



International
Labour
Organization #

Report on the Review of Capacity and Coordination towards Elimination of Child Labour in Ghana

A report on capacity to coordinate and implement the National Plan of Action
to Eliminate Child Labour in Ghana

Volume I: Report on the main findings and recommendations

23 March 2012

**International
Programme
on the Elimination of
Child Labour
(IPEC)**

Copyright © International Labour Organization 2013

First published 2013

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 ILO Publications (Rights and Permissions), International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland, or by email: pubdroit@ilo.org. The International Labour Office welcomes such applications.

Libraries, institutions and other users registered with reproduction rights organizations may make copies in accordance with the licences issued to them for this purpose. Visit www.ifrro.org to find the reproduction rights organization in your country.

IPEC

Report on the Review of Capacity and Coordination towards Elimination of Child Labour in Ghana. Volume I: Report on the main findings and recommendations / International Labour Office, International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) - Geneva: ILO, 2013. vol. 1.

ISBN: 978-92-2-127143-7 (Web PDF)

International Labour Office; ILO International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour

ILO Cataloguing in Publication Data

Acknowledgements

This publication was elaborated by Birgitte Krogh-Poulsen, Poulsen Consulting, for IPEC and coordinated by Alexandre Soho from IPEC Geneva Office.

Funding for this ILO publication was provided by the United States Department of Labor (Project RAF/10/54/USA).

This publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Labor, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

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 and electronic products 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 email: pubvente@ilo.org or visit our website: www.ilo.org/publns.

Visit our website: www.ilo.org/ipec

Available in PDF version only.

Photocomposed by

IPEC Geneva

Table of Contents

Summary of findings and recommendations	v
CLU and Labour Department capacity assessment and development:	v
District mapping and directory development	vi
Coherent advocacy strategy (national and district level).....	vi
Training for NSCCL, DCPCs, CCPCs and IPs	vi
Learning and exchange platforms	vi
Cooperating partner exchange forum on child protection	vii
Abbreviations	viii
1. Background and methodology	1
1.1. Objective and purpose of the Coordination and capacity needs assessment	1
1.2. Overview of national framework and partners.....	1
1.3. Methodology	4
2. Main findings.....	5
2.1. National level coordination and capacity.....	5
2.1.1. The National Steering Committee on Child Labour (NSCCL)	5
2.1.2. Limited CLU capacity for coordination of NPA.....	7
2.1.3. Knowledge management	9
2.1.4. M&E of the NPA	11
2.1.5. Advocacy social mobilisation.....	11
2.1.6. Cross-sector coordination	12
2.2. District level coordination and capacity.....	12
2.2.1. Institutionalisation of child labour at district level	12
2.2.2. Establishing sustainable referral systems	13
2.2.3. Day-to-day coordination and cooperation.....	15
2.3. Community level coordination and capacity.....	16
2.3.1. Referral and identification of local resources	16
2.3.2. Community awareness and attitudes	16
2.3.3. Implementing partners.....	17
2.4. Capacity for coordination within IPEC Ghana	17
3. Conclusion: Recommended priority action points.....	19
3.1. CLU and Labour Department capacity assessment and development:	19

3.2.	District mapping and directory development	19
3.3.	Coherent advocacy strategy (national and district level).....	19
3.4.	Training for NSCCL, DCPCs, CCPCs and IPs	20
3.5.	Learning and exchange platforms	20
3.6.	Cooperating partner exchange forum on child protection	20

Summary of findings and recommendations.

Overall, Ghana's policy and legal framework for elimination of child labour is strong and up-to-date. Ghana has ratified relevant international conventions (such as the UNCRC, ILO Conventions 138 and 182 and the Palermo Protocol). The conventions have, by and large, been domesticated into national legislation and policies.

The operational framework for the elimination of child labour in Ghana is laid out in the National Plan of Action for the Elimination of Child Labour in Ghana (2009-2015) (the NPA). The NPA is embedded in the Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda (2010-2013) and the expectation is for the next plan to incorporate the NPA as well. Thus, the elimination of child labour is very firmly integrated with the national policy and development planning framework in Ghana,

The overall goal of the NPA is the reduction of the Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL) to the barest minimum by 2015 while laying the social, policy and institutional foundations for complete elimination of child labour in the long term.

Reaching the NPA goal evidently requires extensive and coherent coordination of all efforts to eliminate child labour in Ghana. The body responsible for oversight and policy guidance on the NPA is the NSCCL. The Child Labour Unit (CLU) in the Labour Department, MESW is responsible for day-to-day coordination and serves as the secretariat to the NSCCL.

A multi-partner group, which includes government, social partners, other civil society organisations and international partners, is in place working towards elimination of child labour. However, the coordination of the various partners is limited, owing in particular to the low capacity of the CLU to take on its role as it is foreseen in the NPA. The CLU is quite simply insufficiently funded and otherwise resources to live up to its mandate and role.

Related to this, partners face a number of other capacity constraints, including limited use of the knowledge base for evidence based planning and advocacy, limited learning from each other and uneven application of systems to ensure services to children.

A number of initiatives, including the GCLMS, are underway towards improving data collection and storage and strengthen referral services. However, full roll-out will require substantial time as well as further development of the DCPCs and CCPCs. Overall, the district level was found to be critical to the national capacity for implementation of the NPA, along with the capacity of the CLU and the Labour Department.

In order to strengthen capacity for coordination and implementation of the NPA the assessment recommends the following key priority interventions:

CLU and Labour Department capacity assessment and development:

The CLU, and by extension the Labour Department, is the entity that has the most direct responsibility for the effective implementation of the NPA. The CLU is critical to overall national coordination, implementation and oversight of the NPA. Yet, the CLU

capacity does not in any way match the responsibilities allocated to the Unit in the NPA. Therefore, the review strongly recommends that urgent attention is paid to making sure the Labour Department Capacity matches the responsibilities assigned.

Hence, key recommendation number one is to undertake, as a matter of priority, an in-depth capacity assessment and capacity development programme with the Labour Department, including the CLU. IPEC and other ILO department could work with other international partners to mobilise resources and provide technical advice in the process.

District mapping and directory development

Establishing functional referral systems at local level is critical to long sustainability of the intervention against child labour and a key part of ensuring a functional GCLMS. It is only possible to establish such mechanisms when solid knowledge on available services is established at local level. Therefore, the service provider mappings and directories at district level are a key recommendation. It should be stressed, that the active involvement of the CCPCs and DCPCs in the mapping is important to ensure full knowledge, partnerships and ownership of the referral mechanisms once established. IPEC can play a role in conceptualising the mappings, mobilise resources and provide TA for the roll-out of mappings.

Coherent advocacy strategy (national and district level)

In order to gather pace in the implementation of the NPA, partners uniformly identify political commitment at national and district level as a critical factor. Therefore, key recommendation number three is to support the development of an advocacy strategy that covers both national and district level. One possible way to do this is to establish a task force under the NSCL to develop the strategy or the existing Advocacy, Social Mobilisation and CLMS Sub-committee under the NSCCL may be able to take this up. The advocacy must be firmly based on evidence. Therefore, pending improvement in the knowledge management systems, the process must entail a mapping and review of existing researches and other knowledge available.

