



# Evaluation Summary



International  
Labour  
Office

Evaluation  
Office

## *Tackling child labour through education (TACKLE) – Final External Evaluation*

### Quick Facts

**Countries:** *Kenya, Zambia, Sudan, Madagascar, Mali, Angola, Jamaica, Papua New Guinea, Fiji, Guyana and Sierra Leone*

**Final Evaluation:** *07/2013*

**Evaluation Mode:** *Independent*

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

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

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

#### **Evaluation Consultants:**

*Mr. Seán J. Burke, Dr. Bernardita Cárdenas, Gaspar Estevao, Joycelyn T. Williams, Ruth Jankee, Dr. John Mugo, Désiré Razafindrazaka, Bengaly Abraham, Tracy-Ann Shields, Kombah Pessima, Samia Nihar, Joan Teria, Elizabeth Jere*

**Project Code:** *INT/05/24/EEC*

**Donors & Budget:** *€ 16 366 199 (US \$23'138'836)  
EC contribution: € 15'000'000 (US\$ 21'177'315.15)  
ILO contribution: € 1'366'199 (US\$ 1'961'520.46)*

**Keywords:** *Child Labour; Education; Poverty;  
Legal frameworks*

### Background & Context

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

The Tackling Child Labour through Education (TACKLE) project of the ILO was implemented by its International Programme on the Elimination of Child

Labour (IPEC). A final independent evaluation was requested by the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP) secretariat of the EC, the main donor of the TACKLE project. This evaluation covers the entire period of project implementation, from 1 March 2008 until 31 August 2013. The evaluation was conducted by an external evaluation team from MDF Training and Consultancy, the Netherlands, from May to August 2013. The evaluation team consisted of three international consultants and 13 national consultants from Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific region. This team of 16 consultants conducted country field reviews in all twelve countries where the TACKLE project was implemented. The final evaluation report is delivered in four separate volumes:

- Volume I contains the overall and global analysis of the TACKLE project;
- Volume II presents the 12 different country reviews;
- Volume III contains the reports of the country level TACKLE multi-stakeholder focus group meetings;
- Volume IV contains the research methods and instruments used in the evaluation process.

In consultation with the ACP secretariat at the European Commission, 11 countries were identified to start up and roll out the tackling CL actions in this project. Two countries were selected in the Pacific region (Fiji and Papua New Guinea) and in the Caribbean (Guyana and Jamaica). In Africa seven countries participated: Angola, Kenya, Madagascar, Mali, Sierra Leone, the Sudan and Zambia. The work in the Sudan included Northern and Southern Sudan, when South Sudan separated from the Sudan it became the twelfth country in the TACKLE project.

The TACKLE project was funded by the European Commission, and ILO/IPEC provided a small own contribution of 5 per cent of the total project costs. The total project budget was 16,116,199 Euro for a period of five and a half years (this includes 18 month no-cost extension awarded by the EC in 2011 until 31 August 2013 due to a slow start to the project). By 31 May 2013 a total of 14,893,897 Euro had been spent, which is 92 per cent of the total project budget. With three more months to go until the formal end of the project on 31 August 2013 it can be expected that the budget depletion will be around 100 per cent.

In 2010/2011 a Mid-Term Review was conducted by an external evaluation team and discussed in an international conference of tripartite partners in all TACKLE countries. This review served as an instrument to adapt and fine-tune the TACKLE project in the remaining period of implementation, and recommended the 18 month no-cost extension of the project.

### **Purpose, scope and objectives of the evaluation:**

The purpose of this evaluation was to review the progress and performance of the project, assess the extent to which the project has achieved its objectives, review the nature and magnitude of constraints and challenges faced during implementation, as well as identify and analyse the factors that affected its implementation and how these factors have contributed to the project's success. This evaluation also assessed how the project has responded to changes that have taken place during the project implementation period. Finally, it identified lessons learned to contribute to the already identified set of good practices and review the sustainability plans and mechanisms that the project has strived to put in place in some of the project countries.

This evaluation also looked at the TACKLE project within the broader context of operations – nationally, regionally and institutionally – in the framework of ILO's strategy. This was done to provide some input to the broader strategic work of the ILO as an institution seeking to influence global discussions on combating CL through education, including the TACKLE project's contribution to this.

The overall objective of the TACKLE project was to contribute towards poverty reduction in the least

developed countries by providing equitable access to basic education and skills development to the most disadvantaged section of the society. The overall objective was translated into four main result areas, under which the TACKLE actions and outputs were delivered. These result areas were:

1. Improved country level CL and education legal framework exists in project countries through support to its preparation or strengthening it where it already exists.
2. Strengthened institutional capacity leading to improved ability to formulate and implement CL strategies.
3. Targeted actions to combat CL designed and implemented to develop effective demonstration models.
4. Enhanced knowledge base and networks on CL and education through improved advocacy and dissemination of good practices.

