



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation
Office

Child Labour (Outcome 16) component 2012-2013 of ILO/Irish Aid Partnership 2012-2015 – Midterm Evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries: Global

Midterm Evaluation: 11/2013

Evaluation Mode: Independent

Administrative Office: ILO/IPEC

Technical Office: ILO/IPEC

Evaluation Manager: ILO/IPEC-DED

Keywords: Child labour; Decent work; Social Dialogue

Background & Context

In December 2011, the ILO renewed its partnership agreement with Ireland, covering a four-year period (Phase I 2012-13, and Phase II 2014-15). The “Decent Work through Development” Partnership Programme 2012-15 builds on the experience and lessons learned from prior cooperation.

The Irish-Aid funded IPEC project was developed under the framework of this agreement to strengthen the efforts of workers’ and employers’ organizations in contributing to policies to fight against child labour (CL) with a focus on its worst forms (hazardous child labour). The strategy was to continue strengthening social dialogue as an effective tool to eradicate the worst forms of child labour (WFCL) by using the new tool and material produced previously – “Employers’ and Workers’ Handbook on Hazardous Child Labour” (HHCLWE) and the video on good practices involving social partners – as the core elements in

capacity building for workers’ and employers’ organizations both individually and bipartitely.

As part of the Irish Aid/ILO partnership agreement, the project has undergone a thorough assessment by the stakeholders, facilitated by a reviewer (facilitator) from outside the project, focusing on progress to date in the implementation of project activities. The review focused on answering the overall question ***“Is the Outcome 16 component on track to meet its objectives and how can project stakeholders ensure that it does so?”*** in the context of progress so far, both in terms of preparation and implementation.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

The Project Development Objective is to contribute to the elimination of the WFCL through social dialogue, focusing on the enhancement of the capacity of the social partners.

The Immediate Objectives of this Project are:

- *Employers’ and workers’ organizations are better prepared to participate in national tripartite coordination mechanisms on CL policies;*
- *Social partners have improved their role in the implementation of national policies/programmes on CL with special focus on the worst forms.*

Methodology of evaluation

This project implementation review methodology included the following elements:

- **Documents review and internal scoping:** A desk review of project-related documentation was

undertaken by the review consultant. Meetings were held with IPEC, the Bureau for Workers' Activities (ACTRAV) and the Bureau for Employers' Activities (ACT/EMP) to receive feedback on the evaluation questions;

- **Background Report:** A background report was prepared by the review consultant. It included a summary of the key findings based on the purpose of the review, the suggested aspects to address and the initial scoping;
- **Interviews and Interaction with Stakeholders:** The project review was conducted through interviews by Skype, email and in person with internal and external stakeholders;
- **Review Report:** Based on the background report and the inputs from the key stakeholders' discussions during the review and the follow-up meeting, the review consultant drafted a zero draft of the review report, which, as an internal project review, the IPEC project manager provided input to.

Main Findings & Conclusions

Relevance and strategic fit of the intervention

There is currently no evidence available to assess the degree to which the outcomes of the activities so far have been followed by the relevant ILO offices and integrated into the national programmes and Decent Work Agendas.

There is currently no information regarding how the outcomes have been reflected and reported by the offices. The baseline is what is reflected in the ILO Integrated Resource Information System (IRIS) and it is not possible for the review consultant to verify if the outcomes of the activities are already reflected in the system.

Irish Aid is the only donor which is providing resources to directly support the role of social partners in the ECL. The added value of Irish Aid lies in this specificity.

Overall, the project is fully aligned with the ILO's strategic frameworks and the Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) in the five countries. In particular, the project is aligned with 'Outcome 16: Child labour is eliminated, with priority given to the worst forms' of the SPF and P&B.

The project is clearly aligned to C182 - Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182). In particular, project activities focusing on training on hazardous CL lists and the development of hazardous CL lists for official approval are very much in line with C 182 requirements.

Interventions Progress and Effectiveness

Overall, the project is on track to deliver if it speeds up delivery.