Training for NSCCL, DCPCs, CCPCs and IPs

To underpin the establishment of referral systems and increased advocacy, it is recommended that training and team building for the DCPCs and CCPCs is given priority. The training should focus on results-based project management (including reporting), resource mobilisation (including mobilisation of local resources) and advocacy and social mobilisation as these are basic capacities essential to the core functions of the DCPCs and CCPCs. To ensure adequate support and oversight, it is recommended that similar training and orientation can be extended to IPEC IPs and the NSCCL if required.

Learning and exchange platforms

IPs, NSCCL and other actors have a wealth of experience and knowledge that may be utilised more effectively (and may in fact lower the need for trainings) if shared with each other. Therefore, it is recommended that learning and exchange platforms are set-up to

facilitate joint learning. The platforms can be organised in a number of ways using both virtual and actual meetings.

Cooperating partner exchange forum on child protection

A fragmented approach to support for children's rights on the part of CPs tends to exacerbate the fragmentation within national systems. Therefore, it is recommended that a CP/international partner forum for improved coordination and exchange of experience is established as a matter of priority. This would enhance communication and coordination of the support to national efforts and contribute to minimising the risks of duplication of efforts and parallel structures.

Additional detail and recommendations can be found in chapter 3.

Abbreviations

CCPC	Community Child Protection Committee
CLU	Child Labour Unit
DCPC	District Child Protection Committee
DOVVSU	Police Victim Support Unit
EIB	Employment Information Branch
EMIS	Education Management Information System
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GAWU	Ghana Agricultural Workers' Union
GCLMS	Ghana Child Labour Monitoring System
GEA	Ghana Employers association
GES	Ghana Education Service
GTUC	Ghana Trade Union Congress
ICI	International Cocoa Initiative
ILO	International Labour Organization
IP	Implementing Partner
IPEC	International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour
MESW	Ministry of Employment and Social Welfare
MLGRD	Ministry of Local government and Rural Development
MOWAC	Ministry of Women Affairs and Children
NCCE	National Commission for Civic Education
NDPC	National Development and Planning Commission
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPA	National Plan of Action
NPECLC	National Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour in Cocoa Growing
NSCCL	National steering Committee on Child Labour
NYEP	National Youth Empowerment Programme
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
TOR	Terms of Reference
WCF	World Cocoa Foundation
WDACL	World day Against Child Labour
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labour

1. Background and methodology

1.1. Objective and purpose of the Coordination and capacity needs assessment

The capacity and coordination review that is presented in this report was commissioned by the ILO/IPEC Cocoa Communities Project in Ghana. The review and assessment was carried out by an independent consultant and the views expressed in this report are those of the consultant. They are not necessarily identical to the ILO's views.

The consultant would like to most sincerely thank the ILO/IPEC team in Ghana and all the partners who participated in the assessment for their cooperation.

This is volume I of the report on the assessment, detailing the findings and recommendations for strengthening national capacity to coordinate and implement the NP on child labour in Ghana. Volume II of the report contains more detailed information on the process and methodology employed in the assessment as well as annexes. The reports are contained in two volumes to make it easier to read.

The review looked into national, district and local capacity to implement the NPA and to coordinate interventions to eliminate child labour. The main focus for the exercise was on coordination, but other dimensions of capacity were also explored. Therefore, this report includes conclusions and recommendations pertaining to coordination, but also towards other dimensions of capacity that were found to be critical. More detail on the dimensions of capacity that were explored is contained in volume II of the report along with the detailed description of methodology.

The assignment was undertaken towards the following objective (as stated in the TOR):

“Establish/strengthen coordination mechanisms at the national and sub-national levels and build partnerships to ensure a better access of the targeted cocoa communities to quality education, social protection, livelihoods opportunities, improved child labour law enforcement and other public services; as well as identify the capacity needs of the key partners for effectiveness and efficiency in service delivery”.

It was carried out between January and March 2012 and included a four-week visit to Ghana, during which the consultant conducted interviews with partners and facilitated a workshop on coordination.

1.2. Overview of national framework and partners

Overall, Ghana's policy and legal framework for elimination of child labour is strong and up-to-date. Ghana has ratified relevant international conventions (such as the UNCRC, ILO Conventions 138 and 182 and the Palermo Protocol). The conventions have, by and large, been domesticated into national legislation and policies.

The operational framework for the elimination of child labour in Ghana is laid out in the National Plan of Action for the Elimination of Child Labour in Ghana (2009-2015) (the NPA). The NPA is embedded in the Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda (2010-2013) and the expectation is for the next plan to incorporate the NPA as well. Thus, the elimination of child labour is very firmly integrated with the national policy and development planning framework in Ghana.

The overall goal of the NPA is the reduction of the Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL) to the barest minimum by 2015 while laying the social, policy and institutional foundations for complete elimination of child labour in the long term.

Reaching the NPA goal evidently requires extensive and coherent coordination of all efforts to eliminate child labour in Ghana.

The NPA prioritises nine forms of child labour for immediate action: Child trafficking; mining and quarrying; fisheries; ritual servitude; commercial sexual exploitation of children; Portorage of heavy loads; child domestic servitude; agriculture; and street hawking and begging.

In practical terms, attention appears to be focussed primarily on child labour in cocoa growing, but increasingly attention is turning also to mining and fisheries. For the cocoa sector specifically, the Harkin-Engel Protocol Framework for Action has been ascended to by Ghana and the framework provisions are integrated with the NPA

The NPA prioritises a number of key strategic intervention areas that are not targeting specific sectors, but are aimed ensuring enforcement of laws, a conducive policy and social environment to elimination of child labour and capacity of partners to deliver services that will prevent, protect and withdraw children from the WFCL.

The National Steering Committee on Child Labour (NSCCL) is the overall policy, oversight and coordination body for the NPA. The NSCCL has over 27 members, representing government and civil society organisations and institutions that each have a role to play in the elimination of child labour. Cooperating Partners, such as ILO and UNICEF are observer and advisor members of the NSCCL. The NSCCL works through standing subcommittees and have TORs for its operations. In addition to the 27 organisations with a seat on the NSCCL, a number of organisations have been co-opted into the sub-committees.

The Secretariat to the NSCCL, according to the NPA, is the Child Labour Unit (CLU) in the Labour Department under the Ministry of Employment and Social Welfare (MESW). The CLU is responsible for all day-to-day coordination of child labour interventions, for secretariat services to the NSCCL and for spearheading mainstreaming and integration of child labour into government policies and programme. Though each government department is responsible for its own mainstreaming, the CLU is expected to play a supporting role. Other partners report to the NSCCL through the CLU. It should be noted though, that in practical terms the NPECLC (see below) seems to have taken over the coordination functions, including reporting to the NSCCL, in the cocoa sector. It should be noted also, that coordination etc. child trafficking is the responsibility of the Trafficking Secretariat in the Ministry of Women Affairs and Children (MOWAC).