### **Methodology of evaluation**

- Meta-analysis of policy and programming documents;
- Result-chain analysis (including the analysis of TACKLE project intervention logic);
- Analysis of country and project implementation documents;
- Collection of data through qualitative and structured interviews;
- Collection of opinions and appreciations of TACKLE stakeholders data through a questionnaire and a survey;
- Focus group meetings and conference to present, discuss and cross-check data;
- Triangulation of data in the process of analysis and synthesis of information in the final evaluation report.

The following steps were followed:

1. Desk study (May – July 2013).
2. Online Survey to TACKLE supported participants of international training at ITC in Turin (May – July 2013).
3. Interviews with key informants (May – July 2013).
4. Twelve country reviews (May-June 2013).
5. First incomplete draft evaluation report (25 June 2013).

6. International TACKLE stakeholders meeting at the ACP secretariat in Brussels (2 and 3 July 2013) for presentation and discussion of preliminary evaluation findings.
7. Second and final draft evaluation report (31 July 2013).
8. Final evaluation report (July 2013).

## Main Findings & Conclusions

### **Key findings about the TACKLE project results and implementation**

Among the project's wealth of results, the most important achievements of the TACKLE project are:

#### *Result 1: Legal frameworks:*

- In all TACKLE countries, improvements in CL and children's enrolment and retention in schools have been obtained. All TACKLE countries are adhering to the relevant ILO conventions;
- In most of TACKLE countries Hazardous Work lists have been developed that are important instruments to tackle the worst form of CL;
- Ministries of Labour and Education have taken a strong ownership of the TACKLE project and show commitment to continue to cooperate in tackling CL issues.

#### *Result 2: Strengthened institutional capacities:*

- A large number of staff members from TACKLE implementing partners have been trained at the ITC in Turin;
- In all TACKLE countries training courses and workshops have been delivered, and in most cases these capacity-development activities reached out to all relevant stakeholders, the Ministries of Labour and Education, employers' organizations, trade unions and NGOs;
- Specific modules, curricula and methods for educating children in risk situations have been developed and implemented in most of the TACKLE countries. Schools have also developed and strengthened their mechanisms and tools to monitor school retention of children and to take action when needed.

#### *Result 3: Targeted actions to combat child labour:*

- In all TACKLE countries Action Programmes (APs) were implemented to target vulnerable children and their families. According to the TACKLE reports of March 2013, 6,707 children in CL benefited from APs and 10,395 children in vulnerable situations were targeted. Although these numbers of children benefiting from TACKLE APs can be confirmed in the ILO's DBMR monitoring system, it is difficult to assess if these participating children are effectively and sustainably withdrawn or prevented from CL;
- The APs have generated a series of good practices and lessons learned that can be replicated and rolled out in other contexts. According to ILO/IPEC reporting, this had already occurred 30 times by March 2013;
- The APs have provided an opportunity for local partners to develop and implement actions. At the start of the TACKLE project the level of capacity of many local partners was rather low, but towards the end a clear progress in capacity development was observed.

#### *Result 4: Enhanced knowledge base through improved advocacy and dissemination of good practices:*

- The TACKLE project has produced brochures and publications on best practices that are widely disseminated at the national and international level;
- The World Day Against Child Labour in most of the TACKLE countries has developed into a massive and powerful instrument to bring the issue of CL to the attention of the general public;
- Many studies, research and action research were realized, published and made available to wider audiences.

The 12 countries in which the TACKLE project was implemented are very different in terms of size, regional integration, cultural and socio-demographic characteristics as well as economic characteristics. But in each country the topics of CL and integration and continued enrolment of children withdrawn or prevented from CL were identified as an important priority. The TACKLE project achieved ownership and involvement of the Ministry of Labour and Ministry of Education in all the countries, and in most cases it has also managed to involve employers' and workers' organizations and NGOs in project steering committees and in implementation of activities.

The level of progress and the results achieved in the TACKLE project vary between the countries due to a number of factors:

- Country performance in TACKLE seems to be directly related to the historic and current in-country presence of the ILO which had a clear positive influence on the effectiveness and performance of local partners' implementation of the project;
- Situations of (emerging from) conflict and political instability had a clear influence on TACKLE project progress and achievements. In these situations it is clearly more difficult to maintain a good rhythm of activities and also to translate and embed progress achieved at the technical level at the policy level. Government attention in conflict and difficult political situations is focused on other matters;
- The level of capacity of core implementing partners had a great influence on the speed of progress of TACKLE. Low capacities of local partners caused delays in programme formulation and in project development and implementation;
- The existing experience and practice of tripartite social dialogue and multi-stakeholder cooperation influenced the scope and outreach of TACKLE activities in each country.

