



International
Labour Office

Time-Bound Programme

Manual for Action Planning

T B P

M A P



Paper
IV-13



Resource
Mobilization
for Time-Bound
Programmes

International
Programme on
the Elimination
of Child Labour

Resource mobilization for Time-Bound Programmes

International Programme on the Elimination of Child
Labour

August 2003

Prepared for IPEC by Margaret Mottaz. Many thanks to Casper Edmonds in ILO-COMBI and Sherin Khan, Geir Myrstad, Alice Ouédraogo, Yaw Ofosu, Phan Thuy and Guy Thijs of IPEC for their input and comments. Thanks also to Peter Larsen for material from *IPEC Resource Mobilization Guidelines Within the TBP Framework* (Geneva, ILO, unpublished).

Copyright © International Labour Organization 2003

Publications of the International Labour Office enjoy copyright under Protocol 2 of the Universal Copyright Convention. Nevertheless, short excerpts from them may be reproduced without authorization, on condition that the source is indicated. For rights of reproduction or translation, application should be made to the Publications Bureau (Rights and Permissions), International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. The International Labour Office welcomes such applications.

Libraries, institutions and other users registered in the United Kingdom with the Copyright Licensing Agency, 90, Tottenham Court Road, London W1T4LP [Fax(+44)(0)207631 5500; email: cla@cla.co.uk], in the United States with the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923 [Fax: (+1)(978)750 4470; email: info@copyright.com] or in other countries with associate Reproduction Rights Organizations, make photocopies in accordance with the licences issued to them for this purpose.

First published 2003

ISBN web pdf version: 92-2-115165-4

The designations employed in ILO publications, which are in conformity with United Nations practice, and the presentation of material therein do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the International Labour Office concerning the legal status of any country, area or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers.

The responsibility for opinions expressed in signed articles, studies and other contributions rests solely with their authors, and publication does not constitute an endorsement by the International Labour Office of the opinions expressed in them.

Reference to names of firms and commercial products and processes does not imply their endorsement by the International Labour Office, and any failure to mention a particular firm, commercial product or process is not a sign of disapproval.

ILO publications can be obtained through major booksellers or ILO local offices in many countries, or direct from ILO Publications, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. Catalogues or lists of new publications are available free of charge from the above address, or by e-mail: pubvente@ilo.org

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The basis for resource mobilization.....	2
2.1	Political commitment.....	2
2.2	Importance of policy dialogue.....	2
2.3	Donor mapping	3
3	Identifying resources for the TBP	3
4	Direct funding of TBP components.....	4
4.1	Government budgetary resources.....	4
4.2	Bilateral and multilateral donors	4
4.2.1	Creating donor groups.....	5
4.2.2	Grants for social projects	5
4.3	Employers' and workers' organizations	6
4.3.1	Employers' groups.....	6
4.3.2	Workers' organizations	8
4.3.3	International employer-worker alliances.....	9
4.3.4	Public-private partnerships	10
5	Expanding resource mobilization: leveraging and joint targeting.....	10
5.1	Leveraging by capitalizing on positive impact	11
5.2	Identifying the potential for joint targeting	11
5.3	Coordinating efforts with other ILO programmes.....	11
6	How the ILO can help with resource mobilization	13

1 Introduction

Efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labour (WFCL) in a sustainable way must include both upstream measures to create a favourable policy environment for action and downstream direct interventions to assist children, their families and communities. These upstream policy measures include in principle social mobilization, quality universal basic education, legislation reform, and capacity building of local institutions. The downstream interventions focus on prevention activities, the withdrawal and rehabilitation of children found in the worst forms, and the provision of alternatives for them and their families.

Countries that have ratified the ILO Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182) have pledged to eliminate the worst forms as a matter of urgency. IPEC has developed the Time-Bound Programme (TBP) approach to assist countries to meet the requirements of the Convention by simultaneously attacking the root causes of child labour and rescuing and rehabilitating children who are caught in its worst forms. The TBP is meant to serve as a broad umbrella framework for planning and implementing the necessary policy measures and targeted interventions cited above in a comprehensive, integrated way over a limited time horizon.