Apart from housing the CLU, the Labour Department is also responsible for labour inspection, including inspections on child labour; as well as the Employment Information Branch responsible for Labour Market Information, including child labour.

In addition to the CLU, the MESW is home to the National Programme to Eliminate Child Labour in Cocoa (NPECLC). NPECLC is a cocoa sector specific project, housed within the MESW. NPECLC reports directly to the NSCCL sub-committee on cocoa, though it appears that, originally, the intention was for NPECLC to come under the overall coordination of the CLU. In practical terms, it seems NPECLC has assumed responsibility for coordination of interventions to eliminate child labour in cocoa in parallel to the CLU.

The Employment Information Branch (EIB) in the Labour Department is responsible for labour information, including information on child labour and is therefore closely involved in the development and piloting of the Ghana Child Labour Monitoring System (GCLMS), which is spearheaded by NPECLC.

In addition to the MESW (including the Labour Department) and MOWAC, a number of other government entities are active in the implementation of the NPA. These include amongst other the Ghana Education Services, the National Development and Planning Commission, the Ministries of Local Government and Rural Development, Food and Agriculture, Lands and Natural Resources and the Ghana Statistical Services. Each of these have signed MOUs with the MESW, detailing their role and responsibilities in the implementation of the NPA.

Workers' and Employers' organisations, though both national centres and sectoral unions, play a critical role in the implementation of the NPA. The Ghana Trade Union Congress (TUC) and the Ghana Employers Association (GEA) are among the members of the NSCCL and have signed MOUs with the Government for the implementation of the NPA.

In addition to the social partners a number of civil society organisations, including NGOs providing services to children and media houses are very active members of the national partnership to eliminate child labour.

Several international partners support the implementation of the NPA. They include, in addition to the ILO, UNICEF, Danida and cocoa industry initiatives such as ICI and WCF.

In terms of actual delivery of services, monitoring of child labour (through the pilot GCLMS) and identification of children, who require support, the NPA provides for the establishment of District Child Protection Committees (DCPCs) and of Community Child Protection Committees (CCPCs). The CCPCs are community volunteer groups responsible for identification and immediate support within the communities. They are overseen and supported by the DCPCs. The DCPCs consist of representatives from relevant local government departments, civil society organisations and members of the District Assemblies. The DCPCs report to the District Chief Executive (who is also the Chair of the DCPC) as well as to the politically elected heads of the District Assemblies. The DCPCs can generally be seen as one of the most important elements in the implementation and coordination of the NPA. The setting up of DCPCs is on-going, hence not all district have functional DCPCs yet.

A number of coordination bodies for other sectors exist that may have a bearing on child labour. Most notably, the MOWAC is leading work to establish a child protection policy and a national child protection systems that cuts across different sectors, including child labour which seen as a key issue in relation to the wider child protection framework.

1.3. Methodology

A detailed description of the methodology used in this exercise is contained in volume II of the report. Here it should be highlighted that the exercise was not a “classical” capacity assessment of individual organisations. Rather, a wide-angle perspective on coordination and capacity was adopted and the methods and tools employed were therefore a combination of review methods and tools used for more classical organisational capacity assessments.

During the assignment, the consultant held interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with representatives of partner organisations and facilitated a partner workshop on coordination. A list of people consulted as well as the programme, list of participants and the outcome matrix from the workshop are contained in volume II of the report

2. Main findings

2.1. National level coordination and capacity

As described under 1.2. above, a number of entities are responsible for implementation and coordination of child labour (and the wider child protection and other sector) initiatives in Ghana. Though the roles and responsibilities as regards child labour are outlined clearly in the NPA, the efforts do at times appear uncoordinated and disjointed and a number of partners expressed concerns that organisations work in isolation and have limited access to other partners. This leads to untapped potential and poses a real risk of duplication of efforts.

The single most important reason for this appears to be the relatively weak capacity of the CLU to take up its coordination responsibilities, including also the parallel structure for coordination of the cocoa sector that has emerged under NPECLC. A number of other capacity constraints however, are also contributing to the limited coordination.

2.1.1. The National Steering Committee on Child Labour (NSCCL)

The NSCCL is made of representatives from a variety of organisations, government and civil society. Currently, it has 27 permanent members and works through 3 of sub-committees.

During NSCCL meetings, members receive reports from organisations that take action against child labour, discuss the status of child labour in Ghana and review and endorse new projects and initiatives.

In the past, the NSCCL has had challenges meeting at regular intervals. In 2011 the NSCCL met quarterly for the first time in a number of years. The meetings appear to have been funded, however, from ad-hoc sources. There is a need therefore to advocate with the MESW to integrate provisions for NSCCL operations within the budget of the CLU to ensure that the NSCCL can meet and carry out its oversight role. In addition, it could be explored whether some of the NSCCL functions, such as reviews of project proposals, could be undertaken via email. This would also leave more time for the NSCCL to discuss policy initiatives during meetings.

The NSCCL receives its reports on the implementation of the NPA through the CLU. Partners are expected to report to the CLU at regular intervals. The reporting is however perceived to be patchy. Partners do not report on time and the CLU lacks the capacity to follow-up.

In general, the NSCCL members interviewed highlighted the urgent need to strengthen the capacity of the CLU to take on its full secretariat role. The NSCCL TORs are quite clear on the role and mandate of the NSCCL, but the actual carrying out of the mandate relies on the secretariat services of the CLU, which does not have the required capacity (see below also).

In addition to the constraints imposed by the low capacity of the CLU, it is the impression of the review that the NSCCL tends to focus its attention almost exclusively on activities under the NPA without relating discussion and review to the wider development context in Ghana. For example, the NSCCL has not discussed or received report on the development of a national Child Protection Policy by the MOWAC. This poses a real risk of duplication and lost opportunities and is probably a reflection of the tendency to work in relative isolation within specific sectors (e.g. child labour) that work on children's rights in Ghana in general.

The NSCCL members acknowledge that they have a role in advocating for the resourcing of the CLU and do take steps to advocate when opportunity arises. Under the assumption, that the CLU will receive increased resources that match its role and mandate, it would be possible to take a few simple steps that would further enhance the capacity of the NSCCL to carry out its national oversight and policy formulation role. These include developing a work plan for the NSCCL and its subcommittees that includes regular field monitoring visits, a simple standard format for the partner reporting to the NSCCL and the appointment of focal points on the NSCCL for contact to and briefings on developments in other, related sectors such as child protection, education, agriculture etc.

It would also be worthwhile considering reorganising the steering committee to establish a rotational leadership group that could be the primary contact point for the CLU. If the NSCCL members played a more active role in the running of the NSCCL, it would ease the demands on the CLU.