The evaluators identified three countries which achieved the most progress and results: Fiji, Kenya and Zambia.

A second group of four countries made considerable progress and achieved good results: Madagascar, Guyana and Jamaica and did so in a situation of relative stability, while, impressively, Mali and Sierra Leone managed this in a context of current and recent conflict.

Implementation was more challenging in the four remaining countries – Angola, Papua New Guinea, South Sudan, and the Sudan – which were hampered by conflict and post-conflict situations and capacity constraints in emerging local institutions. Although TACKLE achieved results in these countries, the achievements are less pronounced than in the other TACKLE countries.

### **Key conclusions**

This evaluation has developed conclusions at three different levels:

- Conclusions on strategic issues at the level of overall policy and methodology in relation to tackling CL through education. These are relevant for all direct stakeholders in the TACKLE project, and are presented in section 4.1;
- Conclusions on management and implementation issues related to the TACKLE project, mainly of interest to ILO/IPEC and implementing partners, presented in section 4.2;
- Conclusions on policy, strategy and implementation of the TACKLE project specifically at the country level. These conclusions are particularly relevant for local implementing partners and local stakeholders and ILO/IPEC. They are presented in section 4.3 and further elaborated in the country reports in Volume II of this evaluation report.

In this executive summary only the overall conclusions are summarized:

1. After a slow start, the TACKLE project reached full steam in implementation and, by the end of March 2013, had produced a vast amount of outputs and achieved many results.
2. Some countries show strong and solid achievements in the TACKLE project, such as Fiji, Kenya and Zambia, while some other countries are somewhat lagging behind, such as Angola, Papua New Guinea, South Sudan and the Sudan. Four critical factors influenced country performance: the physical presence of the ILO in the country, past or present conflict and political instability, existing levels of local capacity and existing experience in tripartite social dialogue and cooperation.
3. Ownership of the TACKLE project at the country level was guaranteed through MoUs with national Government partners. The partnership with Ministries of Education has been particularly innovating: education is currently considered by TACKLE partners critical to combat CL.
4. A challenge in local participation and ownership lies in meaningful involvement of trade unions, employers and NGOs in the TACKLE project. The project did not achieve full participation of the tripartite ILO constituency and NGOs in all TACKLE countries.

5. A specific challenge for involving trade unions and employers in TACKLE countries is reaching out to the informal economy, where a lot of CL occurs. For these social partners it is difficult to reach out to target groups and achieve a membership base in the informal sector.
6. CL is an urban and rural phenomenon. It is often easier to implement actions, enforce policies and provide services in urban areas. Although TACKLE has included rural and remote areas in the APs it has faced more difficulties in achieving sustainable results and impact in these places.
7. The TACKLE project has clearly been relevant in all participating countries. The link between CL and local policies was generally recognized by all stakeholder groups. The awareness-raising effects on the importance of tackling CL are impressive.
8. The multi-stakeholder nature of the TACKLE project is widely recognized as a strong point of the project. The TACKLE project has had effective Steering Committees in most countries. Multi-stakeholder cooperation on the ground remains a challenge, because not much practice in this has been built and in some countries institutions for social dialogue are still poorly developed.
9. Local activities in the TACKLE APs can benefit from local social dialogue and cooperation with local partners to increase perspectives for institutional and financial sustainability.
10. In many TACKLE countries, trust and close cooperation between Ministries of Labour and Education were good. However, this was not the case in all countries. Also in some other countries, other Ministries with relevant mandates covering children (and women) and education were not sufficiently involved.
11. In most countries participating in TACKLE, challenges and bottlenecks in the education system and policies go well beyond the scope of the TACKLE project and maybe even the ILO mandate. These contextual factors have limited project implementation and impact, despite the commitment of management and staff in the Ministries of Education.
12. Although most TACKLE countries have initiated a good number of legislative reforms, these reforms are usually slow to be implemented and rolled out at the national level. Translation of legislation into effective implementation and enforcement takes a long time, beyond the TACKLE project duration.
13. Much of the capacity development efforts in TACKLE focused on the provision of training to individual participants. However, investments in training individuals can easily trickle away because people can change positions and organizations and political changes can cause significant turn-over of staff in key ministries. Alternative and more collective and organizational capacity development interventions have not yet been sufficiently explored in the TACKLE project.
14. The direct material support in the APs that was provided to families, parents and children has been extremely important to achieve effective (re)integration of children from poor families in schools. However, in most countries the financial sustainability of this support has not been secured beyond the TACKLE project. Furthermore, some of the support modalities in the APs are not sufficiently empowering local beneficiaries and children to improve their situation, and are even creating dependency of them on external material support. APs have successfully allowed staff of partner ministries or NGOs to take ownership and responsibility and mainstream CL issues in their institutions and organizations. Elaboration and implementation of APs regularly faced significant delays because of capacity constraints among implementing national partners.
15. Visibility of actions in TACKLE and particularly of the results achieved by it could be stronger, although this visibility since the MTR has noticeably improved. Now that the TACKLE project is ending further improvements in visibility can be expected.
16. Sustainability of actions supported by TACKLE in the longer term presents an overall challenge. Towards the end of the project, the financial sustainability of TACKLE APs was not yet secured in many cases, and sustainability workshops in several countries had not yet provided sufficient solutions and perspective.
17. Poor availability and quality of data are a challenge in CL and education retention interventions. In spite of efforts made, data

