



Evaluation Summaries

Supporting the Time-bound programme for the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in South Africa and laying the basis for concerted action in Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia and Swaziland

Quick Facts

Countries: South Africa, Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia and Swaziland.

Final Evaluation: September 2008

Mode of Evaluation: Independent

Technical Area: Child Labour

Evaluation Management: ILO-IPEC's Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section (DED).

Evaluation Team: Yasmin Jessie Turton, Richard Kamidza.

Project Start: April 2004

Project End: April 2008

Project Code: RAF/03/50/USA

Donor: US Department of Labour

Keywords: child labour

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

The TECL programme (*'Towards the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour'*) was established in April 2004 by ILO-TECL with funding from the US Department of Labour in the five countries of the Southern African Customs Union (SACU; South Africa and the 'BLNS countries' – Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, and Swaziland). It was launched in response to the need to

kick-start implementation of the most urgent action steps in the South African Time-bound (TBP) Programme to combat child labour, the '*Child Labour Programme of Action*' (CLPA), and to help set up such a national TBP in each of the BLNS countries. TECL therefore has three distinct but interlinked components aimed at (i) South Africa; (ii) the BLNS countries; and (iii) the SACU sub-region. It focuses mainly on the worst forms of child labour, structured in 34 projects linked to three overarching strategies:

- (i) strengthening the knowledge base and increasing understanding;
- (ii) building capacity in policy design, implementation and monitoring; and
- (iii) implementing direct action through pilot projects that can also add to the knowledge base.

The programme is managed by a central team based at the ILO Area Office in Pretoria and supported in each country by a Programme Advisory Committee on Child Labour (PACC) that draws together representatives from government, NGO networks, service providers, labour and employer organisations.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

This independent end of project evaluation, conducted during June-July 2008, was seen as an opportunity to provide TECL and its various stakeholders, including IPEC HQ and

the donor, with reflections on achievements and shortfalls in the programme strategy and approach. It evaluates the strategy and structures put in place to reach TECL's goals, what lessons were learnt from this and how these lessons can be applied in programming future activities (including TECLII).

The Policy Impact Study focussed on assessing TECL's impact at the policy level in mainstreaming child labour into policies and plans at different levels. This was in particular to focus on how the project has worked to bring about the outcomes regarding child labour concerns in national, provincial, and district development plans and policies.

Methodology of evaluation

In South Africa the consultants visited representatives of government institutions, social partners and selected Implementing Agencies and Service Providers. The final TECL I meeting with the Implementation Committee was also attended and the consultants had the opportunity to engage with the IC. Due to time constraints only 2 pilot projects were visited, and in only one of these had the opportunity to engage with direct beneficiaries. The evaluator visited Namibia and Lesotho and conducted interviews in person with PACC members and some Service Providers, while telephonic interviews were conducted with PACC members in Swaziland and Botswana.

Main Findings & Conclusions

TECL was able to achieve an incredible amount of outputs over the duration of the project given that they covered 5 countries with different needs, approaches and peculiarities. Taking the size, scope and small team into account, the project was efficient in addressing child labour in the SACU region. The role that they played was catalysts, facilitators and coordinators across a wide variety of specialised activities and sectors. They also had to understand and work with issues of mainstreaming, capacity building,

consensus building, ownership creation and administrative efficiency.

Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Main recommendations and follow-up

1. A future design programme must include:

i. Be more realistic and focused – distinction between 'must-have' and 'nice-to-have'.

ii. Apart from working with government, support should be provided to Workers and Employers Organisations. The possibility of working with a trade union federation and providing resources and technical assistance to them to develop a policy on child labour so that it is placed on their agenda, and mainstreamed into their operations, would be quite an achievement.

iii. Attribution must be clearly defined, what is TECL responsible for and that is within their control.

iv. The design of Action programmes must ensure the active participation of the Implementing Agents, so that there is buy-in and ownership.

v. TECL must incorporate a gender analysis in the design phase and plan for gender mainstreaming.

vi. The next 5 years is crucial especially in South Africa as it enters the second 5 year phase of implementation, hence sustainability must be built into the design phase so it remains a conscious focus for the next period. If there was a TECL III South Africa should be in a position to assist other countries in consolidating the implementation of their country programmes and not be a recipient of direct TECL support. That would be proof of real progress and sustainable action.

vii. If the budget allows some sub-regional activities in terms of sharing and learning should be built into the design. This is the

face-to-face forums where key stakeholders from each country can participate in an annual or bi-annual (2year) event that brings them together at a sub-regional level to share learnings.