Regardless, it should be noted that the NSCCL needs to address the level of representation to its meetings. It was stressed during discussions with different partners, that sometimes member organisations nominate staff members to attend NSCCL meetings that do not have the authority to make decisions on behalf of the organisation. This slows down the operations of the NSCCL and dilutes its oversight role. This, essentially, needs to be addressed by the organisations themselves, but MESW could be encouraged to remind members of the importance of nominating representatives that can actively participate in fulfilling the NSCCL oversight and policy mandate.

The level of representation appears to be a reflection of the importance, or relative lack thereof, which some organisations accord to the elimination of child labour. By nominating low level staff with no authority in decision making, organisations effectively undermine the NSCCL oversight and policy role and weaken its leadership in the fight against child labour in Ghana. Some respondents interviewed pointed out, that the NSCCL seems to concern itself mostly with detailed technical work, such as vetting IPEC Action Programmes, rather than with the overall policy formulation, NPA oversights and advocacy work expected of the NSCCL. The NSCCL needs to urgently look into its own working modalities and priorities in order to ensure adequate leadership and oversight in the implementation of the NPA.

The NSCCL has been consulted on the development of the NPA M&E framework, but members may lack capacity to apply the framework to the oversight of the NPA implementation. Therefore, training for the NSCCL on results-based management, including the use of targets and indicators in monitoring and oversight, could be considered.

Monitoring the progress and impact of the NPA, and not just the activities, is essentially the NSCCL's responsibility and an integral part of its leadership on policy formulation for elimination of child labour. Ensuring that all NSCCL members have capacity to do this, including a clear understanding of their leadership role and how leadership, oversight and M&E relate would very likely contribute to strengthening the policy level focus on child labour.

All of the above to some degree hinges on strengthening the capacity of the CLU as discussed below. It should be stressed, that mobilising resources for the implementation of the NPA, including mobilising resources for the CLU to take on its role, is within the mandate of the NSCCL. Hence, it is recommended that the NSCCL draws up a coherent resource mobilisation strategy, possibly with technical support from IPEC and other cooperating partners. This should obviously be based on solid evidence, including a budget for the NPA. Hence, the resource mobilisation strategy can be developed when the current exercise by the NDPC with IPEC support to cost the NPA is complete.

2.1.2. Limited CLU capacity for coordination of NPA

The CLU is the single most important coordination, communication and partner service entity in Ghana when it comes to the elimination of child labour. The role accorded to it under the NPA is crucial to the successful coordination of the NPA implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Yet, the unit has been allowed to wither. The one issue that was stressed by partners in almost all interviews and FGDs, as well as in the workshop on coordination, is the urgent need to build the capacity of the CLU to assume its expected role.

The review found that the CLU capacity is extremely limited on a number key capacity dimensions:

The CLU is very short staffed. Currently, the unit has two staff members (initially the Unit had three staff posts, but one post was abandoned). The two members of staff are expected to, amongst others, collect and collate reports from all partners on their initiatives against child labour, provide secretariat services to the NSCCL to ensure that it fulfils its mandate, coordinate partner interventions on a day-to-day basis, ensure that all partners know each other and communicate effectively across sectors and geographical areas, provide support and advise on the mainstreaming and integration of child labour within government policies, programmes and budgets, raise awareness and liaise with partners in other sectors to ensure that child labour is reflected and in sync with wider developments. This is a tall order and well beyond the capacity of a two-person unit. It should be noted, that in the NPA it was foreseen that the CLU would have three full-time staff, but that one post within the Unit has been disbanded.

At district level, the District Labour Officer (alternatively the District Social Welfare Officer) is expected to play the key coordination role and act as an extended arm of the CLU. The capacity constraints faced by district staff will be dealt with separately under 2.2. below. Here, it should be highlighted that currently, the CLU faces capacity constraints in maintaining sufficient contact with and providing adequate support to colleagues at district level.

Added to the short comings in staffing levels, are constraints related to the very limited budgets for activities and limited availability of logistical support and equipment.

Furthermore, the CLU staff members have identified constraints in their skills within a number of key areas, most notably results-based project management and IT. For example, the CLU work plans and reports do not set targets that relate to the NPA and the CLU staff members are not familiar with data base use and management, though they are expected to play a role in collecting and disseminating data on child labour through the GCLMS when established and through other sources.

The weak capacity of the CLU is further exacerbated by the de-facto existence of parallel coordination structures within the Government. Both the CLU and the NPECLC currently assume a coordinating function, with NPECLC de-facto coordinating all aspects of child labour elimination in the cocoa sector, including direct reporting to the NSCCL (rather than through the CLU). Some interviewees pointed out, that the parallel structures have led to wasted resources with two secretariats (NPECLC and CLU) working independently of each other, sometimes not knowing what each other are doing. The review also noticed that the NPECLC offices appear to be far better resourced than the CLU offices. In a situation of scarce resources this may cause discontent. At any rate, maintaining two independent offices in separate buildings but under the same overall Ministry, essentially working on the same issues, appear to be inefficient use of resources. To improve on efficiency, ensure communication and clear and uniform priorities it is therefore essential that this parallel structure is evaluated critically and that it is made clear how the NPECLC and the CLU relate with each other and with the NSCCL as well as other partners. A structure where NPECLC coordinates the cocoa sector, but otherwise fall under the overall coordination of the CLU may make overall national coordination and implementation of the NPA more efficient and effective. This would be well in line with the NPA and the NPECLC mandate.

As is evident, the CLU does not operate in a vacuum. It is also part of the Labour Department and can draw on the wider resources of the Department. It is the impression of the review however, that the Labour Department is characterised by capacity constraints that are similar to those in the CLU itself. For example, the entire Labour Department has limited access to equipment, face severe budget constraints that impact on its ability to carry its duties and face shortages of staff as well as constraints in staff capacity to manage projects, report, mobilise resources etc. The separate workshop on child labour and labour inspection, held by the CCP during the consultant's visit to Ghana, also brought out severe capacity constraints in the Labour Inspectorate and the need to strengthen the capacity of the Labour Department.

Therefore, strengthening CLU capacity cannot be done in isolation. The key recommendation derived from this review is therefore to carry out an extensive and in-depth capacity assessment with the Labour Department, including the CLU, followed by a systematic, well thought-out capacity development and change-management programme.

Without increased attention to the CLU and Labour Department capacity to coordinate the implementation and oversight of the NPA, the implementation will remain piece meal and fragmented and the child labour agenda will not be linked to other

developments (notably within child protection in a wider sense) in any effective or efficient manner.

It follows logically, therefore that other partners, including not least the social partners and the ILO, must come together to advocate for increased resources to the CLU and the Labour Department. Moreover, the ILO can play a key role in conceptualising, planning (including fund raising) and execution of a comprehensive capacity development programme in the Labour Department. Such a programme would go beyond only looking at child labour and it is recommended, therefore, that the IPEC works with other ILO departments, as well as with other partners, such as the ICI to support capacity development in the Labour Department.