collection and analysis is not yet systematic and of sufficient quality, and in some countries it is not yet shared and exchanged. Within the TACKLE project, presentation of data on withdrawal and/or prevention of CL is done at the output level, while it would be more relevant to produce such data at the outcome level.

18. Regional cooperation has occurred between TACKLE countries and there are practices of joint training and exchange of lessons learned. However, regional cooperation is not systematic and TACKLE has not yet achieved a real international level of joint programming and implementation.

## Recommendations

### Main recommendations and follow-up:

The key recommendations in this evaluation report are organized according to specific strategic challenges and are briefly summarized below. For the further elaboration of the recommendations, the reader is referred to chapter 5 of this report.

*On forwarding the Tackling Child Labour Agenda in policies and legal frameworks of ACP countries:*

- I. Implementing partners, ILO and ACP/EC are recommended to look into possibilities for continued efforts in tackling CL in ACP countries.
- II. ILO/IPEC is recommended to develop a more comprehensive strategy to complement legislative reforms on CL with effective implementation, monitoring and enforcement. This strategy could include phasing of interventions, by moving from support to development of legal frameworks in a first phase to support for implementation and enforcement in a next phase.
- III. ACP/EC could make an inventory of its Child Labour, Social Protection and Education experiences in ACP countries and investigate where more direct relations and cooperation with the TACKLE project and other ILO/IPEC projects on CL is desirable.

*On linking tackling child labour strategies and actions of Ministries of Labour and Education and possible other ministries in ACP countries:*

IV. ILO/IPEC at the start of CL and education interventions should make a stakeholder map to ensure that all relevant stakeholders are on board CL projects. This may require expanding the number of ministries as in some countries other relevant ministries can contribute to CL projects, such as Ministries of Youth and Social Welfare.

V. Implementing partners and ILO/IPEC are recommended to document and use the participatory multi-stakeholder approach in the design and inception stage of the TACKLE project for other projects that require multi-stakeholder approaches. The instrument of MoUs with different Ministries deserves replication in similar CL-related projects, but MoUs should be more precise in delineating tasks and responsibilities between the different ministries.

VI. ILO/IPEC needs to develop a more coherent approach and strategy to deal with issues related to education. Some bottlenecks in the education system, such as securing achieving education for all (EFA) and providing alternative forms of education, non-formal education (including for nomadic target-groups) and Financing of Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) are part of the mandate of other UN organizations, particularly UNESCO and UNICEF.

More coordination between national Ministries and ILO/IPEC and other UN organizations and EU Delegations in TACKLE countries is needed to remove some of the bottlenecks that hinder the full achievement of EFA goals. It is further recommended that ILO/IPEC involves other relevant technical assistance providers in the education sector to further develop a comprehensive multi-actor strategy in which ILO can define and develop its specific role and function.

VII. EC/ACP is recommended to look into the ILO/IPEC experience of establishing MoUs with more than one ministry to enable the start-up and implementation of cross-cutting and multi-dimensional programmes such as tackling CL. The mechanism of involving several ministries to take ownership and responsibility over such cross-cutting policy issues, presents new challenges compared with traditional sector-wide approaches.



*On integrating Tackling Child Labour in Agendas for tripartite social dialogue and in multi-stakeholder cooperation of social partners in ACP countries:*

VIII. EC/ACP is recommended to screen its projects and initiatives where human rights and social protection paragraphs in EPAs or other preferential trade agreements with ACP countries are important components. Such projects provide great opportunities for tackling CL interventions, because international certification requirements provide an additional tool for monitoring and enforcing social protection and human rights clauses. Furthermore, ILO/IPEC and EC/ACP could look into possibilities in economic sectors, such as mining, tourism, fisheries, where tackling CL initiatives could be linked to international preferential trade agreements and certification.

