



# Evaluation Summary



International  
Labour  
Office

Evaluation  
Office

## *A programme to reduce WFCL in tobacco growing communities in Brazil & Malawi – Joint Independent Final Evaluation*

### Quick Facts

**Countries:** *Brazil & Malawi*

**Final Evaluation:** *06/2014*

**Evaluation Mode:** *Joint Independent*

**Administrative Office:** *ILO/IPEC*

**Technical Office:** *ILO/IPEC*

**Evaluation Manager:** *ILO/IPEC*

**Evaluation Consultants:** *Jose Maria Alvarez Vega (international), George Vilili (Malawi), Ricardo Caldas (Brazil)*

**Project Code:** *GLO/11/52/JTI  
BRA/11/50/JTI  
MLW/11/50/JTI*

**Donors & Budget:** *JTI (Total: US\$ 8'026'002)*

**Keywords:** *Child Labour; Agriculture*

21 April and 5 May and to Brazil between 7 and 21 May. In each of the countries, this latter phase culminated with a National Workshop organized with the aim of presenting and discussing the preliminary results gathered.

### Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

The 'Achieving Reduction of Child Labour in Supporting Education' (ARISE) Programme forms part of a JTI strategy to contribute to eliminating child labour (CL) in its global supply chain. ARISE's role within this strategy is to "*address the social and economic factors that drive small-holder tobacco farmers to engage children in hazardous work*". The programme has taken a holistic approach to involve the community in a common effort to prevent and eliminate CL. This is ensured through: (a) improvements in education, opportunity and awareness, (b) fostering economic empowerment for tobacco-growing communities, and (c) promoting an improved regulatory framework for the reduction of CL. These are known as the "Three Pillars" of the ARISE Programme and they are being implemented in Brazil, Malawi and Zambia. In addition, the programme includes a "Global Training Program (GTP)", the aim of which is to strengthen the capacity of JTI staff to achieve the objective of reducing and progressively eliminating CL in JTI's tobacco supply chain.

ARISE is promoted and funded by JTI and operates through a partnership between the three organizations mentioned above. The following is a brief summary of the type of activities these organizations have carried out in each country:

### Background & Context

The Programme "*ARISE Reduction of Child Labour in supporting Education (Global, Brazil and Malawi)*" has been managed and implemented by a consortium of three organizations: the International Labour Organization (ILO) via its International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC), Winrock International (WI) and Japanese Tobacco International (JTI). The evaluation began on 10 March 2014 with the desk study phase, and this was in turn followed by the field work phase which included visits to both countries: to Malawi between

- **WI activities in Malawi:** Awareness raising on CL issues, Model Farm School (MSF), Women Agribusiness Groups, Start-ups, Family Support Scholarships (FSS), After School Activities, support the set-up and follow-up of the Community Child Labour Committee (CCLC) under ILO's supervision and guidance, other Community Led Initiatives;
- **WI activities in Brazil:** Awareness raising, After School Programme, Women Agribusiness Groups and Model Farm School;
- **ILO activities in Malawi:** (a) Direct Action: Set up of Community and District CL committees and their further monitoring, establishment of community based CL systems, vocational training, apprenticeships, awareness raising, income generating activities (IGA), entrepreneurship and credit, occupational safety and health (OSH), empowerment through organization; and (b) Improving regulatory framework;
- **ILO activities in Brazil:** Awareness, learning environment, strengthening of the rights guarantee system/network, OSH, improved regulatory framework.

In order to ensure the coherence of the whole operation and obtain synergies between the individual projects at country and local levels, all parties have opted to establish a Programme Coordinating Mechanism (PCM) at the international and country levels. The PCM is composed of three main entities: 1) The International Advisory Committee (IAC), 2) The Programme Coordinating Team (PCT) and 3) the Country Coordinating Committees (CCC).

### Methodology of evaluation

Generally, the methodology is constituted by a judicious combination of quantitative and qualitative techniques. A particular emphasis is placed on the latter, given that the majority of the objectives and results sought by the Programme are based around the strengthening of capacities – something for which qualitative approaches are judged more adequate. This has resulted in the specific application of the following six tools: document reviews, semi-structured individual interviews, group discussions, focus groups, direct observation and questionnaires. The evaluation team considered these as tools that are easily applied, and which would allow information to be obtained and analysed in relatively short amounts of time – a requirement for this evaluation. It is

important to note that the methodological approaches applied have been somewhat challenged by the need to combine the individual analysis of each individual project with the desire to obtain a picture of the performance and impact of the programme as a whole. The main tool applied for this purpose has been the matrix for the criteria and evaluation questions.

