



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation
Office

Combating Hazardous Child Labour in Tobacco Farming in Urambo (UTSP) Urambo District, Tanzania [Phase I] - Final Evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries:	<i>Tanzania</i>
Final Evaluation:	<i>7/2007</i>
Evaluation Mode:	<i>Independent</i>
Administrative Office:	<i>IPEC</i>
Technical Office:	<i>IPEC</i>
Evaluation Consultant(s):	<i>Stanley Asangalisah</i>
Project Code:	<i>URT/06/03/ECT</i>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Based on the information and data made available to the evaluator by the project managers, collaborators, beneficiaries and stakeholders, and within the limits of human error, the following is a summary of the evaluator's assessment of the results, achievements and impact of the Urambo Tobacco Sector Project (UTSP). It should be noted that the findings are based on project reports and stakeholders' interviews and limited field visits in Urambo. The evaluation team was not able to independently verify all of the project's reported achievements due to limited time for field visits.

I. Background Information

The final evaluation exercise (carried out from 7th to 20th February, 2007 and involving desk research, field investigations in more than 50% of the project communities, and participation in a final evaluation and programming workshop in Tabora, Tanzania), was designed to measure the results and achievements of the project and assess its impact on the target villages in Urambo District. The project was funded by the Eliminating Child Labour in Tobacco-growing Foundation (ECLT Foundation), and executed by the International Labour Office (ILO) through its International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC).

II. Findings/Observations:

Based on the intensive desk research, extensive field interactions with project managers, implementers and collaborators in Dar Es Salaam, Tabora, and Urambo, and the community meetings and focus group discussions with project beneficiaries in 5 (out of the 9) project Wards, namely:

- Itundu Ward (Itundu, Kasisi, Wema, Mpigwa, Kitete)
- Muungano Ward (Muungano, Kalemela A, Kalemela B)
- Imalamakoye Ward (Imalamakoye, Nsenda, Itebulanda)
- Songambe Ward (Songambe, Igunguli, Jionee-Nwenyewe, Uyogo)

- Kaliua Ward (East Kaliua, West Kaliua, Kasungu, Ulindwanoni)

The independent evaluator made the following findings:

i) Project Environment

The project environment in its entity is a difficult rural setting characterized by:

- Poor roads network, which becomes worse during the raining season
- Very weak communication infrastructure with no internet connectivity at all
- Unreliable power supply
- Poor transportation services

ii) Project Design

The vertical logic of the project design is evident in the vertical linkages between activities, outputs and objectives. However, the indicators do not contain specific verifiable measurements such as how much, how well, by when and where project objectives have been reached. In ILO/IPEC these specifications and exact targets are to be set in the Project Monitoring Plan (PMP). The evaluator feels however that the indicators should include specific targets.

iii) Project Implementation

The implementation of UTSP had the benefit of the collaboration (or suffered the lack of collaboration) of the following institutions.

Collaboration with National TBP:

- The CTA of TBP Supervised the implementation of UTSP
- UTSP project officer co-ordinated the implementation of TBP in Urambo District.
- Both projects worked on prevention and withdrawal of children through education alternatives
- Both concentrated on community mobilization and economic empowerment of vulnerable families.

This level of collaboration allowed for cross-fertilization of ideas and dovetailing of the activities of the 2 projects

Collaboration with the 2 main Tobacco Trading Companies, namely: Tanzania Leaf Tobacco Company Ltd, and Alliance One Tobacco Tanzania Ltd as well as their agency, Association of Tanzania Tobacco Traders (ATTT), was diverse and very encouraging (see page 23 for details) and should be strengthened in phase-II. There was however no formal agreement between the project and the traders with regard to their involvement in fighting child labour in tobacco growing and processing. It is therefore recommended that the necessary legal avenues be explored to foster a formal agreement in UTSP-II. There was no collaboration whatsoever with Tanzania Tobacco Growers Co-operative Union, and the involvement of Tanzania Plantation and Agricultural Workers Union (TPAWU) was limited to only the following:

- TPAWU under COMAGRI identified vulnerable children and parents in Urambo District, and UTSP relied to some extent on their list for selection of beneficiaries.
- TPAWU representative participated in facts finding and proposal development for UTSP phase-II

Clearly, the Trade Unions were not actively involved in UTSP's implementation. Their active involvement in phase-II must be ensured, particularly in child labour monitoring activities.

iv) Implementation Challenges:

The following were some of the major challenges faced during project implementation

- Low capacity of some Implementing Agencies (IA) regarding Action Programmes (AP) preparation, technical and financial reporting.
- The majority of IAs had weak speaking, reading and writing proficiency in the English language—the project's official language.
- 60% of IAs did not have the requisite logistics such as computers and means of transport.
- The project vehicle (a second-hand Suzuki Escudo) was too small, too weak and completely inappropriate for the project terrain.

- High illiteracy level and rate of beneficiary communities.
- Delays in disbursement of funds.
- Serious understaffing or project field office.
- The high transfer rate of district political leaders, District Commissioners (DCs) District Executive Directors (DEDs), in Urambo District adversely affected the smooth implementation of the project as the project officer had to debrief and re-strategize with 3 different DCs, 4 different DEDs and 4 different District Child Labour Co-ordinators (DCLC).

v) Administrative Procedures

On the administrative procedures and the steps involved in the approval of Action Programmes (APs) these are extensive and can take 3-5 months to complete.