IX. Implementing partners should try to apply the tripartite approach also in the conception, planning and implementation of interventions on CL at decentralized or local level. Such interventions (particularly APs) could build in more sustainability from the start by securing that different stakeholders contribute with human, material, technical and financial support, also after a period of external funding.

X. Implementing partners and ILO/IPEC should always guarantee sufficient involvement and participation of different stakeholders at the start and inception of CL projects, or contain a strategy to achieve commitment of these stakeholders and secure their increased participation over time. Any decreasing commitment and participation over time should be examined with urgency and additional actions are required to ensure that the project can remain on track.

XI. The participatory multi-stakeholder approach of ILO/IPEC should be further expanded and refined to better include the participation of trade unions, NGOs and Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) and particularly employers' organizations, the latter stakeholder group showing somewhat less interest in CL than the other stakeholder groups. The participation of the full tripartite constituency (plus NGOs) in similar projects should be guaranteed in the MoUs with the relevant national ministries.

XII. ILO/IPEC is recommended to continue with the management modality of the national Project Steering Committee of CL projects. It is recommended to

always include all relevant partners in the tripartite constituency (plus NGOs) in the Steering Committee, even if they would participate as guests and not implementing partners. Regular meetings with sufficient quorum should be actively promoted and supported by ILO/IPEC, in its function as the secretary of these Steering Committees. Partners that are showing decreased interest in participation should be actively followed up by ILO/IPEC staff.

*On dealing with capacity constraints and capacity development challenges at the individual, organizational and institutional level:*

XIII. ILO/IPEC is recommended to expand the repertoire of capacity development interventions in CL projects. This could be done by developing train-the-trainer approaches, cascading training activities, coaching, learning on the job, peer consultation and reviews and exchange and exposure between organizations at the national and international level.

XIV. EC/ACP and ILO/IPEC should jointly look into possibilities where synergy and advantages of scale are possible in capacity development support to national partners, particularly in the areas of governance, human rights, social protection and educational approaches and strategies. More exchanges of experience and participation of partners in relevant capacity development initiatives can bring cost savings.

*On developing and implementing innovative and sustainable action programmes to withdraw and prevent children from child labour in ACP countries:*

XV. Implementing partners in ACP countries and ILO/IPEC should consider building in sustainability and exit strategies in APs for interventions on the ground, particularly where these plans contain direct material transfers to families and children, mostly in the form of providing support to retain children in schools. Additionally, extra interventions should be developed (as done occasionally) to develop alternatives for poor families for income generation to compensate for loss of income when children are withdrawn from CL. This might require working with other partners that can provide services, such as the provision of technical capacities and of micro finance for small economic activities.

XVI. More comprehensive technical support and coaching by ILO/IPEC to national partners in

designing and developing APs are needed to ensure that proposals meet the minimum requirements of ILO and that the implementing partners are able to deal with monitoring requirements (such as the DBMR). These capacity development interventions should precede the implementation period of APs to avoid delays in start-up and delays or even interruption of implementation of these plans (see key conclusion15).

XVII. A large number of APs were implemented and several of them have generated innovative and new approaches and methodologies. Additionally these APs have contributed to increased ownership and institutional sustainability of local interventions to tackle CL. As such these new approaches and models need to be replicated and expanded. This requires more considerable effort than documenting experiences as best practices. The TACKLE implementing partners and ILO/IPEC are recommended to develop a strategy, to systematize actions in replicating good practices, and to track and report upon successful and unsuccessful replication experiences.

*On bridging gaps and addressing methodological challenges in tackling child labour approaches in ACP countries:*

XVIII. ILO/IPEC is recommended to reflect further upon the trend of the growing informal economy and increasing informalization of the economy in relation to CL. This trend also requires specific attention to work with trade unions and employers' organizations that face difficulties in achieving organization of target groups in this sector. At the same time a more active involvement of NGOs and CBOs in CL projects in the informal sector could be explored.

XIX. ILO/IPEC is recommended to build in strategies and result areas in CL projects that deal with the challenge of lack of availability and access to reliable data on CL, with particular attention to informal economic activities, and children's enrolment and retention rates. This also includes a more robust approach, with related indicators and methods and instruments for data collection, in ILO/IPEC's own CL projects.