### Main Findings & Conclusions

**Relevance:** The programme has responded to the real needs of an extensive and varied list of the beneficiaries and stakeholders, both individuals and institutions, at the policy level and at the direct or targeted action level. It has managed to break through different political and ideological sensibilities and promote a constructive dialogue around the sensitive issue of CL in the tobacco supply chains. The programme has clear linkages with national policies and plans in both countries and it has lent continuity to ongoing efforts against CL. In some cases, it has supported the development of those national policies via the replication of models, the empowerment of local structures and the provision of technical assistance for debates on crucial issues, (mostly the case of Malawi).

**Design:** It is difficult to assess the design of the ARISE programme as a whole since there is no consolidated Project Document against which to make this assessment. Precisely, it has been found that the set-up of the programme has shown some problems mainly related to the difficulty of harmoniously integrating four different projects that had been designed following different protocols yet targeting the same population (two in each country). This finding, however, concerns the joint design and does not evaluate each organization's own design protocol.

**Implementation and delivery of products and services:** The evaluation has observed that the above-mentioned points conditioned the subsequent execution of the programme to differing degrees. However, thanks to the extensive experience and commitment of the different teams, these issues have not had critical consequences. The programme has managed to deliver a broad list of products and services in spite of the shortfalls of the design and in compliance with the expected standards of quality and quantity. The performance of the programme at the different territorial levels (communities, municipalities and districts) has been highly satisfactory in each of the three pillars.

The Pillar on Education and Awareness has achieved a high degree of success in all cases. The activities have helped to fill significant gaps and the programme has been flexible and adaptable in order to meet the real needs and demands of the target groups. It is also important to highlight the efforts to introduce the CLMS in Malawi.

Under the Economic Pillar, a wide list of services (training, start-ups and technical assistance) has been delivered. The level of satisfaction expressed by the members of the community regarding this component is equally high. It is observed, however, that the activities within this Pillar have had a greater impact on generating enthusiasm and changing socio-cultural paradigms – particularly in connection with the role of women in the economic activity – than on providing economic alternatives.

With regard to the Regulatory Pillar, it may be said that significant efforts in both countries regarding the construction and execution of plans and policies have been made. The readiness and openness of the communities and institutions to collaborate is considered to have been extremely high.

**Governance and Co-ordination:** Along the implementation process, some issues were reported concerning co-ordination. Some of them could be considered common problems for an intervention of this nature and there are grounds to believe that most will resolve themselves via dialogue and reflection on the practices. Others, however, might reflect deeper structural problems regarding the governance structure and the terms and conditions that sustain the partnership. A strength is the opportunity to build an innovative and synergetic venture around the extensive wealth expertise brought by the partners. A weakness is the overlapping of functions and the difficulties to optimize resources and the materialization of the potential synergies. The evaluation has observed a sharp division of opinion about which side prevails. On the one hand, the partnership represents in itself a comparative advantage, albeit susceptible to improvement. On the other hand, the triangular partnership in its current format does not have the capacity to exploit properly the comparative advantages of the partners because those advantages have not been properly identified and articulated.

**Monitoring Systems:** Concerning the monitoring of Direct Beneficiaries there has been a discussion,

which has not been fully resolved. **In the case of Brazil**, the concept of ‘withdrawal’ has been practically discarded, on the basis that, given the specific context of Rio Grande do Sul, it is one that is particularly difficult to verify. The concept of prevention has been kept, however it is not clear whether the measurements are necessarily being carried out over a vulnerable cohort. The proposal, which has been put forward, is to use the concept of “reduction”, but the criteria to measure that reduction have not been defined yet. **In the case of Malawi**, it has not been possible to use a common system and on the whole, the picture is one of fragmentation. The evaluation team believes that the direct beneficiary monitoring and reporting (DBMR) applied by ILO in previous interventions and which had the endorsement of the Ministry of Labour should have been the only model applied. A stronger dialogue between the three partners around the issue at the beginning of the process would have been desirable, together with the corresponding budgets allocations.

