



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation
Office

Cooperation to address the worst forms of child labour in agriculture – Midterm Review

Quick Facts

Countries: Malawi, Mali, Cambodia

Mid-Term: Dec 2012

Evaluation Mode: Independent

Administrative Office: IPEC

Technical Office: IPEC

Evaluation Consultant(s): Una Murray

Project Code: GLO/09/58/HSF

Donor(s) & Budget: US DOL, 1.5 million

Keywords: Child labour, agriculture

Background & Context

In 2007, a Partnership between the ILO (International labour organization), FAO (The Food and Agriculture Organization), IFAD (The International Fund for Agricultural Development), IFRPI/CGIAR (The International Food Policy Research Institute of the CGIAR/ The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research), IFAP ((formerly) the International Federation of Agricultural Producers) and IUF (The International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations) was created to address child labour in agriculture. This Partnership was termed as the *International Partnership for Cooperation on Child Labour in Agriculture*. The agencies listed above who are members of the

partnership are hereafter referred as the *Partnership Organizations*. This Partnership aims to:

1. Promote cooperation and achieve policy coherence on child labour among the Partners, develop policy and programme links especially at the field level;
2. Create awareness and mainstream child labour concerns into existing activities, programmes and projects of agricultural organizations and help agricultural agencies and bodies to understand how the elimination of child labour in agriculture, especially hazardous child labour, contributes to achieve organizational mandates;
3. Promote action and cooperation in operational activities aimed at improving rural livelihoods, creating alternative income-generating activities;
4. Promote action and cooperation in operational activities to ensure that children do not carry out hazardous work in agriculture;
5. Promote opportunities for decent youth employment in agriculture and in rural areas.

This *Partnership* allows different organizations to explore their comparative advantages in either advocacy; capacity development; policy advice for labour or agricultural concerns; and programming for either rural employment or labour and agricultural issues.

In October 2009, the USDOL funded the project GLO/09/58/USA, which was set up to contribute to the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in agriculture, by addressing three objectives linked to

the *Partnership's* principles of cooperation. This USDOL funded project is hereafter termed the *Partnership Project*. These three *Partnership Project* objectives centre around expanding the knowledge base on child labour in agriculture to provide support for policy, interventions and advocacy; mainstream child labour reduction into key policies and activities of the Partnership Organizations; and developing local structures, models, and capacity to address the worst forms of child labour in agriculture.

The USDOL provided US\$1,500,000 for this Partnership Project: 65 percent was allocated for personnel costs (including expert costs, mission costs, additional technical advisory costs, national consultants, evaluation costs). Almost 13 percent was allocated for sub-contracts. Around 9 percent was allocated for training including technical meetings, with 2 percent for miscellaneous activities. The balance of funds (10 percent) was for support costs and provisions for cost increases.

Originally envisaged to be a 36-month Partnership Project, a no-cost project extension allows the project to continue for 42 months to compensate for the late recruitment of a project manager. The project will end in March 31st 2013. After 30 months of implementation, this 'mid-term' review seeks to examine the so far implementation of the project and consider any changes in strategy on the basis of emerging experiences, and to recommend adjustment where necessary.

Purpose, scope and objectives of the evaluation:

The key purpose of this review is to suggest any changes in the project strategy on the basis of emerging experiences. Apart from considering the continued relevance of the project, the achievements to date and progress towards sustainability, the review provides a summary of what worked well; and suggestions on how to overcome the main constraints that impede full engagement of various actors (partnership members and national actors). Recommendations and lessons learned are highlighted.

Methodology of evaluation:

- A desk review of relevant project documentation and other relevant publications.