The TBP may be launched with a large support project funded by one or several donors that focuses on particular target groups of children or communities. However, as the TBP is expanded to achieve the overall goal of eliminating all worst forms of child labour, many other action programmes will be initiated and implemented in collaboration with a wide array of national and international agencies dealing with social and economic development issues linked to child labour. This means that in addition to substantial financial resources, different types of technical expertise and institutional

support at different levels must be mobilized as well. This will also necessarily involve leveraging resources from other social or economic development programmes by encouraging them to address child labour concerns and to designate child labour target groups as their beneficiaries.

Resource mobilization starts early in the programme development process and continues in parallel with the data collection, research, consultations and programme formulation exercises. A TBP may start with national resources or with funding from one principal donor and attract other donors after the start of implementation. Indeed, resource mobilization is likely to be an ongoing process that continues throughout programme implementation. In many countries, the sustainable pursuit of TBP goals will depend on the ability to attract a succession of donors over the medium to long term.



IPEC has traditionally obtained its funding through agreements made between bilateral donors and IPEC Headquarters. This was the way in which funding was obtained for the large support projects in the first TBP countries - El Salvador, Nepal, and the United Republic of Tanzania. In these three cases there was

one major donor, the US Department of Labor. This is not necessarily the model for all future TBPs, however. Indeed, in most countries large-scale action against the WFCL will require a diversification of funding sources and funding mechanisms. While, the ILO can assist in the mobilization of resources with technical

expertise and through its network of contacts with bilateral, multilateral and other donors, much of the work needed to mobilize both domestic and international resources for TBPs will have to be carried out at the country level with national authorities taking the lead.

2 The basis for resource mobilization

2.1 Political commitment

Political support at the highest level of the country is the single most important element for the smooth implementation and long-term sustainability of a TBP. The TBP has to be fully accepted and backed by strong and consistent political commitment from the outset of the initiative. Responsibility for programme development, including resource mobilization, rests with the government.

A strong political commitment is a critical prerequisite for the formulation of proactive policies and programmes, for the integration of the child labour issue into relevant national laws, and for the development of policies and programmes. This commitment must also be evident in the mainstreaming of the elimination of child labour into national development plans such as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), five-year plans, national initiatives on Education for All as well as policies promoting decentralization and good governance at local levels.

Eliminating child labour must be a stated development objective and separate targets must be set. There are several reasons why this mainstreaming is important for resource mobilization:

(a) It generally means that government budgetary funds can be allocated to eliminating the worst forms of child labour as part of other development programmes.

- (b) It signals to bilateral and multilateral partners that the elimination of child labour is a priority development goal of the government, thereby facilitating the attraction of donor funding for this purpose.
- (c) It increases the potential for important synergies with education, health or anti-poverty programmes.

2.2 Importance of policy dialogue

To effectively mainstream child labour goals into government planning, policy dialogue is necessary. For example, child labour concerns will need to be voiced in policy discussions and resource allocation fora, such as public budget hearings, PRSP consultations and similar meetings covering key sectors of relevance to child labour. National policy dialogue is, of course, facilitated by similar efforts in international fora that include major current and potential donors and where ILO Headquarters will continue to play an important backstopping role.

In order to understand the nature and scope of the problem and to develop effective responses, a problem analysis will need to be carried out. All relevant government departments and agencies should be considered as key partners and involved in the process as early as possible. Current and potential donors should also be invited to participate in relevant consultations and in informal donor group meetings. They could also

be encouraged to co-fund research activities and to participate in research dissemination seminars.

2.3 Donor mapping

Most developing countries will usually have a variety of ongoing projects and programmes sponsored by the government, UN agencies, international financial institutions, bilateral donors or international and national NGOs. The process of analysing and mapping out the major child-labour-related programmes in El Salvador, Nepal and Tanzania revealed numerous opportunities for integrating and assimilating components of such

ongoing projects within the broader framework of the TBP. For example, in the United Republic of Tanzania the study identified the key areas relevant to TBPs that were currently being supported by various donors (poverty reduction, education, HIV/AIDS prevention, food support, etc.). While the study was not very detailed, it did provide a point of departure for IPEC staff to be able to set up meetings and guide strategic discussions with potential partners. Undertaking a study of the policy and institutional frameworks in place also allowed for more guided consultations with potential partners.

