 502 profiled:

- 24.8% produce shrimp
- 75.2% produce other seafood products
- 1/3 have been in operation 3 year or less
- 1/5 been in operation for more than 10 years

**Key Events and Progress Made:**

3. Key Activity Areas

3.1 **Hazardous Child Labour List Process:**

= Draft HCL list for the industry sector that can be used as an input to the revision of the national HCL list and for guidance on HCL for the industry. Additional thematic briefs are required on heat, weights and heights

ASIAN 2006  
DECENT WORK  
DECADE 2015

**DECENT WORK**  
Labour and Livelihoods

**Key Events and Progress Made:**

3.2 **Labour Inspection Management Workshop in Thailand**, DLPW and ILO-IPEC, 28-29 June 2012

- inputs to future joint activities on improvement of labour inspection

3.3 **Safe Work for Youth** campaign and project development co DLPW –BOSH

- Guidance Note and OSH materials
- Safe Work for Youth Campaign

ASIAN 2006  
DECENT WORK  
DECADE 2015

**DECENT WORK**  
Labour and Livelihoods

**Direct Beneficiary Planning**

-Formal education.....	2500	7500 children
-Non formal education .....	2500	
-Better Working Conditions..	2500	
- Livelihoods.....	2500	3000 families
- Legal services.....	500	
<b>TOT: 10,500 beneficiaries</b>		

Current beneficiaries 233 CL and 513 CAHR

ASIAN 2006  
DECENT WORK  
DECADE 2015

**DECENT WORK**  
Labour and Livelihoods



### ACTION PROGRAMMES

- 1) Promoting the rights to education and legal protection for working children and migrants in Samut Sakhon – LPN
- 2) Advocacy on the Protection of Young Migrant Workers in Seafood Processing Areas in Thailand and in sending countries National Council of Child and Youth Development
- 3) Promoting Education, Social Protection and Safe Work for Migrant Children and Teen Workers in Seafood Processing Areas (Samut Sakhon & Samut Prakan) - FCD
- 4) Migrant Rights and Child Protection in Surat Thani Province - Raks Thai
- 5) Promoting life quality for disadvantaged children and migrant workers in Songkhla Province – Stella Maris – to be finalized
- 6) Protection of Child Labourers in Hazardous Work in Shrimp and Seafood Industries to ensure safe work and to provide health services in Songkhla and Nakhon Si Thammarat Provinces – PPAT

ASIAN 2006 DECENT WORK DECADE 2015

DECENT WORK  
Labour and Education

### LOCATION

ASIAN 2006 DECENT WORK DECADE 2015

DECENT WORK  
Labour and Education

### Links Between Policy and Area Based Service

Provisions

ASIAN 2006 DECENT WORK DECADE 2015

DECENT WORK  
Labour and Education

### Policy Influence

INFORMS -> New National Action Plan for 2015  
-> National CL Survey

ASIAN 2006 DECENT WORK DECADE 2015

DECENT WORK  
Labour and Education

### Key Activities

**Development of a Good Labour Practices (GLP) programme:**  
on Child Labour, Forced Labour and Migrant Labour Issues

- CONCEPT BEING DEVELOPED – what to do next?
- > A joint advisory committee to decide on scale, focus and implementation
- > Expected to be focused on peeling sheds
- > Are there any expectations from the market the industry needs to respond to?
- > This will address awareness, common understanding on CL but will it prevent and be effective on HCL at the workplace?

ASIAN 2006 DECENT WORK DECADE 2015

DECENT WORK  
Labour and Education


### Key intended FOCUS of GLP

- Direct CL Awareness
- HCL and OSH Training to informal levels by DLPW/DOF/TFFA
- Complimented by NGO reach out
- TFFA Echo training/support to raise standards
- Improved registration - DLPW
- Improved quality and food safety standards DOF

ASIAN 2006 DECENT WORK DECADE 2015

DECENT WORK  
Labour and Education

**CURRENT PLANS – is this too much ?**




- > Working with Farmers Associations (Charter against CL and OSH in Aquaculture)
- > Finalization and dissemination of the research studies
- > Completing the Trade Union plan of action
- > Active implementation of the direct services projects in coordination with the POCs feeding into policy through NCYD forums
- > Joint determination of scope and emphasis of GLP
- > Continuity of technical inputs to the National HCL list
- > Development of the Impact Evaluation project on transitional education in SS in support of education for all policies
- > Considering new agriculture sector HCL child surveys
- > ECOT collaboration on business and labour rights

ASIAN 2006  
DECENT WORK  
DECADE 2015



**What to do?**



- Focus – rights strategy at the right level...
- Select impactful priorities
- Support implementation
- Ensure common understanding
- Document process
- Communicate, Communicate and Communicate -> everyone on same page.
- Diverse stakeholder base – diverse roles and expectations
- One project for all (?) - a need for a common vision

ASIAN 2006  
DECENT WORK  
DECADE 2015

Thank you