Advocacy for increased budgets for the CLU work must be based on solid evidence, including a realistic budget for the implementation of the NPA and for the costs of coordinating and overseeing the implementation. The current exercise undertaken by IPEC and the NDPC towards budgeting for the NPA can be an effective tool to assist the Labour Department in working out realistic budgets for the costs of coordination and oversight. As discussed above under the NSCCL, an overall resource mobilisation strategy could be developed by the NSCCL, which would also take into consideration the need to mobilise additional resources for the CLU's work.

Furthermore, it should be stressed that a number of initiatives can be started while awaiting the wider capacity assessment and development programme. This includes, for example, revision of the CLU work plan and reporting formats to become more results oriented. It is suggested that IPEC Ghana can provide technical advice on this. A more detailed report on the specific steps proposed has been provided to the CLU and IPEC under separate cover.

It should also be stressed, that loading all responsibility for coordination, monitoring and reporting onto the CLU makes the system very vulnerable to capacity constraints, changes and other circumstances within the CLU. Hence, it is worth considering relieving the CLU of some of its more operational duties, such as the collection and dissemination of research through establishing partnerships with other partners for actual day-to-day operations (see below). It must be stressed though, that the overall coordination of NPA implementation and the reporting to the NSCCL must be firmly rooted with the CLU to ensure coherence and transparency within the system.

2.1.3. Knowledge management

The NPA, the CCP project document and other recent policy and programme documents all quote the 2001 child labour survey as the prime source of information. A labour force survey which includes child labour indicators is planned for 2012.

The review attempted to locate other pieces of research that may have been undertaken between 2001 and 2012, but was unable to find an overview or indeed obtain copies of research from organisations or the Internet. Several respondents did point out, however, that a number of smaller studies have been carried out. These include surveys in the cocoa sector by NPECLC, GAWU and MOWAC;

It is the responsibility of the CLU in collaboration with research bodies to ensure that all research is printed, disseminated and made easily available. Due to the severe capacity constraints in the CLU, there appears to be no well-functioning system in place to ensure easy access to knowledge generated through research. Furthermore, there is no indication that available research is used for evidence based planning and advocacy in any systematic manner.

The GCLMS has been pre-tested by NPECLC and will be piloted in a number of cocoa growing communities, starting in 2012. Partners expect the GCLMS to provide, on an on-going basis, an up-dated and easily accessible knowledge base on child labour in Ghana. The GCLMS, however, is a complex and resource demanding system and rolling it out across all sectors and regions will be a costly and time demanding process. Hence, it would be unrealistic to expect that the GCLMS will be able to provide the up-date knowledge required for evidence based planning and advocacy in the immediate term. There is therefore an urgent need to look at systematically collecting and collating knowledge that is already available. This could be integrated with the pilot phase review of the GCLMS, scheduled for the third quarter of 2012 according to NPECLC.

Given the current capacity constraints in the CLU, it is recommended that the CLU could work in partnership with appropriate research bodies, such as universities or the GSS to collate and disseminate research. It is strongly recommended that an on-line resource is established. Preferably, the resource should be accessible through both the CLU and NPECLC websites and through one or more research institution websites. It can be maintained by any of the hosts. It is important to note, that knowledge must be made easily accessible at district and community levels, just as well as national level.

Knowledge is more than research and partners in Ghana have a wealth of operational experiences and lessons that can be used effectively to shape strategies and policies if systematically shared and documented. Apart from the Cocoa Partner Forum convened by NPECLC and the Yen Dakyee movement for NGOs it seems there are few platforms for partners to come together and share experiences and lessons. Partners repeatedly brought up the need for additional mechanisms to share information, lessons and coordinate strategically. During the partner workshop, a number of partners and the IPEC M&E Officer decided to establish an M&E Caucus with the purpose exchanging experience and learning from each other. It is recommended, that similar platforms on other subjects could be established to stimulate learning and coordination. These platforms can be sector based (like to Cocoa Partners Forum) or based on particular processes (like the M&E Caucus) and can be internet based communities of practises, study groups or professional networks that meet physically or a combination of both. In any case, it is important to define their specific purpose and their expected duration from the onset. If the group is expected to be long term, its viability and continuation must be ensured from the beginning. If the group is expected to exist for a limited time, its life span must be defined. A directory of partners in elimination of child labour (see 2.2. below) can form the backbone for identification of members for the different platforms.

Finally, the review finds that work could be done to strengthen the systematic use of research, good practise and other knowledge in planning, advocacy etc. This would

require training for key partners on project management and development of advocacy strategies as discussed below.

2.1.4. M&E of the NPA

An M&E plan for the NPA is under development but the issue seems to be low on the agenda of partner agencies. Without the development and application of a comprehensive M&E framework for the NPA, however, there is no way of measuring results and correct the course of action of the NPA, where required.

Again, it is absolutely essential that the CLU has its capacity strengthened to lead the application of the M&E framework and report the findings to the NSCCL. In addition to the core capacities (staff etc.) that need strengthening in the CLU, it is also recommended that CLU (and other Labour Department staff) and members of the NSCCL are given training on M&E, including how to adjust strategies and actions based on monitoring and evaluation. This all the more critical as the NPA M&E framework needs to be linked with the M&E framework of the overall National development Framework in close collaboration with the NDCP and a thorough understanding of M&E among child labour partners is necessary to ensure solid outcomes.

The IPEC projects in Ghana, and especially the CCP, appear to have substantial components on M&E. These components are tied to the projects themselves it seems. It may be useful to consider applying some of the M&E resources within IPEC to strengthening the national M&E framework and practise too.

2.1.5. Advocacy social mobilisation

Advocacy by the NSCCL members and other partners, for allocation of resources to child labour, including to the CLU, for political commitment and leadership at national and district level and mobilisation of change agents within communities has been highlighted, both in the partner workshop and in various interviews and FGDs.

The need for increased advocacy is driven by a realisation that even though Ghana has a very comprehensive legal and policy framework for the elimination of child labour, the provisions are often not put into practise and change is slower than partners would want.

The slow change to practise, and the slow progress on actual elimination of child labour, is seen very much as a result of resources not being allocated to match the good intentions. Therefore, partners are calling for increased political commitment and for more resources (human, financial etc.) to be allocated to child labour elimination, especially within the government.

Partners are already advocating for this, but the efforts tend not to be coordinated in a systematic way. Moreover, efforts are limited by the absence of a budget for the NPA and by the limited accessibility to the knowledge base described above.

It is therefore recommended, that partners, under the leadership of the NSCCL, should formulate a coherent advocacy strategy or plan and set up an advocacy task force, whose mandate it is to identify opportunities for advocacy, coordinate the advocacy efforts

undertaken by different partners and track the changes in commitment and practise resulting from the advocacy. The advocacy group could consist of the tripartite partners as well as other partners with strategic leverage on advocacy, for example media houses and traditional leaders. The task force would also be well placed to provide technical advice and support on advocacy across the partner base at both national and district level.