3 Identifying resources for the TBP

Financial support may take the form of either direct contribution from the government or other donors to the TBP budget or funding of complementary activities within ongoing programmes of national and international development agencies.

There are also two other important ways to expand the Programme that require relatively little or no fund raising. The first involves the leveraging of the resources of other development or social programmes by negotiating with them to also contribute to the reduction in child labour and include child labour indicators among their own where feasible. The second entails joint targeting of beneficiaries with other programmes that can serve, and indeed facilitate, the attainment of the objectives of both. These strategies are covered in more detail in Section 4.

The mobilization of resources is, evidently, a crucial prerequisite for large-scale interventions such as TBPs. Besides contributions from the national governments, core funding for the earliest TBPs came from one bilateral donor. However, in most cases it will be useful to explore the possibility of pooling resources from a consortium of several donors, as is being done for the Bangladesh TBP. In countries participating in the World Bank and IMF Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative, it will also be useful to explore the possibility of channelling resources generated under this scheme into funding TBP interventions. Other possible sources include grant and loan funding from the international and regional financial institutions.

4 Direct funding of TBP components

Direct funding of TBP components, whether part of a large support project or of small projects in the overall framework, can come from a variety of international and local sources. Some of these funds will come from national budgets. Some may be negotiated locally with donor governments. Some can also be raised from private sources through the social partners (workers' and employers' organizations) or public-private partnerships.

4.1 Government budgetary resources

Government resources may include the funding of direct TBP interventions and public expenditure in areas such as education and poverty alleviation that impact on the problem of child labour. In line with ILO Convention No. 182, it is also expected that the government will set up institutional structures and design appropriate policies for the elimination of the problem as a matter of urgency.

Particular emphasis needs to be put on integrating child labour issues in budget priorities. Ideally, this should be more than providing relatively small amounts of cash for logistical purposes, in-kind contributions or office space. This may mean linking up with education programmes as indicated above or broader employment policies. This should also be achieved provincial and lower levels in local development plans.

4.2 Bilateral and multilateral donors

Eliminating child labour must be a stated development objective. This is particularly important where bilateral donors with decentralized funding structure are concerned. These donors often look to fund selected components of development programmes. The official recognition of the elimination of child labour as a development objective will facilitate the attraction of funding from such sources.

Box 1: Recommendations for building partnerships with potential bilateral donors

- Get to know the specific programming cycles of potential bilateral donors: timing is crucial and waiting periods can be long (often 6 months to a year). ILO Sub-regional Office directors can be of help here.
- Undertake a donor-mapping exercise. This does not have to be a costly or highly detailed study.
- Assess the potential for incorporating child labour eradication into social and economic development programmes.
- Encourage donors to actively participate in research, planning and programme design. This creates a sense of ownership and heightens possibilities for funding.
- Establish networks of government departments, NGOs, policy research institutions, bilateral and multi-lateral agencies on child labour.

4.2.1 Creating donor groups

The creation of a donor group locally to support the TBP at the country level is a strategy that has been tried successfully in Bangladesh (Box 2). There are various possible approaches to doing this. One way is to start out with the existing IPEC donors and ask them to take a leading role in forming the donor group. One

donor can then act as a convener/coordinator of the donor group in coordination with IPEC. These donor groups can act and work in several levels by developing a common agenda/declaration against child labour in accordance with the TBP and jointly funding major initiatives. They can also assist in creating diversity in terms of funding arrangements.

Box 2: Decentralizing resource mobilization for TBPs--the example of Bangladesh

TBPs were conceived from the outset as national initiatives. However, the first three relied heavily on headquarters assistance in mobilizing resources. The ILO Office in Bangladesh is one of the first to take the initiative to organize and mobilize resources for that country's TBP. With IPEC headquarters providing technical support, the local IPEC Office led the negotiations with the government and social partners and identified and secured a primary donor, DIFD (UK), to support the preparatory work needed for this major endeavour. When this donor indicated interest in consortium funding to ensure support not only for the preparatory phase, but also for its implementation, the Office was able to identify two other donors, the Governments of NORAD (Norway) and the USAID (United States) in 2002, making a three-donor consortium. Others may possibly join at a later date.