The project is a success regarding the role of workers' organizations in the implementation of policies and programmes against CL. The project helped trade union organizations to raise CL issues in their agendas, to link CL and other related issues, and to engage better in national policy debates on CL, employment, and social protection. The project was useful in making links between other activities and policy agendas on employment and social protection. It was also a success in bringing together workers' and employers' organizations to join forces on the Elimination of Child Labour (ECL).

An additional important point is related to the III Global Conference on Child Labour. The conference took stock of what has been achieved in order to meet the 2016 targets to eliminate the WFCL by 2016.

On the employers' side, Zambia seems to have made most progress towards achieving the project's objectives.

Overall, the strategy is adapted to the project objectives. On the employers' side, the strategy is well-designed because the employers are free to design their own programme. They fully own the strategy on hazardous work for children.

On the workers' side, the strategy is again well-designed because it allows them to design their own programme. The previous partnership with Irish Aid helped set up the CL focal point (FP) network among national trade centres. The next step will be to strengthen the focal points through further training and knowledge on linkages between CL and other economic and social issues to help them identify and better integrate the links between CL and minimum wages, social protection and employment policy issues.

There is consensus among colleagues interviewed that the project should aim to do more than just rounds of

training and campaigning and should (i) define follow-up activities to ensure sustained results, and (ii) have a strategy to monitor change in the capacity of employers' and workers' organizations to participate in coordination mechanisms on CL labour policies and fulfil their role in the implementation of CL labour policies and programmes.

Overall the Handbook on hazardous CL has been well-accepted by employers' and workers' organizations and, though quite general, has been found useful. The manual was the basis for designing the capacity-building events in all countries except Fiji. The need to tailor the HHCLWE to national contexts has been identified but not yet accomplished. In Ghana there is also a need to make it sector specific.

There was a consensus among all interviewees that it was too early to identify all or most results. Overall, the project managed to reinforce workers' organizations' activities against CL in Benin, Ghana and Zambia. In Fiji, more than in Chile, CL was quite new to the social partners so activities had a slower start. On the employers' side, there has been no capacity building yet in Chile and Fiji.

Efficiency of resource use

The project's overall budget is USD 662,880 with 40 per cent of the total budget allocated to the overall project management and 60 per cent of the total budget allocated to the project activities (equally shared between employers' and workers' activities – 30 per cent each). Delivery of activities has been rather slow with 65 per cent of funds spent. The overall delivery, including overall management, brings the delivery rate up to 75 per cent.

Overall, the project has succeeded in fostering collaboration between workers' and employers' organizations in the field, and between ACTRAV and ACT/EMP in the ILO. This is the real added value of this project.

Overall, the institutional set up is working. Colleagues interviewed for this review mentioned the weaknesses of the project design process (as mentioned previously in this report). This has set a weak basis for project implementation and made it hard for the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) to redress this initial problem. Some colleagues mentioned that there was an issue with the CTA's coordination to execute and

support the project. It seems that a clearer IPEC strategic vision was needed with follow up, guidance on how to shape the work and work plan structure.

The technical specialists both in HQ and in the field mentioned that work plans had been developed at the beginning of the project. Some mentioned that the consultation process for developing these should have been more inclusive and involve IPEC field specialists and other ILO/IPEC project CTAs (to ensure synergies). The field specialists also mentioned that they had not seen any monitoring of activities carried out on the basis of the work plans during the project implementation. Specialists in the field recognized they had good collaboration with the CTA to process Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) and deal with administrative and logistical matters. However, they would welcome some more strategic guidance from the Irish Aid project CTA and IPEC in general on how to monitor results of the activities, even though ACTRAV and ACT/EMP specialists have focal points ACT/EMP in HQ.

There is a need for the CTA, with the support of IPEC/Employment Impact Assessment (EIA), to design a tool for colleagues collaborating with the projects (i) to have a clearer idea about the project objectives and strategy at a glance, (ii) to be able to monitor delivery and progress of employers' and workers' organizations against the project objectives, outputs and activities, and (iii) to allow knowledge and experience sharing across the countries covered by the project.