XX. ILO/IPEC needs to recognize that it is much more difficult to obtain sustainable results in rural and remote areas, where children's enrolment in education is often limited because the educational structures do

not provide sufficient access to education, and maybe even more importantly, do not provide relevant education for children in these areas. This will require more massive interventions with a clear role for the Ministry of Education and other development-oriented ministries that are likely to surpass the specific mandate of ILO/IPEC, and therefore will also require more coordination and cooperation with other development actors.

XXI. EC/ACP is recommended to look into the TACKLE experiences at the local level, particularly in rural and remote areas, where significant constraints are faced because of the local and regional development situation. In many of these settings a sector-wide approach on education or a specific economic sector will not resolve all challenges. ILO/IPEC and EC/ACP together with national EU Delegations could look into possibilities where interventions geographically overlap to establish more coordination and cooperation and – if possible – develop integral regional/rural development projects, where CL and education are integrated as cross-cutting components.

*On addressing challenges in strengthening sustainability of TACKLE initiatives and exit strategies:*

XXII. ILO/IPEC is recommended to build in sustainability approaches and actions right from the start of CL projects and not merely in the final phase as was done in the TACKLE project. The sustainability approach should contain a variety of strategies for the different result areas of the project (for which a start was made in the sustainability matrix of the TACKLE project, established in 2012 and subsequently updated).

*On elevating national tackling child labour initiatives in ACP countries to the regional and international level:*

XXIII. EC/ACP and ILO/IPEC are recommended to analyse in more depth the possibilities for more synergies and international coherence of the TACKLE project and other CL projects. The best possibilities for doing so do not seem to be at the global level of all ACP countries, because regional and national situations are too diverse. Instead the regional and sub-continental level provides more possibilities for cooperation and exchange. Specific regions that can be identified are: Pacific Islands, Caribbean Islands



and Caribbean Coast of South and Central America, and the East, Southern and Western African economic communities: EAC, SADC and ECOWAS.

XXIV. ILO/IPEC is recommended to make use of the experiences of leading TACKLE countries (Fiji, Kenya and Zambia) in other CL-related initiatives. These experiences could also be tapped into to support other countries where ownership and political will exist, but capacity constraints limit progress in implementation. In the selection of possible countries for tackling CL interventions, the following criteria could be used for clustering countries:

- a) Physical presence of ILO in the country and previous work on CL-related issues;
- b) Proximity of past or present conflict and political instability;
- c) Existing levels of capacity of local partners;
- d) Existing experience in tripartite social dialogue and multi-stakeholder cooperation.

XXV. ILO/IPEC is recommended to continue to invest in disseminating experiences and lessons learned from the TACKLE in its other projects and programmes. The TACKLE project was innovative in terms of its multi-stakeholder nature and the joint participation of Ministries of Labour and Education, which could benefit future CL projects that build upon the experiences obtained in the TACKLE project.

XXVI. EC/ACP and ILO/IPEC are recommended to jointly explore more possibilities in CL-related projects to develop regional and global dimensions and linkages between actions in different countries. Such regional approaches can strengthen relations of cooperation and support between specific countries and the creation of regional hubs for support of individual countries and also to coordinate the implementation of regional programmes. Furthermore, by strengthening the international dimension of CL projects, cross-border issues can be dealt with, such as the child trafficking that has been identified as a priority challenge by several ILO country and regional offices.

### **Important lessons learned**

Some important lessons have been learned in the implementation of the TACKLE project. Many of

these lessons are analysed and documented in country reports and also the TACKLE Technical Progress Reports (TPRs). Others are already integrated in the conclusions in section 4.1 of the report.

In this section the evaluators highlight some of the lessons learned at the global level of the project and evidence from TACKLE countries that is relevant for the design and development of possible follow-up or similar projects. Some of these lessons will be further analysed and developed into possible intervention models for future and/or follow-up projects on tackling CL and increasing school retention.

- Effective and sustainable solutions to tackle CL and to increase enrolment of children in school and improve retention rates of vulnerable children, require multi-stakeholder approaches and cooperation, as the roots of the persistent problem of CL are complex and multidimensional. The involvement of multiple stakeholders is also a better guarantee that local partners take ownership of CL-related interventions and will ensure continuation of efforts after project interventions;
- In many (TACKLE) countries tripartite social dialogue is still a relatively new phenomenon and commonly the different partners have not yet built relations of trust and open and fluent communication. Many subjects are politically or economically sensitive because they touch upon interests of specific stakeholder groups. The TACKLE project has shown that the issue of CL is considered by most stakeholders a real issue of importance and there is a general moral agreement that one should do whatever possible to tackle it. As such the issue of CL has served as a starting point for building more experience in tripartite social dialogue and it can serve as a stepping stone to move to other social-economic issues. In this respect the TACKLE experience can be helpful for ILO's corporate actions in building and strengthening tripartite social dialogue on labour issues in general;
- Many (TACKLE) countries face enormous challenges in their educational policies, systems and structures. In spite of progress made by most countries in EFA goals, issues remain that cannot be solved by ILO/IPEC alone: these include access to education in rural and remote areas, costs of education, and the quality and relevance