- AP idea is agreed with Desk Officers in Dar, Nairobi and Geneva
- AP interventions are developed, and budgeted in collaboration with proposed implementing Agency
- Draft proposal is sent to Dar Es Salaam Desk Officer for comments.
- Budget is passed through ILO/IPEC Responsible Financial Officer
- Draft is then sent to Geneva Desk Officer for Clearance
- Cleared draft proposal is then sent to National Inter-sectorial Co-ordinating Committee for review and approval.
- Comments from above are incorporated and proposal finalized.
- Finalized proposal resubmitted to Geneva
- Contract Agreement is then prepared for IA to sign.
- For amounts not more than US\$20,000 ILO Area Officer could process the agreement/contract.
- If amount is more than US\$20,000, then Procurement Department in Geneva takes over the approval processes.
- If Agreement is ready for signing, ILO Area Office Finance and Administration Officer studies the agreement and its annexes and initiates request for Office Financial Clearance.
- At this stage, IA is requested to open appropriate Bank Account.

- Signatories to the contract are the ILO Area Direct and Representative of the IA.
- After signing the contract, the IA puts in a written request for advance payment.
- Advance payment is then processed and paid into IA account.

All of the above is clearly long winding and bureaucratic, and, according to stakeholders' reports, can take from 3 to 5 months to complete.

Administrative Procedure for travel authorization:

- Programme Officer (PO) agrees with Desk Officer (DO) in Geneva on need to travel
- PO completes Travel Authorization Forms
- Sends Forms to Line Manager, e.g. CTA TBP for signature
- Then Forms are forwarded to ILO Area Director for approval

This arrangement is comprehensive but can be constraining in times of need for urgent travel.

Reporting Procedure:

- Technical Progress Reports are written biannually
- PO prepares draft report
- Sends to DO in Dar, Nairobi, and CTA for comments
- Incorporates comments from above Officers
- Forwards 2nd draft to DO Geneva for comments
- Incorporates comments and sends final draft report back to Geneva
- DO in Geneva finalizes report and forwards it to Donors

vi) Mid-Term Evaluation

The mid-term evaluation was conducted in February 2006, when the project was left with less than one (1) year to completion. The evaluation team, however, made very relevant short term and long term recommendations, which I could not agree more with (see page 24 for details). The short term recommendation were hardly implemented in the remaining 1 year, or so, of project phase-1. **But, it is gratifying to notice that all the long term recommendations**

have been adhered to as project phase-II has already been approved based on a participatorily developed project proposal and a Project Advisory Committee is on the way to being institutionalized. What is left to be done is that the relevant administrative, capacity building, results consolidating recommendations (classified as short term recommendations) of the mid-term evaluation are adopted and religiously adhered to in phase-II for better project results and impact.

vii) Project Achievements

In general, the project achieved its set objective quite well. The key quantitative achievement of UTSP is the withdrawal and integration of 822 children affected directly by hazardous child labour practices and mainstreaming them into the formal school system and vocational training institutions. Additionally, 430 adult members of vulnerable families were trained on income generating activities out of which 150 were assisted to start various income generating undertakings; and a total of 15 classroom blocks were built in 8 of the 9 project Wards. These figures are based on project reports and the evaluation team was not able to verify all of these figures due to limited time for field visits. On the qualitative side, the project has helped raise awareness on the problem of child labour in Urambo District more than any other project that preceded it. **But a lot more needs to be done on building the capacities of key stakeholders in the fight against child labour in the district.**

viii) Project Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability

Relevance

It is the evaluator's carefully considered opinion that the UTSP was relevant in terms of helping solve the problem of child labour in the district as it succeeded remarkably in taking children from tobacco farms into the classroom, and parents are now clearly aware of the right of their children to education, and are mindful of the long-run adverse consequences of child labour on their children. But in terms of addressing the needs of the beneficiary communities, more work remains to be done (see page 38).

Effectiveness

The effectiveness (or otherwise) of UTSP was tested from the standpoint of the extent to which the project has been able to achieve its set objectives and to reach out to the target beneficiaries. To the extent that the project succeeded in achieving its output targets and objectives, and on account of the fact that no side effects emanating from the project's work was observed in the beneficiary communities, UTSP was effective.

Efficiency

Efficiency is the quantity and quality of project outputs produced in relation to the inputs/resources spent to attain them. The evaluator found reasonable grounds to conclude that aggregate expenditure was reasonably justifiable in relation to the quantity and quality of results chalked by the project. On that score, UTSP was acceptably efficient.

Sustainability

The question of project sustainability is not critical at this stage as UTSP is slated to enter a second phase for the next 3 years starting from April 2007. Phase-II will work to consolidate the gains of the first phase and cover more ground. Nonetheless, sustainability issues in phase-I have been discussed in greater detail page 40.

iv) Project Impact

It is the evaluator's carefully considered opinion that UTSP has impacted favourably on the respect for children's rights, standard of living and primary school performance in the beneficiary communities (see pages 32 and 33 for details).