Given the increasing adoption of decentralized funding modalities by major donors and the positive trend of local resource mobilization for child labour projects, it is likely that most new donor funding of child labour will come through donors at the country level. It is therefore imperative that the programme partners explore all possibilities of enlisting local donor support for TBPs.

Bilateral donor potential varies considerably from country to country and agency to agency. Development cooperation agendas may be broad or highly focused on particular sectors or types of support modalities. Certain TBP countries may be of interest to donors for specific reasons (their poverty level, the fact that they are a former colony or for strategic reasons). Key donors with whom IPEC has experience and which have potential for resource mobilization

through their local embassies include the USDOL (United States), the French Employment and Foreign Affairs Ministries, NORAD (Norway), FINNIDA (Finland), DANIDA (Denmark), CIDA (Canada), SIDA (Sweden), the Government of the Netherlands, and DFID (U.K.). Other donors, such as the European Commission and AUSAID (Australia) have also provided some local resources.

4.2.2 Grants for social projects

Many embassies and development agencies are also able to provide small grants for social projects. As these generally target civil society organizations and international or local NGOs, they can be a source of funding for a number of different types of projects that fit into the TBP framework as well as for short-term needs such as funding studies, workshops

and seminars or emergency assistance in case of conflict, natural disaster, etc. These may also be significant as a first step in building an active working relationship with a particular donor.



4.3 Employers' and workers' organizations

Employers and workers organizations are important stakeholders in the fight against child labour. The ILO has considerable experience working with its social partners internationally and locally as implementing partners for direct interventions and important agents for mobilizing and raising awareness among their memberships and society at large about the importance of eradicating the worst forms of child labour. This is an area of cooperation that must be pursued and strengthened. Whether or not these groups are able to contribute financial resources for specific interventions, their in-kind or indeed moral support for the cause of eliminating child labour can be significant towards achieving the TBP goals.

4.3.1 Employers' groups

In terms of raising resources for direct interventions in the TBP framework, there are interesting and realistic possibilities in working with these groups. In South Asia, several important sector-based projects have been successful in progressively and decisively eliminating child labour from target industries. In

Bangladesh, the joint ILO-UNICEF-employer project in the garment export sector has for many years served as a model for combining workplace monitoring with the provision of education for the children and incentives for their families. This project, now in its final phase, was funded in part by the Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers and Exporters Association (BGMEA) from its own budgetary resources. At the initiative of the BGMEA, the project has now been transformed into a broader inspection programme that covers not only child labour, but also other issues related to working conditions, including safety hazards.

Several other examples from Pakistan illustrate how local employers groups can contribute to the cause of eliminating child labour. In two well-known examples, the Sialkot Chamber of Commerce and Industry (SCCI) contributed funds for IPEC projects to eliminate child labour in soccer ball stitching, whilst the Surgical Instruments Manufacturers Association of Pakistan (SIMAP) helped fund similar programmes in its industry. The case of the Pakistan Carpet Manufacturers and Exporters Association is described in more detail in Box 3.

International consumer pressure certainly played a role in boosting momentum and urgency for these projects. That said, it is significant that these groups took the initiative and long-term responsibility to clean up and monitor their industries and that they were willing to contribute funds to do so. It is important to note that in all of these examples, the actions taken by the employers had positive reverberations well beyond their own industries.

Two additional examples that do not specifically concern export manufacturers come from Nepal and India. The Federation of Nepalese Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FNCCI) has been active in policy development, negotiation and advocacy against child labour in Nepal. At present, the FNCCI

and the Employers' Council (EC) are focusing on the issue of child labour as an important item on the employers' national agenda. Some of their activities to date include: the development of codes of conduct; investigations on the incidence of child labour, particularly in the formal sector; the development of area-based programmes for the elimination of child labour; and empowerment programmes such as skill and vocational training or credit support

to families prone to child labour. As part of their support for the TBP in Nepal, FNCCI and EC are jointly experimenting with innovative approaches to strengthen their offensive against child labour in Nepal. They are introducing a nationwide "child friendly logo" for all of their members' consumer products. They have designed programmes to be carried out by local affiliates to make 11 districts "child labour free".

