



Evaluation Summaries

Evaluation: Project of support for the implementation of a Time Bound Programme (TBP) in Senegal

Quick Facts

Country: Senegal

Mid-Term Evaluation: October 2005

Mode of Evaluation: Independent

Technical Area: Child Labour

Evaluation Management: Standards and Rights Sector

Evaluation team: An international external consultant

Project Start: September 2003

Project End: December 2006

Project Code: SEN/03/50/USA

Donors: United States (US \$ 2,000,000), France (US \$ 353,000)

Keywords: child labour, hazardous work, begging, domestic work, agriculture, fishing, plan of action, development policy, educational policy, tripartism, institution building, capacity building, legislation, poverty alleviation, awareness raising, decentralization, local government

Background & Context

Project Background: By ratifying ILO Convention n°182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL), Senegal declared its engagement to abolish the worst forms of child labour within 10 years starting from the year 2004. A Time Bound Programme (TBP) process was started. To support the Government of Senegal in its endeavour, IPEC launched its project of support to the TBP in Senegal in September 2003. The project of support was preceded by two other projects in

Senegal, the National Programme for the Eradication of Child Labour phase I and II.

The three priority sectors of the national TBP are begging children, child domestic labour and the WFCL in agriculture, fishing and herding.

The IPEC project of support has seven immediate objectives:

1. To increase the national capacity to combat the worst forms of child labour
2. To harmonize the legal framework
3. To strengthen the capacity of the education system to attract and retain children at risk of child labour
4. To improve the knowledge base for planning, the development, monitoring and evaluation of interventions to fight child labour in Senegal
5. To raise awareness raising of the Senegal society regarding the harmful effects of the WFCL
6. To develop effective strategies in the fight against the exploitation of children through begging and,
7. To withdraw children and to prevent them from engaging in hazardous work in domestic work, fishing and agriculture.

Evaluation Context: The two main objectives of this mid term evaluation were (i) accountability towards key partners regarding the results achieved, and to draw lessons learned from the experience to analyse how

the project deals with the conditions in the country, and (ii) to recommend a possible adjustment.

Main Findings & Conclusions

Assessment of the design: The area "economic development" was not taken as an objective. One of the consequences is that (apart from what could be implemented by Action Programmes (APs)), there are no project-specific activities in this area. Poverty being one of the principal causes of CL, economic development constitutes a key element for solving the problem.

The project document considers governmental institutions and local communities as direct recipients of the project. Two consultations were planned at the regional level; however it was not considered necessary to establish bodies at the regional level that would resemble the National Intersectoral Committee. The systematic participation of all regions was not envisaged. However, administrative decentralization implies that regions wish to be more involved in the development of the National Plan, and that local communities want to have a visible role at the political level. This political dimension has perhaps not been clearly taken into account at the time of the project design. The approach taken by the project by involving regions could be used as an example for taking into account decentralization dynamics in future designs.

The design focused the project efforts on government administration and services, while collaboration with NGO focussed on regional APs. Civil society is represented through meetings with various committees. This participation is not enough to make full use of the forces which these actors could have and which the project needs in order to have an impact in society. Some of them would need to transform their role from "participants" into "actors".

At the time of the national workshop, three sectors were identified as priority sectors: begging, domestic labour and agriculture,

including herding and fishing. Apart from domestic labour, the sectors targeted through the project of support are new sectors in the experience of IPEC in Senegal; this might have contributed to the delay in the formulation of APs. The comparative advantage of the ILO in the sector of vocational training could not be used to the full extent.

A total of 9,000 children are to be targeted for withdrawal and prevention from exploitative and/or hazardous work through the provision of educational and non-educational services, following direct action from the project. Of this total, 3,000 will be withdrawn from work and 6,000 will be prevented from being engaged in child labour. In addition, 1,000 families are to be targeted in the communities to improve their income. These figures appear to be very high, especially regarding the children to be withdrawn from work; the short duration of the APs will probably make it impossible to reach this result.

The interventions of the project were initially focussed on 6 of the 10 regions of the country. The selected areas, except for Saint-Louis, constitute more or less neighbouring areas and account for a great number of children engaged in the WFCL. In each of the six regions activities were supposed to start and then gradually be extended to cover the whole region (except for Saint-Louis where only the fisheries sector would be covered). However, with regard to the extension strategy, the design could have over-estimated the capacity of the project and of the implementing agencies.

Implementing the APs by NGOs - and not by the ILO itself - is a positive element in the design: NGOs already work with some target groups, which increases the chances of sustainability. The importance given to local communities is relevant because this is decisive for the impact of the interventions. Regarding the selection of service providers (implementing agencies), a range of criteria has been established in order to ensure a relevant selection. However, basing the project

on the results of the preceding IPEC phase in Senegal (for which there was no validation through an external evaluation), somewhat skewed the expectations: the large figures of success of the previous phase led to the belief that NGO partners had developed solid competences in the field of the child labour, and that changes had been largely accepted by the population. The evaluation shows that this does not correspond with the reality.