2.1.6. Cross-sector coordination

As described above also, the coordination and oversight structures on child labour are relatively clear. Similar structures exist in relation to a number of other child rights issues, for example juvenile justice. Even though the various issues are interdependent and an individual child may be both a child labour and a child in conflict with the law or a victim of violence, as examples, there seems to be little coordination across sectors. This invariably poses a risk of duplication of efforts, creation of parallel structures etc. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that capacity development for coordination with the CLU, the Labour Department, the NSCCL and other partners in the child labour alliance takes into account the need to strengthen cross sector coordination. For example, a capacity assessment of the Labour Department could include a mapping of the Department's links with other relevant actors (both in terms of numbers and strength of links). Stronger national coordination must also be underpinned by improved coordination among CPs as described in 2.4. below. A child protection system mapping undertaken by MOWAC and Unicef in 2010 can be used as a starting point.

2.2. District level coordination and capacity

Though partners recognise the importance of a strong, well-coordinated alliance against child labour at national level, they repeatedly stressed the importance of ensuring that the district level partners, both government and civil society, have adequate capacity to coordinate, implement and monitor interventions at district and community level for the NPA to succeed.

2.2.1. Institutionalisation of child labour at district level

The District Child Protection Committee (DCPC) is the key entity for NPA implementation and partner coordination at district level. The DCPC consists of local government officials and civil society representatives. The District Labour Officer (alternatively the District Social Welfare Officer) is the secretary to the DCPC.

The DCPC, with the District Planning and Coordination Officer is responsible for the integration of child labour elimination in the district development plans. A directive to this effect has been issued by the National Development and Planning Commission and the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development.

In spite of the formalisation of the integration of child labour into the district development plans, the process appears to move at different pace in different districts and the actual budget allocations vary, depending primarily on the local political commitment within the District assembly.

It was suggested by partners, therefore, that districts should be required to provide counterpart funding, (for example through a certain percentage allocated from the District Assemblies' Common Fund) for projects on child labour that operate in their district. This is already practised by NPECLC. While this may be a tool for securing budget allocations for child labour in the immediate term, there is no guarantee that the funding will be maintained after the end of the projects. Moreover, this will not change the commitment levels or budget allocations in district where no external (in the sense of national programmes or donor funded projects) support is present. Therefore, the counterpart funding mechanism cannot stand alone and is not uniformly agreed to by all partners.

In addition, it is essential that child labour issues are further institutionalised at district level. Suggestions for this include revising job descriptions and the performance assessment for government staff to include child labour. Moreover, it is suggested that child labour is included in the next Mid-Term Development Framework to reinforce inclusion of child labour in the budgeting mechanisms at district and national level. The Ministry of Local Government, the Civil Service Commission and the National Development Planning Commission must be actively involved in these processes by including child labour in the Guidelines for the development of Sectoral and District Medium Term Plans and M&E Frameworks.

All partners agree, that for institutionalisation of child labour at district level to take root, further advocacy and social mobilisation is essential. Institutionalisation will not happen without commitment and commitment can be harnessed through advocacy and social mobilisation.

It is suggested therefore, that, as recommended by partners, DCPCs and members of the District Assemblies are offered training and orientation. The DA members should primarily receive basic orientation on child labour, aimed at building local political commitment. The DCPCs would benefit from training on effective advocacy, results-based planning and management and awareness and social mobilisation.

2.2.2. Establishing sustainable referral systems

The DCPCs do not only play a crucial role in coordination and resource mobilisation in a broad sense. They are instrumental in establishing and maintaining referral systems for provision of services to children and families. For referral systems to be effective and sustainable they must be embedded in existing local structures and services. Moreover, in a situation with scarcity of resources it is essential to avoid duplication and waste of resources. Therefore, referral systems must be based on sound knowledge of the organisations that work in a particular district, the systems that are already in place and other systems that may be under development (not least the national child protection system under development by MOWAC and the education systems). It is strongly recommended, therefore, that institutional mappings are carried out at district level and that, based on the mappings, directories of service providers are developed. The exercise can start from the CCP mapping of actors in the Cocoa Sector, the national level institutional mapping on child protection carried out by Unicef in 2010 and the directory of service providers contained in the draft SOPs for withdrawal, protection and prevention of child labour. Both are very

valuable sources of information but information could be refined and broken down further to facilitate action at district level.

It is recommended also, that the mappings should cover both services directed at children (education, recreation, psycho-social support etc.) and programmes and services targeting improved livelihoods and social skills among parents and communities (health, adult literacy, farming practises etc.). In addition, the mappings must identify government and civil society organisations and programmes, as well as local resources, such as savings and credit groups. It is therefore proposed that the exercise should actively involve the DCPCs and CCPCs, with technical and financial support from national government and cooperating partners. A multi-partner funding and TA group would enhance the collective knowledge generated through the exercise and would also serve as a partnership building mechanisms at local, district and national level. In practical terms, the basic mapping tool can be PRA-style community maps, supplemented by information from district registers, partner registers etc. Using this approach, the mapping exercise itself can also serve an important mobilisation purpose at community level.

This is of course a major undertaking that requires substantial time and other resources but the benefits in terms of improve partnerships, knowledge and oversight for coordination and actual service delivery are expected to be high. Mappings and directories have shown themselves to be simple, straight forward tools with high impact on operations in a number of contexts. It may be necessary to stage the mapping and start with a pilot in a select number of districts.

The mapping exercise may also contribute significantly to the implementation of the GCLMS pilot as it will facilitate the referral of children identified under the GCLMS for support. It is an inherent risk in CLM systems that focus stays on collecting information and reporting, rather than on using the data for action. By mapping available services, the GCLMS action component will be enhanced. It is absolutely essential to bear in mind throughout that the referral of children for services must not only be set up to support children withdrawn from child labour but to also prevent at-risk children from entering in the first place. Hence, the services and organisations to be mapped must include both those that may provide specialist assistance to ex-child labourers and those that may tackle the root causes of child labour (economic empowerment, attitudes etc.) at family and individual level to prevent children from entering child labour.

Before the mapping is undertaken, partners must come together to agree on the services that should be part of a child labour (or child protection) referral system and a standard format for the directory, detailing briefly what the organisations listed can offer, must be developed.

The development of definitions and tools can be done by a working group under the oversight of the NSCCL. This would also serve to stimulate discussion and knowledge generation on strategies to prevent, protect and withdraw children from child labour.

Moreover, the mapping will invariably identify the areas where gaps in service provision are evident. Concerns were raised in the partner workshop, for example, over the

relatively low availability of professional psycho-social support and therapy for traumatised children.

The development of a functioning referral system is tied in with the GCLMS. However, serious concerns over the sustainability of the GCLMS were raised throughout the exercise. As discussed earlier, the GCLMS is a resource demanding exercise and therefore not likely to be completely rolled out and functioning within any short time frame. In fact, several people interviewed expressed their concern that the GCLMS in its current form may never be fully functional and sustainable. This makes the development of simple tools that facilitate action within the GCLMS framework, or outside of it, even more crucial. Development of directories for effective referral will most likely facilitate action even if the GCLMS is not fully rolled out and/or proves unsustainable. If the GCLMS becomes a functioning system, the directories will contribute directly into this system.