of the education curriculum in specific situations. The challenges faced in the education sector require a stronger involvement and leadership of Ministries of Education (and sometimes other ministries too) and a clear sector-wide strategy on increasing access and improving quality and relevance of the educational services, particularly in the rural and remote areas. This might also be an important area for exploration of closer coordination and cooperation between ILO/IPEC in the TACKLE project and the EU Delegations in the TACKLE countries which are often managing important resourceful programmes in the education and social protection sectors;

- The fact that education ministries are usually bigger and stronger than labour ministries is a relevant factor to take into account in the implementation of joint projects with these two ministries. The lack of historical experience of partnership among these differently-sized ministries has caused the TACKLE project to move more slowly than planned. An issue of joint concern for both ministries is the provision of a relevant skills and TVET training offer for youth. In most countries skills and TVET training is given a low priority, yet it is probably critical in tackling CL through education. Although TACKLE experience in this domain exists, it is not sufficiently visible nor duly analysed, documented and disseminated. However, this issue is also very appealing for employers and labour unions who are direct stakeholders in this matter and can be directly more involved as partners. It is in this domain where cooperation between Ministries of Education and of Labour needs to be further developed;
- The relevance of the education services in rural and remote areas and for children from poor families can only be increased when relevant curricula are developed for specific target groups and regions, through TVET and skills development programmes, education in mother tongue languages, non-formal education, literacy training (for parents), economic empowerment and entrepreneurship development;
- Among the issues of non-formal and alternative education in rural, remote and hard to reach areas, those working with pastoralist communities are particularly relevant to countries such as the Angola, Kenya, Mali, South Sudan,

the Sudan and Zambia. TACKLE is working on CL in pastoralist communities in Kenya and South Sudan. Strong partnership with Ministries of Education and other UN Agencies (such as UNICEF) are essential to design sustainable action, such as shepherd classes for pastoralist children and their communities. Recent events have illustrated that neglecting remote communities can result in regional and even national destabilization (e.g. in Mali, South Sudan, among the TACKLE countries);

- The data-provision on CL is by definition a challenge as much of this phenomenon occurs illegally and outside the scope of monitoring and enforcing institutions. However, even in the formal structures, the education system data collection on enrolment and retention rates is poor, incomplete and unreliable as can be observed in UNESCO's Global Monitoring Reports (GMRs). When data are available, these are often not shared and linked between different relevant institutions. The success of projects focusing on tackling CL depends to a large degree on the availability and reliability of data and this should be considered a necessary area of intervention in CL projects;
- As observed in conclusions 5 and 6 in section 4.1, processes of increased informalization of the economy and the urban-rural divide require more reflection and analysis. New forms of interventions, specific and tailored interventions, and involvement of other (local) partners are needed to challenge the trend of informalization of the economy and to provide proper solutions and perspectives for families living in rural, sub-urban and remote areas;
- Among the different stakeholders involved in CL-related initiatives the group of employers, although they are participating, might need more awareness raising and support to become more actively involved. The specific interests of the private sector employers are different from the other tripartite partners and more oriented towards profit and the economic bottom-line rather than the social aspects. Although there is no doubt about the commitment of participating employers' organizations in the TACKLE project, this will not automatically mean that among and particularly outside their membership, the interest of employers in tackling CL will be

there, as it can negatively affect their profit. Therefore, other and additional mechanisms to involve and motivate employers in tackling CL are needed, such as international certification trajectories and corporate social responsibility initiatives;

- CL and Hazardous Work are contextual concepts on which sometimes not all stakeholders agree. Although international definitions are helpful, they are not always effective and applicable. This applies particularly to the establishment of Hazardous Work lists, because the economic activities of national populations as a whole or in specific sectors and sub-sectors are very different. Universal definitions of Hazardous Work do not apply and the development of Hazardous Work lists should be the outcome of a thorough process of stakeholder consultation, as was done in the TACKLE project in almost all TACKLE countries.