Assessment of the implementation: Taking into account the difficult starting conditions, the project succeeded well in creating the basis for a favourable environment to combat CL. The creation of the National Intersectoral Committee (CIN), the development of the National Plan and the efforts for harmonizing the legislation are undeniable achievements. By making the decision to involve the regions, the project added an invaluable element, through extending the area of influence in this favourable environment from the central towards the decentralized level. In addition, the project also established the fundament for the knowledge base.

A part of the planned outputs was not achieved because of delays in the implementation. Depending on objectives, outputs and activities this delay oscillates between 3-6 months. When analysing this delay one identifies several factors that play a role, each in its own manner. One of the factors is the difficult start of the project (staff situation), which in the long term reflected on the operation and management of the project. In spite of the invested work (the team invested a considerable surplus of work), it is obvious that it will be difficult to catch up with lost time.

At the time of the evaluation, the project had already made some decisions that point towards a possible readjustment. Regarding the education system, the focus was put on qualifying education and on vocational training. Regarding strategies against begging, the project decided to follow the Terms of Reference of the Ministry of Family. Both decisions were relevant.

In the field of awareness raising, there were only a few programmed activities. Before developing strategies, the project awaits the results of the investigations and studies. However, some preparatory thoughts would be useful, based on what is known already about the socio-cultural context and experiences from the past, because neither mass awareness raising as in preceding phases nor dissemination strategies alone will help to achieve the objective of sensitising the society.

At the time of this evaluation, no AP had begun its activities. The various stakeholders of this evaluation considered that the time from the development of an AP until its implementation is not in proportion with the duration of an AP. This is due to procedures and requirements of the ILO, combined with the fact that NGO partners do not meet these requirements, but also the meticulous search for quality on behalf of the project management.

The project was supported by the ILO structure in Geneva and in Senegal; the Regional CL Specialist regularly follows the project. There are sporadic meetings between the ACTRAV specialist and the project that would merit to be developed further. The project sought the collaboration with various ILO projects in Senegal, an intensification of this collaboration could improve the impact of the interventions.

The project has invested a lot to establish a good basis for collaboration and synergy with other organizations, especially UNICEF. The role of employers and trade unions has not been made concrete for this phase. It would be desirable to intensify this relation.

There is political will at the highest level. However with regard to engagement at the operational level, the various ministries or public services do not collaborate in the same way and not with the same intensity. The evaluation identified all degrees of interest and engagement, from "little" until "much". The functioning of the national and regional committees is ensured by the project. There is

no visible tendency to assume the responsibility for this functioning. On the contrary, the project is confronted with strong complaints about financial issues.

The project went through several phases of political and administrative changes (e.g. three changes of the Minister of Labour). The changes of ministers had a direct effect on the availability of the administration, and staff changes in governmental institutions caused

Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Recommendations for future project of support to the TBP:

It would be advantageous for child labour prevention if the «Economic Development» component, which is one of the pillars of the TBP, was presented as an objective in the logframe of the project of support to the TBP. This would give the component more visibility and cause actors (and decision makers) to pay more attention to this component. The ILO has specific competences, including a comparative advantage in economic development (trades in the informal sector, job creation, apprenticeship, and development of local economy). An IPEC project could provide significant advice in synergy with other ILO projects. This could be one way for having maximum influence on economic conditions that are absolutely important for eliminating child labour including its worst forms.

The way the project has evolved in terms of focussing on regions shows that it is opportune to consider decentralisation processes and involvement of regions. This should be done independently from direct interventions in the regions. The approach is one that stimulates political involvement. It can bring about better acceptance, and consequently, stronger impact of programmes against child labour.

Involving local authorities seems particularly important. It should not be limited to direct action programmes. Those who say «any action that is not based at the grassroots level will have no impact» are right and deserve to be taken much more seriously. In the public administrative system local authorities are the

best partners for building local ownership. It would therefore be important to make them political actors against child labour. This approach for active political involvement could permit better acceptance, and consequently, greater impact.

A project design that includes a particular strategy for active collaboration with civil society could help improve understanding on synergy. The project would have a «specific mandate» in this regard, that is, active approaches for consultation and synergy that will not depend on the development of an AP.

Regarding the choice of sectors, it would be useful to also take account ILO's comparative advantage (apart from national priorities), for it is a factor that considerably improves efficiency.

It could be advantageous if there was an opportunity in project design to integrate cases where a region cannot identify one of the chosen sectors, or where there are difficulties for implementing APs. This would be seen as a truly participatory approach and result in stronger support for the fight against child labour.

The gender approach should not only be taken into account during partner selection, but also during strategy development. Providing guidelines on design could help to refine analyses in this regard.

It would be useful if the SPIF could add an element (exercise) that helps stakeholders to understand in depth the systemic interrelationship between causes and outcomes.