Box 3: Employers' group in Pakistan contributes to eliminating child labour in the carpet sector

In 1998, the Pakistan Carpet Manufacturers and Exporters Association (PCMEA) entered into a partners agreement with ILO-IPEC to combat child labour in the carpet industry. Within the framework of that agreement and drawing upon an earlier experience in combating child labour in the soccer ball industry, a three-year project was launched in 1999 with financial support from the US Department of Labor and PCMEA.

The project has made a clear and demonstrable contribution towards the national goal to eliminate child labour. During the project's lifetime, 10,261 carpet weaving children and their at-risk younger siblings were provided with non-formal education in two districts in the Punjab province. The industry-based monitoring carried out by the PCMEA and external monitoring implemented by the ILO verified that the workplaces were free of children and that those withdrawn were attending the non-formal education classes. The non-formal education programme was complemented with provision of pre-vocational education to older carpet weaving children, as well as extending support for income-generating activities to carpet weaving families.

The PCMEA contributed US\$900,000 to the project and has committed the same amount to a second phase expansion, which is now underway. PCMEA's donation is generated through a contribution collected by the Export Promotion Bureau (EPB) of the Ministry of Commerce. For each carpet exported, exporters contribute 0.25% of the declared value of the carpet. Although only those PCMEA members whose carpet weaving sites are located in the project areas are directly benefiting from the Project, all carpet exporters contribute. This levy is pooled into a fund called "Export Development Fund (EDF)". A Board consisting of government and public representatives manages the Fund. The funds are then invested in activities beneficial to the development of the industry. The PCMEA has major say in the utilization of the funds. Each year PCMEA advises the government, through EPB, to release its contribution for the Project out of these funds.

The Phase II project will consolidate the non-formal education programme under Phase I, extend education and other social services to children and carpet weaving families in other areas of Punjab and, given the popularity of the programme among target families, address the demand for education for other children in the project areas currently working in other sectors in order to prevent their shifting to carpet-weaving in the hope of entering the programme.

The project will work towards the sustainability of the intervention by devolving ownership of the programme upon termination of IPEC and donor support. These goals are being pursued through six interrelated components, namely: (1) child labour monitoring and prevention, (2) education, (3) income-generation and micro-credit, (4) advocacy and awareness raising, (5) capacity building and (6) research and surveys. Each of these components constitutes a distinct action programme in itself to be implemented in coordination with others under the umbrella of the project.

In the State of Andhra Pradesh in India employers formed the Consortium of Employers' Associations for the Elimination of Child Labour (CEASEChild Labour). This consortium is now implementing an IPEC Action Programme. Individual employers in the State have followed up by getting involved in child labour issues, both through funding awareness-raising activities and direct support, for instance by paying a monthly incentive to workers who send their children to school.

4.3.2 Workers' organizations

In numerous countries where IPEC has programmes, workers organizations have been important, indeed essential partners. They have worked with their membership and their communities at large to raise awareness and mobilize them to action; they have integrated child labour elimination in collective bargaining agreements; and they have implemented various types of action programmes, including the important function of workplace and other types of child-labour monitoring. All of these serve the objectives of TBPs.

Since the mid 1990s, IPEC and the ILO Bureau of Workers' Activities (ACTRAV) have been working to build the capacities of trade unions and their confederations from a wide range of industries to conceive and implement action against child labour.¹ These include numerous international teachers' organizations and their local affiliates. Cooperation among workers' organizations has become an important trend in the fight against the worst forms of child labour and has yielded positive results in many countries where IPEC has programmes. In Nepal, for example, all three national trade union confederations and two national teachers' unions jointly adopted a policy

¹ For further information on IPEC/ACTRAV projects, please visit <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/dialogue/actrav/g-enact/child/index.htm>

on child labour in December 2000, the *Dhulikel Declaration*.² These five organizations have committed themselves to a national partnership against child labour and WFCL in particular. The Declaration reiterates their intent to be both advocates and agents for the elimination of child labour. All five groups are active participants in the Nepal TBP process.