Impact orientation and sustainability of the intervention

Some colleagues reported no implementation of activities so far and thus they were not able to discuss the project impact orientation and sustainability of interventions. Colleagues agreed that the project needs to speed up its delivery.

The project has not set up a Monitoring and Evaluation system and does not appear to have used any readily available output-focused work plan to monitor delivery of the complete project. The work plan used is the one that ACTRAV and ACT/EMP informally use based on the financial division of the project. As such, the CTA has not developed and documented any baseline data or annual targets, against which progress could be assessed.

There was consensus among colleagues that (i) social dialogue had strengthened through this project, and (ii) activities implemented by the social partners were key factors to the project's sustainability.

Recommendations

Some recommendations emerged from the analytical report. These have been prioritized by short- and medium-term actions for the project as follows:

1. Strengthening project management for speeding up delivery:

- Even though only 40 per cent of CTA work in IPEC is covered by the Irish Aid funds, it is important to improve coordination with other tasks and duties so as to allow better focus on project delivery. It is recommended that the CTA proactively contacts all the specialists involved in the project (both in HQ and in the field) to ensure they have a clear understanding of IPEC's vision, the project objectives and strategy, the work plan and monitoring system, and to resolve any misunderstanding. This includes: (i) defining strategies for follow-up activities after the training has been delivered to ensure it is not a stand-alone activity but rather an integrated step of a thought-through process, (ii) analysing the need for a tailor-made HHCLWE manual and defining the way forward for each country, and (iii) reorienting employers' activities in Fiji as a way forward. Whenever a new field specialist comes on board, the CTA needs to ensure a proper briefing;
- In order to speed up disbursement of funding and activity implementation, the CTA needs to develop a short template specifying clearly all the information required to issue an EPA or a contract. ILO programme officers in the field and the CL specialists should provide adequate technical support to ACTRAV and ACT/EMP specialists, including briefings on the linkage with DWCPs;
- Under the leadership of the CTA, the coordination of actions taken by IPEC, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP in HQ and in the field needs to be improved with adequate guidance from IPEC's Operations Unit and overall Branch Management. With this aim, the CTA needs to give strategic direction and the field needs to provide field information to generate synergies;

- Field specialists generally feel that they would need more follow-up and pressure put on them by the CTA to ensure delivery of activities. This is important particularly where there is no IPEC field specialist to support ACTRAV and ACT/EMP field specialists. ACT/EMP and ACTRAV specialists feel they do not have the time to make up for that gap;
- Considering that the project has no staff in the field, the CL specialists in the regions should liaise with on-going IPEC projects operating in the countries covered by the Irish Aid project to identify synergies and complement on-going activities in collaboration with the IPEC CTA. It is crucial to coordinate with other Internal Mid-Term Project Implementation Review of Child Labour (Outcome 16) Component 2012-2013 of ILO/Irish Aid Partnership 2012-2015, September 2013, and build on what already exists to find the project's niche and added value in that specific context;
- All ILO staff involved in the Irish Aid project should ensure they deliver as one and speak with one voice to the social partners to avoid any confusion. In other words, it is crucial that there is close coordination with ACT/EMP and ACTRAV specialists for all matters regarding the project.

2. Improving knowledge management and sharing for maximizing impact:

- Specialists in the field expect the CTA to broker access to research findings on CL, monitor CL information generated through the project and redirect it to those in other parts of the project. This includes collecting lessons learned and good practices so that countries can benefit from others' experience. Other IPEC HQ officers should collaborate more in delivering this recommended objective;
- A good practice emerged in Ghana, and it is recommended that other countries build on it. Ensure that provisions looking at practices of suppliers are included in other countries' joint declarations (Chile, Fiji and Zambia). This would promote a reduction in the acceptability of CL and (in the case of Zambia) ensure the joint declaration is aligned with the Symposium Declaration.