- The preparation of an inception report and an ILO/IPEC standard evaluation instruments (pages 10 & 11).
- Rome visit to attend the meeting of the International partnership for cooperation on child labour in agriculture and interviews with UCW (Understanding Children Work) and FAO.
- Interviews with relevant ILO-IPEC staff and other ILO staff; with donor representatives (USDOL) by telephone; telephone/Skype interviews with stakeholders involved in the project in Malawi, Mali and Cambodia.
- .Presentation of preliminary findings through this draft report to key stakeholders to validate preliminary findings and recommendations - through comments on the draft report (and further interviews if necessary). Feedback to be included in the final report.

Main Findings & Conclusions

The project may have had a slow start in 2009, but since the second quarter of 2010 considerable initiatives have taken place.

Progress has been made to expand the knowledge base on child labour in agriculture. A forthcoming report on the existing global and national data will show relevant aspects of children working in agriculture. Data collection instruments on child labour in agriculture are developed with the ILO-IPEC SIMPIC section, which can be used after the project for other countries.

Efforts are underway to mainstream child labour reduction into Partnership Organizations (Objective 2). In particular many divisions of FAO have shown considerable interest and progress, in line with the decent work in rural areas agenda. Communication channels are excellent between FAO and ILO, and there is considerable trust between those that work in both organizations. However, the strengths of other partnership members have not yet been brought forth. Generally there is not enough input from partners other than FAO and ILO (and IUF), although it can be said that the Partnership Project focused on collaborative activities that worked well early on. Considerable efforts to engage other Partnership organizations took more places throughout the Partnership Project, and more engagement is expected in the immediate future. On the other hand the

Partnership Projects have linked with national farmers/agricultural producers' organizations.

Some of the main constraints that impeded full engagement of partner organizations in the Partnership probably include the level of commitment of their organization to address child labour. Work is underway to engage more closely with IFAD through renewed linkages with individual staff. Links with WFO and other organizations representing agricultural producers globally and regionally are currently being considered. The Partnership Project must continue to carefully link the issue of child labour in agriculture to the Partners' mandate. For example, for IFAD it is necessary to ensure that the plight of small agricultural producers is the central focus and that a focus on child labour issues can actually benefit agricultural producers in the long run (if children attend school, their assumed literacy and cognitive ability may help tackle future agricultural challenges). IFAD are also interested in youth employment and decent work in agriculture. A focus on junior farmer field schools may also be interesting for IFAD to suggest to use in some of the projects they fund (using JFFLS modules). Although the Partnership Project Manager has plans for linking with IFAD, it is acknowledged that bringing IFAD management on board may take considerable effort and time and may not be possible within the time frame of this project.

A partnership will only work if there is something in it for everyone. Members of the partnership must be able to see the added value to their own agency's mandate. Support from management heads in collaborating organizations is very important for promoting collaboration. The project must try to ensure that all directors agree on a solid case for collaboration, and what each organization brings to the programme. This entails knowledge on who are the key players in collaborating organizations and being able to convince them to come on board. The Partnership Project staff reported that the nature of the project outputs sometimes give them less time to focus on the partnership objectives. Another challenge is that when 'champions' in a collaborating partner agency change jobs, the momentum may be lost.

In an effort to support Partner Organizations, tools focused on attaining Evidence-based advice on the

elimination of child labour, particularly regarding labour saving technologies, has been a challenge. It may be necessary to examine in more detail the impact from the different options for achieving child labour reduction in agriculture or a reduction in hazards that the children face, and their likely impacts in the economic, environmental and social fields. Advantages and disadvantages of different options, possible synergies and trade-offs should also be examined. Consulting more with technical specialists such as agricultural engineers, crop specialists, livestock specialists and others is recommended for the Handbook and the drafted good practices. This was how the issue was approached in the fisheries sector.