In another example from Turkey, the three major trade union organizations joined together to assist working street children (Box 4). The trade unions in Turkey, as elsewhere around the world, see the fight against child labour as part of the struggle for genuine political, economic and social justice in the country. Consequently, they understand the importance of taking an active role in the design and implementation of public policies intended to overcome the problem of child labour.



² These organizations are the General Federation of Nepalese Trade Unions (GEFONT), the Nepal Trade Union Congress (NTUC) and the Democratic Confederation of Nepalese Trade (DECONT), the Nepal Teachers' Association (NTA) and the Nepal National Teachers' Association (NNTA)

Box 4: Turkish trade unions join forces to get working street children off the streets and back in school

In spite of their different political affiliations, Turkey's three major trade unions with a collective membership of nearly 3 million workers - the Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions (TÜRK-İS), the Confederation of Real Turkish Trade Unions (HAK-İS) and the Progressive Trade Unions (DISK) - built a coalition to conduct joint action against the worst forms of child labour. Within the framework of an IPEC country programme in 2000, TÜRK-İS, HAK-İS and DISK created a partnership to withdraw children from hazardous street work and enrol them in primary education.

The programme targeted 2,000 children under the age of 15 and involved a public-outreach programme aimed particularly at parents to raise enrolment of working children in the free primary education system. Working with the Ministry of National Education (MONE), the three unions shared the responsibility of informing parents and increasing demand for education.

Prior to the start of the programme, an agreement was reached between MONE and trade unions on a cooperation protocol to ensure the enrolment and retention of ex-child labourers in primary schools. The trade union initiatives for the education campaign were backed by a commitment of financial resources by the MONE.

Field investigations were conducted and children were identified. Trade union members and volunteers contacted their parents, and training sessions were held to explain to parents the hazards of child labour, the importance of education and the opportunities available.

At the end of the six-month campaign, 2,000 working children were withdrawn from streets and enrolled in primary schools. A systematic monitoring mechanism and educational support programme was put in place by the MONE to ensure the retention and educational success of ex-working children.

4.3.3 International employer-worker alliances

The creation of international business-labour alliances within certain industries or among the social partners within donor countries is another trend that has potential to widen the resource base for TBPs. These types of alliances can serve to diversify the sources of funds for projects that can fit into the TBP framework in certain countries.

In response to heightened consumer awareness and initiatives like the UN Global Compact, international companies are increasingly sensitive to the need to ensure that they are following international human rights and labour standards in all countries where they operate and to guarantee that their suppliers and sub-contractors do the same. Labour unions also clearly consider these to be important issues.

Within the past two years, two major international industry alliances have been established to fund research and direct interventions to eliminate child labour in those countries where their primary commodities are produced and partially processed. The End Child Labour in Tobacco (ECLT) Foundation is a joint worker-employer initiative of the International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations (IUF), the International Tobacco Growers Association (ITGA) and British-American Tobacco. Its membership comprises many of the other major international tobacco companies. A similar initiative in the cocoa processing industry called the International Cocoa Initiative - Working towards Responsible Labour Standards for Cocoa Growing joins leading global chocolate manufacturers, trade unions, notably the IUF, and NGOs to eliminate

child and forced labour practices in cocoa cultivation and processing.

4.3.4 Public-private partnerships

Public-private partnerships on the international and national levels are also a potential source of funds. The BGMEA example cited in Box 3 is also an illustration of this on the national level. In another example on the international level that predates the introduction of the TBP approach, the ILO national tripartite committee in Italy together with the Italian Committee for UNICEF established

a fund for projects to eliminate child labour in Nepal, Pakistan and Bangladesh. Active since 1994, the Italian Social Partners Initiative (ISPI) comprised of Italian trade unions and the Confederation of Italian Industry (Confindustria) raised US\$ 1 million for projects which have either been implemented by the ILO or UNICEF or subcontracted to workers' or employers' groups or NGOs. The government of Italy also provided matching funds in some cases.

