



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation Unit

Tackling child labour through education (TACKLE) – Mid Term Evaluation

Quick Facts

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

Mode of Evaluation: *Mid-term, April 2011*

Technical Area: *Child Labour*

Evaluation Management: *IPEC - DED*

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

Project Start: *March 2008*

Project End: *Feb 2012*

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

Project Budget: € 16 366 199 (\$23,138,836)

EC contribution: € 15 000 000 - \$21,177,315.15

ILO contribution: € 1 366 199 - \$1,961,520.46

Key Words: child labour, education

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

TACKLE is a project jointly launched by the European Commission (EC) and the International Labour Organisation (ILO) to fight child labour in Angola, Fiji, Guyana, Jamaica, Kenya, Madagascar, Mali, Papua New Guinea, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, North Sudan and Zambia. The objective of the TACKLE project is to contribute to the withdrawal of children

engaged in child labour and to prevent further entry of children into employment by offering alternative education and training opportunities and thereby contributing towards poverty reduction. In this context, the project aims to provide guidance in formulating new or improved existing legal and policy frameworks on child labour and education in the partner countries and to ensure their effective implementation and application; promote the development of institutional capacities of ministries and other relevant bodies for concrete action to fight child labour; promote advocacy and raise awareness concerning child labour issues; and increase dialogue and strengthen networks on child labour and education in coordination with stakeholders, social partners, and civil society. TACKLE comprises 4 clearly defined Results Areas: i) Result 1: Establish review, and assess an effective legal framework for the abolition of child labour in accordance with ILO convention No.138 and No. 182, ii) Result 2: Strengthen institutional capacity to improve national ability to formulate and implement child labour strategies, iii) Result 3: Design, implement, and review Target Actions that combat child labour and encourage education, and iv) Result 4: Improve advocacy and awareness of good practices to enhanced knowledge base and networks on child labour and education.

Methodology of evaluation

The mid-term review approach included a detailed desk review of all components of the TACKLE project. The Mid-Term Review (MTR) has been carried out by i) a series of

country evaluation (review) consultants, contracted by ILO-IPEC, and ii) an international co-ordination consultant team responsible for providing methodological inputs and guidance to the national consultants, using a as well as developing the overall MTR report. The MTR is based primarily on the country review reports from the country review consultants, as well as the co-ordination team's own desk research and selected interviews with IPEC staff in Geneva.

Main findings and conclusions

Despite the implementation challenges and delays experienced, TACKLE looks set to record some promising results. Under *Result Area 1*, for example, significant progress has been made in several countries in revising and/or assessing the national legal framework to comply with ILO Conventions. At the time of review, eight TACKLE country programmes had carried out legal framework reviews tailored to their individual country needs. Examples include TACKLE's encouraging the development of a national list of hazardous work in Fiji, Southern Sudan and Zambia, and the updating of Mali's national list. Another adaptation of the TACKLE programme to fit local needs is the support provided to the Ministries of Labour and Education in the development of national plans, (e.g. Kenya) or in the update and recommendations on the legal framework relating to child labour in Jamaica, Mali, Papua New Guinea, and Zambia. In the case of Sierra Leone, the work under Result Area 1 has supported the ratification process of the ILO conventions 138 and 182. However, in Angola and Northern Sudan, only preliminary work on Result Area 1 appears to have been carried out.

For the most part, the introduction and relationship building path of TACKLE in the project countries has seemed to work, with the Ministry of Labour typically having been the first port of call, and there has been general (but not complete) understanding among Labour Ministries of the rationale of involving national Ministries of Education in TACKLE activities. Given that a key part of the initial focus was on national child labour policy and legislative

frameworks, much work remains to be done on the education aspects of TACKLE's agenda. In countries where IPEC has already established a solid presence prior to TACKLE, such as Mali and Kenya, the project was able to start focussing immediately on education-related issues. The same applies to Zambia where coordination groups had already been established and TACKLE had an active participation providing significant input in the revised national education policy of the country, which shows more clearly the importance that the project places on policy level interventions in the project countries. However, the MTR country reports also suggest that in some of the target countries, the child labour and education nexus is not always well understood by project stakeholders and sometimes by the Implementing Partners.