## Good Practices

1. The Adopt a School model implemented in Kenya with the Federation of Kenyan Employers (FKE) is an interesting model that tackles CL through active involvement of private sector employers exercising their Corporate Social Responsibility. This initiative was launched in 2009 and it links private sector businesses with school to support income-generating activities and school feeding programmes to encourage families to send their children to school. The initiative was called “adopt a school” and it involved 11 schools supported with in-kind, financial and technical means by the FKE. Local authorities, local employers and the parents themselves were also involved in the initiative. This model of local multi-stakeholder partnership and support from the local business community is an important instrument for sustainability of the initiative as ownership is brought to the local level and income-generating activities are supported, increasing the capacity of local resource generation.
2. The People’s Community Network in Fiji has developed a support programme to withdraw children from extremely poor families in squatters’ communities from CL by providing support to those children to go to school. This is combined with capacity development and empowerment of their parents to engage in economic activities and improve the family income to compensate for loss of income from CL. The combination of material support with complementing activities to improve the social-economic situation of parents and families is a very important strategy to avoid that target groups become dependent on external material or financial support. Although challenges were faced by PCN in the project to implement these training and capacity development support activities with parents, in some cases successes were obtained. However, the long-term sustainable success of these efforts still requires establishing further linkages with providers of microfinance and Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises’ technical support.
3. The establishment of a Project Management Committee for the implementation of a school retention programme in Guyana implemented by the Ministry of Labour. This committee provided a solution for administration and reporting problems at the start of this programme. Although the committee represents a cost to the TACKLE project at the same time it provides the possibility to strengthen capacities of persons in charge and a management and implementation institution that in the longer term can contribute to further institutional sustainability of CL interventions.
4. At national level, the subcommittee on CL composed by government, employers’ associations and employee’s unions is a good practice developed by the project in Angola. This subcommittee was established from the original Management Committee that was a quadripartite space of consensus formed by Government, employers, trade unions and NGOs. The meetings of this subcommittee became a forum for dialogue and consultation, which helped to enhance the knowledge on CL, share experiences and plan joint actions.
5. International exchanges between semi-similar countries are seen as very useful and are much appreciated by the diverse stakeholders. The ILO TACKLE Madagascar project has had frequent exchanges with the Mali programme (the only other French-speaking country in the TACKLE programme). These international exchanges have been much appreciated and national stakeholders

were interested in knowing about CL structures and solutions in Mali.

6. The Nanyoiye Community Development Organization in Kenya successfully developed an Action Programme for combatting CL among pastoralist communities, tackled through non-formal education. Special curricula have been designed, tested and approved by the Ministry of Education. Local communities and teachers were also trained and 200 children withdrawn from hazardous work are now at school through Lchekuti (shepherd) classes for pastoralist children. Moreover, these classes are now institutionalized and included in the national education budget. TACKLE supported the Ministry of Education to elaborate the Policy on Alternative Provision of Basic Education and Training (APBET) allowing bringing evening classes into the government school support system. This experience is relevant for other African countries, where pastoralist communities are difficult to reach and often neglected.
7. The work done by ILO/IPEC with the Child Labour Unit (CLU) of the Ministry of Labour in Fiji provides two important good practices and models for interventions. The first one is directly related to the TACKLE project: ILO/IPEC has supported the Ministry of Labour to set up a CLU to deal with more effective monitoring, control and enforcement of CL violations in the country. Since its establishment in 2012, it has identified and acted in approximately 145 cases of CL violations. This unit is a good example of institutional sustainability for implementing and enforcing CL policies. A second practice and model lies in the cooperation of TACKLE with a parallel intervention: the work of the CLU in Fiji in the sugar cane sector is closely aligned and coordinated with the national association of sugar cane growers in Fiji. This association (with support of the Fair Trade Labelling Organization (FLO) and the EU) has recently received a FLO certificate for the entire sugar production of the association. This certification includes CL clauses and these clauses are now audited by FLO certification companies and the Sugar Cane Growers' Association itself. This is a powerful self-regulation mechanism within the private sector itself that can serve as an example for other countries and economic sectors

(particularly in the clothing industry, mining, tourism and fisheries) in other ACP countries.

8. The TACKLE project in Mali has generated significant examples for the organization of dissemination and awareness-building activities and campaigns for large audiences and target groups. The World Day Against Child Labour (WDACL) was used to organize a big music concert for a large audience, during which the audience was informed about CL issues. The TACKLE project in Mali, since 2009 also has a structural cooperation with the private sector to support awareness-building activities. There is an agreement with the mobile phone company Orange's ORANGE foundation to send out a text message slogan every year around the WDACL to all Orange subscribers in Mali: in 2011, an audience of 6 million subscribers was reached. This is an interesting example of reaching out to large audiences with a minimum cost or no cost at all that is likely to be viable in many other countries as the mobile phone nowadays is the most important communication means used by almost all people in developing countries.