Moreover, it will be critically important to review carefully the effectiveness and sustainability of the GCLMS during the pilot phase. The GCLMS builds on assumptions that the DCPCs have capacity (or can have their capacity built) to manage the system, both in terms of data collection and coordination of action based on the data. The system is a stand-alone system, which, all other things being equal, makes it more costly in terms of equipment, skills, staff time etc. It may be worthwhile, based on the outcome of the pilot phase, to explore linking the system with other, existing systems, such as the EMIS.

2.2.3. Day-to-day coordination and cooperation

Whereas the mapping and directory development are key tools for establishment of systems and long term coordination, effective implementation of the NPA also requires effective day-to-day coordination at district level. Enhanced coordination is required to make effective use of limited resources, such as transport equipment. It is recommended, that the DCPCs are requested to maintain a calendar of events, such as field travel, major meetings, WDAFL activities etc., in the district. This could contribute to more effective utilisation of resources and a well-coordinated work programme.

In order for DCPC members to be not only active, but proactive in identifying children, opportunities for action and change, local resources etc. it is essential that members understand child labour, that they have the skills and attitudes required to take affective action and that they work together in a spirit of cooperation. The impression from the review is, that these factors are present in some district and less developed in others. It is recommended therefore, that training for DCPCs is made a priority. The training must go beyond training on data entry etc. under the GCLMS. It must also be training on results-based planning, management and M&E and on effective cooperation and coordination. Therefore, it is recommended that the training is conceptualised and designed not only as a means of transferring specific skills and knowledge, but also as team building exercises, that will facilitate cooperation within the DCPCs and between the DCPCs and other district entities and the communities.

2.3. Community level coordination and capacity

2.3.1. Referral and identification of local resources

Within communities, the CCPCs are the key entity for action. They are expected to play a substantial role in the GCLMS roll-out and in the development and implementation of Community Action Plans. Therefore, their capacities to coordinate identify children and mobilise local communities and resources are essential. This means, in effect, that trainings must be extended to the community level as well. This would in large parts involve IPs and DCPCs and hence their capacity to train the CCPC members becomes critical to the implementation of the NAP at local level.

As described above, an effective way to build partnerships and skills is not only training but also the active involvement of CCPC member and DCPC members in mapping local resources and service providers. Nevertheless, CCPCs may need support to operate the CCPCs in a transparent and effective manner. Moreover, it should be recalled that CPCC members are volunteers that contribute their personal resources, such as time that could have otherwise been spent on economic activities. Recognising this through monetary payments to CCPC members have clear sustainability challenges. Therefore other means of motivating and recognising volunteers are important. Providing training on child labour, mobilisation and awareness raising skills etc. is one way to recognise and motivate volunteers that will, at the same time, strengthen the establishment of effective referral mechanisms, change attitudes and behaviours in communities etc. In addition, partners could consider offering livelihoods support, such as training on improved agricultural practise, to members of the CPCC.

Moreover, increased efforts to recognise DCPCs, CCPCs and other organisations making a difference during events at WDAFL (and similar occasions) by the NSCCL could play an important role in mobilising volunteers. Recognition could take the form of a prize for “Elimination of Child Labour Partner of the Year”, press statements naming organisations that have done particularly well or any other public recognition of good work.

Such measures are already part of projects undertaken by various partners, including IPEC. To ensure that capacity development reaches out to as many CPCCs as possible and that the quality standards are high, a learning platform on community mobilisation and capacity development could be established at national level.

2.3.2. Community awareness and attitudes

Partners repeatedly stressed the importance of creating a favourable social environment at local level as one of the keys to successful NPA implementation. The CPCCs play a critical role in mobilising communities for the elimination of child labour. Therefore, training for CPCC members could include training on communication skills, mobilisation strategies etc. It is highly recommended that the materials available in the IPEC SCREAM Pack are used for such training. Moreover, it is recommended that training is not limited to members of the CCPCs, but also include other potential change agents including children and young people.

2.3.3. Implementing partners

IPEC implementing partners and other civil society organisations, working for the mobilisation of communities and establishment of sustainable community structures and mechanisms, are the primary source of capacity development expertise and other resources within communities. Hence it is critical, that they are themselves well-resources to carry out capacity development within communities. They must know and understand child labour in detail, e.g. be able to identify the drivers behind child labour, devise and adapt strategies to eliminate child labour within their communities and be able to monitor progress and adjust the course of action. Moreover, they must have basic project management skills (including reporting and financial management), skills in social mobilisation and advocacy and, not least, skills and knowledge that will allow them to build a trusting working relationship with members of the communities they work within.

Though IPs were selected for their skills in the first place, it may still be necessary to support their development on some of these parameters. This can be done through trainings, such as the planned CCP training on project management, (including IPEC requirements for reporting). Capacity development for implementing partners, however, cannot be done through trainings alone. It is recommended that implementing partners are included in the learning platforms that were described in more detail under 2.1. above. It is strongly recommended that mechanisms that will allow IPS, DCPCs and CCPCs to learn from each other, such as study visits and learning platforms are promoted as well.

IPs also need to be able to coordinate with each as they implement activities. This is discussed in more detail below.

2.4. Capacity for coordination within IPEC Ghana

In addition to assessing national coordination and capacity, the exercise also included identifying ways to strengthen IPEC internal coordination in relation to IPEC's support for national coordination and capacity.

During the partner workshop, recommendations were made to IPEC on how to support the enhancement of national, district and local coordination mechanisms. These recommendations are summarised in the matrix in annex 1. The recommendations were used in an exercise with the IPEC Ghana team to identify steps to improve IPEC's internal coordination. The identified steps are detailed in a separate report.

IPEC's internal coordination does not happen in isolation, however. Firstly, the IPEC projects are based on the implementing partners and therefore, coordinating IPEC support to national action means coordinating a number of partners. Among the tools that will likely be employed by CCP (and possibly other IPEC projects) are partner meetings at regular intervals as well as development of a project calendar of main activities (travel, workshops etc.) held by the CCP office or the IPs. The calendar will allow all partners to see what each other are doing and identify possibilities for joint implementation of activities and prevent "double bookings".

IPEC projects are also part of the wider donor support to Ghana. Currently, cooperating partners do not have a coordination mechanism for child labour/child

protection. This can exacerbate the coordination gaps in the national system, as CP support to particular institutions then also tend to happen in isolation from other CP's support to their counterpart ministries and organisations. It is therefore strongly recommended that IPEC contacts other international organisations (both bi- and multilateral CPs and INGOs) that support child protection in Ghana for the purpose of establishing regular coordination mechanisms among the CPs.

IPEC does not have to take the lead in organising the coordination mechanisms but can use its position and existing partnerships to take up the issue. A good starting point would be to discuss options for improving coordination with other UN agencies through the UNDAF framework. The coordination mechanisms should not be limited to the UN agencies though, but should include all relevant international partners.