Regarding the monitoring of the outputs, outcomes and impacts, the programme has a significant gap, especially in relation to the last two categories. Again, this was likely associated with the deficiencies in the design process. The use of the Integrated Logical Framework for each country as a management tool or for monitoring purposes has been unequal and therefore it has not served as a tool to integrate the ARISE diversity. ILO’s protocols contemplate the use of Log frame as a basis for planning and monitoring and, in fact, it can be observed that the ILO’s Technical Progress Reports (TPR) follow the Log frame structure. In any case, the evaluation team believes that, with slight differences between ILO and WI, the Logical Frameworks designed were not fully well chosen by their respective technicians and managers and this has limited their use and application. In some cases, these were deemed not to respond to minimum standards of quality and in others, they were not considered to contain adequate proposals.

**Effect and impacts triggered by the programme:** Despite the shortcomings of the Monitoring System concerning outcomes and impacts, the evaluation has been able to identify a series of dynamics in the geographical areas of intervention that can reasonably be attributed to the activities of the programme. The qualitative assessment carried out by the evaluation team was able to identify impacts in the following areas: (a) Engagement in education, (b) Awareness

about CL and its risks, (c)) Other changes in cultural and socio-economic paradigms, (d) Income and job opportunities, (e) Empowered communities, and (f) Institutional and regulatory framework. Similarly, the data, opinions and other information gathered by the team attest to a trend of reduction in CL in the tobacco growing communities, which have been served by the programme. The data and testimonies are perhaps more impressive in Brazil, although this trend is more or less present in both countries.

Some of the respondents described the programme as a “High Impact-Low Scale” intervention and the evaluation team fundamentally agrees with that description. Indeed, most of the information gathered during the fieldwork stage points to the conclusion that the combined formula that the programme has applied in each case has yielded good results to those local communities and expanded areas that have directly benefit from its actions. Some questions might be raised concerning the cost-effectiveness and the scalability of the model, particularly in Malawi where the juxtaposition of the ILO and WI packages has resulted – from the evaluation’s point of view – in an over-comprehensive package.

### Recommendations

**1. Concerning the terms and conditions of the partnership.** To carry out a specific self-review of the terms and conditions of the partnership. There are some crucial questions to be addressed to unblock some of the governance and coordination issues, which have been raised.

**2. Concerning the management of complexity.** Complexity requires a judicious combination of strategic and adaptive management. In this case, – perhaps because of the innovative nature of the experience – that difficult balance has not been fully achieved and the idea of constructing the strategy along the process of implementation has been the approach that has prevailed. In an intervention as extensive as this, with many elements of diversity involved, there is a need to reinforce those preparatory phases and practices that contribute to the integration of those differences. Bearing this in mind, it is proposed to establish some common protocols, routines and benchmarks for design, monitoring, and reporting. Those protocols should push towards a more unified design process in each country and require some sort of standardization regarding the tasks, the timing and the outputs expected of this process. In addition, it seems important to clarify what

the purpose of the baseline would be and what structure the project monitoring system would take. As for the monitoring of the Direct Beneficiaries, the suggestion is to use the ILO/DBMR as the default system. The management of sustainability is another area that might need a common frame in terms of the analysis and tools to be applied. In general, the evaluation team believes that the development of the protocols and procedures should consider reinforcing the use of the Logical Framework and its associated methodologies.

**3. Concerning the design process.** To dedicate a specific amount of time (typically 2-4 months) and resources to apply a specific design methodology that includes all of the standard stages and tasks of this process. JTI could take on a coordination and leadership role at this point in order to encourage the construction of a common design itinerary, which leads to a common Project Document for each country.

**4. Concerning the monitoring system of the whole programme.** The following are some suggestions:

The Key Performance Indicators should be those included in the Log frame. Another possible improvement in the monitoring system would be to articulate a bigger involvement of the JTI Leaf Technicians. If provided with a framework (points that they could pay attention to), the Leaf Technicians could become an invaluable source of information.

Another possibility that could be considered is the outsourcing of the monitoring tasks at least to set up and test the system. In the long run, monitoring activities should also fit into the routines of the local structures.

**5. Concerning the concept of Child Reduction.** It would be important to draw up some criteria in order to better define the concept of ‘reduction’ and thus be able monitor its progress. As suggested in this document, one way to do this would be to consider the number of hours worked weekly via a mini-survey, which is repeated periodically.

**6. Concerning the implementation arrangements in each country.** There should be an analysis to establish the most cost-efficient formulae through which each programme’s continuation can be ensured.

*See the full report for more details.*