Under *Result Area 2*, a significant training and capacity development effort has been delivered by the project. This has including training in research, child labour laws, child trafficking, proposal writing, and child labour reporting organised at ILO's training centre in Turin, for labour inspectors and school inspectors, as well as training on child labour for tripartite partner organisations. In country training, consist of workshops dealing in educating teachers, volunteers, and the media about child labour. While most training and capacity development work appears to have met with good stakeholder/user satisfaction, the work has also served to underline the huge capacity development needs across the project countries, and this is an area where longer-term plans may need to be developed.

Regarding *Result Area 3*, most country programmes have focused mainly on formal and informal education. Kenya, Mali, Madagascar, and Zambia have made significant progress in improving school facilities and programmes, and with some initial promising results – for example in terms of the school feeding programme and the number of children withdrawn in Kenya and the schools renovation work in Mali. The results to-date in these four countries, and the strong pipeline of APs under development in some of them, indicates in part the inherited advantages that TACKLE has had in some of these countries

that have a previous ILO presence. For a number of the other countries (e.g. Northern Sudan, Jamaica, and Papua New Guinea) it is likely that both the development and implementation of APs will be well behind these four countries, due primarily to the limited capacity levels in these countries. The pipelines of APs under development in Kenya, Madagascar, Mali and Zambia are impressive in terms of their diversity, interventions¹⁸, target sectors and themes, as well as the varied number of Government ministries and actors (Ministries of Labour, Education, Employment, Agriculture, Health etc).

Under Result Area 4, the project countries have (since the project launch) successfully leveraged IPEC's global advocacy and awareness-raising activities, in particular World Day Against Child Labour [WDaCL]. However the capacity levels in many governments have meant that much of the advocacy work initially foreseen towards political stakeholders under Result Area 4 was deemed not to fit the reality on the ground, and many countries have focused initially on awareness-raising work, though more awareness raising, knowledge generation and advocacy activities on CL are waiting to be funded. A number of countries, as Zambia, Madagascar, Fiji, Kenya and Mali, have however initiated political-level advocacy actions.

Regarding project relevance and project design, the review findings confirm the relevance of TACKLE to the needs of the countries in which the project is currently active, as well as the broad stakeholder support for a project such as TACKLE. Nevertheless, it is important to mention that the capacity to adapt to local needs has to be carried out locally by the TACKLE National Coordinator and the National Steering Committee (and, where it exists, the National Project Committee).

In terms of implementation experience, the review has highlighted the challenges encountered, including challenges related to the country context (such as capacity levels within local counterpart organisations) and those at the project level (human resource constraints, capacity development support levels, new

funding procedures under the results-based approach etc.). While a number of delays could hardly have been avoided (e.g. delays in the signing of partnership protocols), the factors underlying other delays – and in particular capacity constraints – will need to be addressed by the project.

In terms of results achieved to-date, TACKLE has recorded some promising results, despite the significant implementation challenges. This is especially the case in countries such as Kenya, Madagascar, Mali and Zambia, where the project is benefitting from earlier IPEC involvement in these countries. In some new IPEC countries, such as Fiji, progress to-date suggests that TACKLE will also record important achievements, for example in policy influence and mainstreaming. In general, the TACKLE programme has been achieving significant milestones across the twelve countries within the Result 1 and Result 2 project areas. In the case of Result 3, the direct action programmes have experienced some delays and thus most of them were still being implemented at the time of the MTR country-level fieldwork and reporting. As for the Result 4, all countries have celebrated the 2008, 2009 and 2010 World Day(s) Against Child Labour (WDACL), but some activities were still pending at the time of this review. However, based on the lessons learned to-date, it would be optimistic, if not naive, to expect that the project can 'catch up' within the remaining implementation period, and some challenges will in any case not go away.

Please see the full report for more details on the recommendations and lessons learned.