The Partnership Project has supported the implementation of country activities in collaboration with members of the Partnership, including national affiliates of IUF and agricultural producers organizations in Malawi, Mali and Cambodia. Regarding objective 3, although funding for country-level activities was considered a constraint by the Partnership Project, the project used available personnel and linked to existing resources whenever possible. In Cambodia, the project worked closely with the sub-regional ILO child labour specialist. There could have been more human resources in country offices; perhaps more collaboration should have taken place. Although the project was very creative in linking to other country initiatives either through FAO or ILO projects, having dedicated funds for activities raises the profile and galvanizes initiatives. For a global project, a direct link to country-level activities is vital to capture lessons learned and constraints faced in implementing guidelines and recommendations from knowledge products.

Precise reporting in this type of project (working within a Partnership) is a challenge. Indeed attributing how this project contributed to policy level work can be difficult because such work can be intangible at times and difficult to measure precisely. Since funding is not sufficient for specific stand-alone funded activities at the country level; the project has linked to other projects working on child labour (for objective 3) or other planned surveys (for objective 1). However this commendable aspect of the project is not necessarily easy to measure. Results chains are not

so clear in projects that require a combination of interventions (such as technical assistance from different partner agencies), with many components and partners interacting with each other at the policy influencing level. This is in comparison to a more traditional input – output – impact path. In the final analysis, it appeared evident during the MTR, that the Partnership Project focus was on how to use the funding in the most efficient way.

Recommendations

1. Synthesize the assessment of the global data report on children's work in agriculture. Allocate someone to finalize report. Produce a readable accessible report that clearly demonstrates where data gaps exist, with recommendations for what researchers must do to ensure a better disaggregated knowledge base on child labour in agriculture.

2. Share finalized SIMPOC data collection instrument with the Partnership Project organizations as well as other stakeholders, particularly groups of statisticians who collect socioeconomic information in agriculture sectors (to ensure that other countries/regions collect information about the extent and nature of children's work in agriculture and in agriculture sub-sectors).

3. Improve the criteria for what makes a good practice good in child labour and agriculture, and agree with all Partnership members. Define different levels of 'good practice' such as promising practices, practices that have been tried and tested, practices that have been already replicated. Disseminate an amended template with clearer outlines of what exactly constitutes a 'good practice'.

4. Improve the evidence base on ideas around how to reduce child labour in agriculture and prove what has impact. Use IFPRI's proven research expertise. Regarding the Handbook for mainstreaming child labour in Partner organizations', ensure that those with a solid background in agricultural sciences appear in the the draft, particularly for evidence of labour saving techniques and other claimed impacts in the draft. Include more focus on different modalities for addressing child labour in agriculture. Ensure that the Handbook includes a list of child labour related

questions/issues to be considered prior to initiating a new project in agriculture or sub-sectors.

5. Ensure that when the FAO-ILO Good practices guide for addressing child labour in fisheries and aquaculture: policy and practice is finalized, a publicity campaign widely promotes it. Also share OSH materials with all Partnership partners.

6. Investigate how to publicize the ITCILO Turin course on child labour and agriculture more widely. Ensure that marketing efforts are put in place to invite agricultural stakeholders to any training offered.

7. Continue to support national level country processes, and provide linkages to existing Partnership Organizations.

8. Continue to mobilize funding for the project. There is also room for more awareness raising of the Agricultural Partnership itself by increasing its visibility. This is the responsibility of all partner organizations, led by the Partnership Project management. Stress how the Partnership actually implements many of the recommendations in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and UN Reform on the ground and at the policy level.

9. Further evaluations could try to link the project efforts with attitude change outcomes amongst those who were involved in the focus countries to illustrate national capacity building and policy support. The practical experiences to eliminate child labour in agriculture from Cambodia, Mali and Malawi should be documented. Focus on the factors that were required to achieve results, including political, economic, social, technical, environmental, gender, instructional, and international influences. Short case studies for each country might illustrate how the Partnership Project policy focus helped to shape changes at different levels and what needed to be in place for change (and was done through the Partnership Project).

10. Continue to strive to include IFPRI/CGIAR and IFAD (and continue with IUF affiliates) in the final year of the Partnership Project, linking also (if appropriate) with other agricultural producers' organizations.