5 Expanding resource mobilization: leveraging and joint targeting

The largest source of resources may well be the complementary programmes and projects of national and international agencies. Therefore, every effort should be made to link the TBP with all relevant programmes and to promote joint targeting of child labourers and their families. Other important social and

economic development goals impact child labour: reducing household poverty, providing compulsory, quality education, improving the health infrastructure, the legal framework and promoting decent work for those above the minimum age for work.

Box 5. The strong link to education

Linking the elimination of WFCL to programmes that promote universal quality education is one of the most fundamental tasks of TBPs. In IPEC's experience, it is one of the most easily understood and the most productive strategies for reducing child labour. In many countries resources earmarked for Education for All initiatives or national education programmes from both international or domestic sources are substantial and may be available to projects related to child labour.

In the education sector in particular, strategic partnerships that result in mutual benefit can be easily identified between planned or ongoing programmes and the TBP goals. In another joint targeting example from the TBP in Nepal, collaboration between the Basic and Primary Education Programme (supported by a consortium of bilateral donors) and the TBP will help guarantee sustainable outcomes for both programmes' objectives. The BPEP has agreed to build schools in areas where former bonded child labourers —one of the TBP target groups— live. This means that these children and others at risk will be much more likely go to school instead of falling into other forms of child labour. The BPEP, for its part, will reach some of Nepal's most needy children, which conforms to its own mandate.

5.1 Leveraging by capitalizing on positive impact

Assessing the impact of programmes on child labour is an important exercise for leveraging efforts. There is a need to look at both the potential positive and negative impacts that a particular development programme might have. This includes both large bilateral projects and small NGO projects, upstream and downstream. Large infrastructure projects where the chain of subcontracting reaches down many levels also need to be monitored.

There are many obvious examples of positive impact of other social programmes on the elimination of child

labour. Initiatives to provide universal basic education are an obvious example (Box 5). Health programmes targeting HIV/AIDS in particular are also relevant to child labour. It is well known that many AIDS orphans end up as child labourers. In addition, many children in the worst forms of child labour are at increased risk of contracting HIV/AIDS. There are also cases where well-intended social programmes in other areas can have the perverse effect of actually increasing child labour. For example, programmes to extend credit for creating or expanding small family businesses can encourage child labour unless there are complementary measures or programme rules in place to prevent those families from pulling their own children or others out of school to work. In another example, micro-credit programmes targeting women can mean that older daughters may be required to stop school to take over household chores or care for younger siblings while her mother works. Part of the leveraging effort must be to ensure that other programmes consider and incorporate child labour elimination among their own goals.

5.2 Identifying the potential for joint targeting

Activities that can contribute directly to the success of the TBP include:

- poverty alleviation; micro finance and micro credit,
- small enterprises development schemes,
- women's empowerment programmes,
- expansion of the coverage of primary education,
- improving the quality of primary education and the reduction of dropout,
- non-formal education,
- vocational training,
- employment creation,
- youth employment,
- food security,
- social security, and
- micro health insurance schemes.

These and similar interventions should be coordinated within the TBP framework with a view to creating a major thrust to combat WFCL, securing synergies and ensuring a measurable impact. Box 6 provides several examples of joint targeting from Nepal and Tanzania.

Similarly, major NGOs in the country that have direct experience with working children or with the poor segments of the population and have been running these types of programmes ought to be welcomed as partners in the alliance and encouraged to contribute towards the elimination of WFCL.