3. Conclusion: Recommended priority action points

A number of recommendations have been made throughout this report. Not all of these can be implemented at the same time and prioritisation may have to be made based on resources available. Therefore, this section highlights the recommendations that the review identified as priority interventions as follows:

3.1. CLU and Labour Department capacity assessment and development:

The CLU, and by extension the Labour Department, is the entity that has the most direct responsibility for the effective implementation of the NPA. The CLU is critical to overall national coordination, implementation and oversight of the NPA. Yet, the CLU capacity does not in any way match the responsibilities allocated to the Unit in the NPA. Therefore, the review strongly recommends that urgent attention is paid to making sure the Labour Department Capacity matches the responsibilities assigned. Hence, key recommendation number one is to undertake, as a matter of priority, an in-depth capacity assessment and capacity development programme with the Labour Department, including the CLU. IPEC and other ILO department could work with other international partners to mobilise resources and provide technical advice in the process. The assessment needs to take into consideration a number of dimensions of capacity: technical skills and knowledge, staffing levels, financial and material resources, links with other entities (not least in light of the parallel structures in the MESW between the CLU and the NPECLC) as well as the role, mandate and responsibility accorded to the CLU through the NPA. It is recommended that the assessment looks critically at new ways to organise the CLU work where this would enhance efficiency. For example, it is worth considering partnerships to deliver services/outputs. One example would be exploring a partnership with a research institution towards reviving and maintaining the resource centre on child labour.

3.2. District mapping and directory development

Establishing functional referral systems at local level is critical to long sustainability of the intervention against child labour and a key part of ensuring a functional GCLMS. It is only possible to establish such mechanisms when solid knowledge on available services is established at local level. Therefore, the service provider mappings and directories at district level are a key recommendation. It should be stressed, that the active involvement of the CCPCs and DCPCs in the mapping is important to ensure full knowledge, partnerships and ownership of the referral mechanisms once established. IPEC can play a role in conceptualising the mappings, mobilise resources and provide TA for the roll-out of mappings.

3.3. Coherent advocacy strategy (national and district level)

In order to gather pace in the implementation of the NPA, partners uniformly identify political commitment at national and district level as a critical factor. Therefore, key recommendation number three is to support the development of an advocacy strategy that covers both national and district level. One possible way to do this is to establish a task force

under the NSCL to develop the strategy or the existing Advocacy, Social Mobilisation and CLMS Sub-committee under the NSCCL may be able to take this up. The advocacy must be firmly based on evidence. Therefore, pending improvement in the knowledge management systems, the process must entail a mapping and review of existing researches and other knowledge available.

3.4. Training for NSCCL, DCPCs, CCPCs and IPs

To underpin the establishment of referral systems and increased advocacy, it is recommended that training and team building for the DCPCs and CCPCs is given priority. The training should focus on results-based project management (including reporting), resource mobilisation (including mobilisation of local resources) and advocacy and social mobilisation as these are basic capacities essential to the core functions of the DCPCs and CCPCs. To ensure adequate support and oversight, it is recommended that similar training and orientation can be extended to IPEC IPs and the NSCCL if required.

3.5. Learning and exchange platforms

IPs, NSCCL and other actors have a wealth of experience and knowledge that may be utilised more effectively (and may in fact lower the need for trainings) if shared with each other. Therefore, it is recommended that learning and exchange platforms are set-up to facilitate joint learning. The platforms can be organised in a number of ways using both virtual and actual meetings.

3.6. Cooperating partner exchange forum on child protection

A fragmented approach to support for children's rights on the part of CPs tends to exacerbate the fragmentation within national systems. Therefore, it is recommended that a CP/international partner forum for improved coordination and exchange of experience is established as a matter of priority. This would enhance communication and coordination of the support to national efforts and contribute to minimising the risks of duplication of efforts and parallel structures.

In addition to the above key priorities for immediate attention, the following issues could be looked into. Some of these may only be addressed in the longer run and/or involve change processes that require substantial time before changes materialise:

a) The capacity of the NSCCL to take on its leadership role in the elimination of child labour.

It is recommended that the NSCCL members are engaged by the chair (possibly supported by IPEC) in a discussion of its own role, mandate and the way in which the NSCCL carries out its functions. The NSCCL could be encouraged to go through a process of self-evaluation to gauge to which extent it is currently living up to its expected role and responsibilities. This would include looking into the level of representation by member organisations, its advocacy and policy oversight activities, the way in which the NSCCL organises itself etc. This is something that can be started in the short term, for example as part of the in-depth capacity work with the CLU and development of a national advocacy strategy (numbers 1 and 3 above). Most likely however, it will require substantial time to be

finalised, both to allow for internalisation of changes among member organisations and to allow for establishing stronger links with other government oversight bodies in related sectors (e.g. education and child protection).

b) Review of parallel structures within the MESW.

It is recommended very strongly that the government starts work towards streamlining its implementation and coordination structures and clarify the roles, responsibilities and positions of the CLU and NPECLC. This may require time but could, like point a. above, be started soon as part of the strengthening of capacity in the Labour Department (point 1 above).

c) Under the leadership of the NSCCL, carefully evaluate the GCLMS.

It is recommended that partners very carefully review the effectiveness and sustainability of the GCLMS during the pilot phase and adjust and change the system if required. It is particularly important, that the GCLMS takes into account the capacity of the CCPCs to collect data and of the DCPCs to store, process and transmit data. In this regard, it may be useful to look at linking the GCLMS to other, existing systems (such as the EMIS) more systematically. Of equal importance is careful review of the capacity of DCPCs to coordinate action based on the data collected and of various partners to actually take action and prevent and withdraw children from child labour based on the information generated through the GCLMS.

d) Increase the focus on monitoring and evaluation of the NPA.

Monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness and impact of the NPA currently seem to be given relatively low priority, in favour of establishing implementation and coordination modalities. This is a natural prioritisation at the early stages of the NPA. The M&E framework is under development but partners did not appear familiar with the framework and, in some cases, not with M&E principles. It therefore important to bear in mind, that speedy finalisation and application of the NPA M&E framework is critical and partners need to ensure that the framework is not “lost” in the details of implementation of the NPA. Ensuring that M&E is part of trainings with the CCPCs, DCPCs, NSCCL and IPs (point 3 above) will contribute to capacity for effective M&E of the NPA as will the M&E caucus established during the partner workshop.

e) Strengthen institutionalisation of child labour elimination at district level.

In addition to the trainings proposed at district level, it is recommended that districts, with support from MESW, NDCP and other relevant government agencies, pursue continued and increased institutionalisation of child labour elimination at district level. The current efforts to integrate child labour into the District Medium Term Plans is excellent and could be further enhanced, for example, by also integrating child labour elimination into job description and performance evaluation systems. Moreover, simple coordination tools, like calendars of events, could be institutionalised for all DCPCs.