2. TECL must:

i. Increase their staff compliment including employing a coordinator in Botswana and Namibia. Measures must be taken to find the right person for the job because this is a critical challenge but it must be a permanent employee and not a consultant. If the correct skills base is developed, this person could potentially become the focal person appointed by the Ministry.

ii. In appointment of staff and consultants TECL must carefully consider transformation, representivity and diversity, and there is no contradiction in this and the point above.

iii. Continue to explore with ILO-IPEC possibilities for a more efficient and simplified reporting and procurement process. The CTA would usually be a very senior person (and should be) and able to sign off on more than is currently possible. ILO-IPEC should put mechanisms for accountability in place and ensure that appropriate systems are upheld.

3. TECL must continue to support the implementation of TECL II in the identified countries:

i. TECL must ensure that its role as Technical Advisor must be spelt out clearly (whether it is facilitator, implementer or both).

ii. In South Africa, costing of the CLPA must be completed with Cabinet giving a clear time frame for this to be concluded.

iii. TECL should continue to support interventions with targeted departments.

iv. In BLNS countries, the lessons learnt from South Africa should be used when supporting implementation of the NAPs.

v. A country coordinator must be appointed in Botswana and Namibia accountable to TECL and have a reporting function to the PACC.

4. The DOL must have a dedicated focal person for child labour to lead the next phase of implementation of the CLPA. The role of this person should be amongst others to:

i. Drive the implementation of the CLPA in government.

ii. Chair the IC.

iii. Coordinate and facilitate processes in departments.

iv. Work closely with TECL who should provide the technical assistance.

5. The IC and PACC's must be reviewed, and restructured if necessary and include:

i. A dedicated and mandated representative that must have this included in their KPA's, thereby ensuring accountability. A second person must be identified in case the first mandated representative is not available but this has to be at the same level.

ii. The role of the IC in terms of ensuring compliance to actions in the CLPA must be clarified as well as whether they are only a coordinating structure or whether they have the mandate to ensure compliance. If not, there should be clarity on where this authority is vested and how does one ensure action from a higher structure (DDG forum).

6. Some mediation must take place between the Area Office in Pretoria and TECL where:

i. Roles, parameters and expectations are clarified.

ii. Where existing tensions are addressed and resolved.

7. Child labour monitoring systems must be put in place, synergised with existing departmental systems but able to act as a stand-alone system for providing the necessary

information required for monitoring child labour.

8. With Direct Action:

i. Organisations must be identified early in the process so that impact and sustainability are more discernable.

ii. A model of using bigger organisations to work with smaller organisations doing similar work and in a partnership model (see CINDI example in Kwazulu Natal) is a useful one to explore. This will improve the chances of building more sustainable organisations and interventions over a period of 3-4 years. The criteria for such a partnership is vital so that smaller organisations are not disrespected or 'colonised' in the process.

9. For impact and sustainability it would make sense to use the same team of TECL I (although expanded). A new team would spend at least half of the time establishing relationships, getting to know government systems, becoming acquainted with departmental policies, and so forth and much time will be lost in the process. It is important to immediately build on the gains made in TECL I and address the outstanding work that must be done. This is the priority for TECL II.

Important lessons learned

- In any planning processes, the tendency is often to want to do as much as possible and not consider aspects that are beyond its control. A programme must know what it is accountable for and determine what is in its control. If it is not in control of the project, it should not be in the Logframe.
- The issue of attribution is also a consideration when working through the above. While it is often difficult in development work to assign attribution to only one source, in a project like this the issue of attribution is important. This links to the question of defining if a programme is there to facilitate or to

implement. The lines between these were sometimes blurred, hence attribution became blurred. It is quite obvious that a programme could fulfil a variety of roles and that it is not mutually exclusive. So TECL could facilitate some processes and implement others. In the case of TECL I some government respondents were concerned that TECL was implementing rather than facilitating. The principle, therefore, is to clarify the role that the programme is meant to play and to be open about communicate these to all stakeholders concerned.

- If gender is not consciously included as part of the Logframe planning process and indicators identified to be able to measure its progress, in other words, it is mainstreamed into the work of an organisation, then like any attempts to mainstream CL so too will gender be seen as an add-on and not given serious attention.
- Mainstreaming is also about changing mind-sets about particular issues, and this takes time but also requires commitment and leadership.
- Amidst many development challenges one can at times make the mistake of thinking an issue is not considered an important issue when in fact it is more about people being overwhelmed by their immediate objectives (the tasks they have to perform) and not seeing other issues as a priority. This does not mean that they don't view the issue as important.
- Country contexts have to be taken into account, not only programmatically but institutionally as well. In other words, a programme must take account of its local context and country dynamics and translate this into institutional realities. This would add to its legitimacy and credibility.
- To ensure sustainability of any programme, project and process requires much foresight from the

donors that support these. Resources, time, energy, and money would be wasted if the approach is simply that objectives have been achieved, indeed it has, but in order to institutionalise and therefore add to its sustainability, additional time, commitment and understanding from donors is required. Withdrawal from a process at the wrong time is a threat to sustainability and should be carefully considered.