5.3 Coordinating efforts with other ILO programmes

Finally, for IPEC executed programmes, there is ample scope for coordinating activities combating child labour with those of other sectors and programmes within the ILO. In El Salvador, for

example, the ILO InFocus Programme on Small Enterprise Creation (SEED) has programmes in place that overlap geographically with interventions foreseen for children in fireworks production and working in dumpsites. SEED is coordinating its efforts with that of IPEC to try to assist the families of children identified in these target groups. In Tanzania, several employment-promotion and gender-focused ILO programmes underway will impact child labour as they address some of its root causes. These include the ILO Strategies and Tools against Social Exclusion and Poverty (STEP) programme for Tanzania

that aims to promote the extension of social protection to women and men in the informal economy, and the joint ILO/UNDP regional project "Jobs for Africa—Poverty Reducing Employment Strategies for Africa". More directly, IPEC and the ILO International Programme on More and Better Jobs for Women are implementing a joint project, "Promoting Linkages Between Women's Employment and Reduction of Child Labour". In Nepal, IPEC has a joint project with ILO Declaration on eliminating bonded labour, which targets 16,000 children. This project has been absorbed into the TBP framework.

Box 6: Joint targeting—Examples from Nepal and the United Republic of Tanzania

The donor mapping exercises undertaken in preparation for the TBP identified existing programmes of other development partners that had relevance for eliminating child labour. These included a wide range of interventions, such as education, poverty alleviation, health, legal reform and awareness raising, research and child labour monitoring, that touch the enabling environment and/or direct interventions to withdraw and rehabilitate children while providing alternatives to them and their families.

Nepal:

For the TBP in Nepal, World Food Programme (WFP) is collaborating with IPEC to promote joint targeting so that poor families vulnerable to child labour will be prioritized for participation in WFP's existing or planned Food-for-Work activities. Also, they will cooperate to ensure that the quality of primary education is improved together with improved enrolment and attendance rates, especially in schools targeted by the WFP Food-for-Education Programme.

United Republic of Tanzania:

Among a number of specific programmes for which there is collaboration for the TBP include:

- The Tanzania Social Action Trust Fund funded by the World Bank
- Institutional support to the Ministry of Labour's Labour Law Reform project funded by DANIDA (Denmark)
- The School Feeding Programme of the WFP
- The Small Entrepreneurs Loan Facility of the African Development Bank

6 How the ILO can help with resource mobilization

The resources mobilized for the first three TBPs in El Salvador, Nepal and the United Republic of Tanzania, were concentrated in one large-scale support project. In these cases, funding was negotiated between IPEC and one principal donor, the US Department of Labor. There were good reasons for setting up the TBP framework with a large-scale support project to put it in motion. Such a project focusing on several high profile target groups has a strong demonstration effect. It shows what is possible and helps attract additional resources. Given the ambitious goals of the TBP and its relatively short time-horizon (5 to 10 years in most cases), a large support project is highly useful for creating momentum. It is, however, one way to set up a TBP, but not necessarily the only one.

ILO Convention No. 182 is well on its way to universal ratification. Each additional ratification boosts the global cause to eliminate WFCL. Although only a portion of ratifying countries will choose the TBP approach to apply the Convention, IPEC clearly does not have the resources to assume the principal role in the mobilization of funds, the design and the implementation of all future TBPs. Thus, the extent of IPEC's involvement will vary according to the capacity and potential of each of its partner governments.

While governments have the principal responsibility for securing funding for their TBPs, the ILO can help to facilitate the process where needed. Local IPEC and ILO offices have experience in negotiating agreements as well as interagency networks of contacts. The ILO can assist in the process of mobilizing bilateral donor support both through Headquarters and its local contacts. In many cases ILO offices and IPEC staff

have direct contacts with donor agencies at the country level. They can provide information on donor priorities, requirements and procedures, and technical input and know-how for producing necessary documentation. Similarly, ILO Regional Offices and Multidisciplinary Teams can facilitate access to regional project funds and resources, particularly where regional desk officers of relevant donors are based in the same country.



National Steering Committees (NSCs), (TBP task forces in some cases) can potentially play a strong role in strengthening TBP-related resource mobilization and leveraging activities. Possible activities include: producing and endorsing resource mobilization strategies; facilitating tri-partite consultation and support; and supporting social mobilization and awareness raising

on resource mobilization needs. IPEC's National Programme Managers (NPMs), for their part, can be of assistance in ensuring that resource mobilization needs

are well identified and correspond to the capacity and activities envisioned. NPMs also support the NSCs in implementing decisions related to resource mobilization.