



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation
Office

Combating Child Labour in Central Asia: Commitment becomes Action (PROACT CAR - Phase III) – Final Evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries: *Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan*

Final Evaluation: *07/2013*

Evaluation Mode: *Independent*

Administrative Office: *DWT/CO-Moscow*

Technical Office: *DWT/CO-Moscow*

Evaluation Manager: *ILO/IPEC-DED*

Evaluation Consultants: *Inna Bayda (Ukraine),
Katoen Faromuzova (Tajikistan), Nurgul Alybaeva
(Kyrgyzstan)*

Project Code: *RER/11/51/FRG ,RER/10/51/FRG*

Donor & Budget: *F.R. Germany (€ 2,250,000)*

Keywords: *Child labour; Vocational training*

provided a financial contribution of 2,250,000 Euros for its implementation. The duration of Phase III of the project is 36 months, from 1 January 2011 to 31 December 2013.

The project has three immediate objectives (IO) at national level and one at sub-regional level in each of the three countries:

- At the end of the project, the child labour (CL) issue will have been mainstreamed into national policy development frameworks and National Action Plans (NAPs) on the Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL) will have been supported in their implementation;
- At the end of the project, up-scaling of IPEC tools and models of intervention through capacity building of key stakeholders and greater involvement of trade unions and employers' organizations will have increased the outreach of institutions for the elimination of worst forms of child labour (WFCL);
- At the end of the project, working children will have been withdrawn from the WFCL (agriculture, street work, trafficking for labour and sexual exploitation) and children at risk to work will have been prevented to enter WFCL through provision of a comprehensive package of services;
- Sub-regional: At the end of the project, exchange of information among key stakeholders will have been facilitated, and the knowledge of effective good practice will have been shared at the sub-regional level.

The development objective of the project's Phase III is: "To contribute to prevention and elimination of the WFCL in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan".

Background & Context

The Project "Combating Child Labour in Central Asia – Commitment becomes Action" (PROACTCAR Phase III, ILO Project number P.340.11.400.051 (2011-2013)) is a continuation of the International Labour Organisation (ILO)/International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) PROACT-CAR Phase II implemented in 2008-2010 covering three countries of Central Asia - Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. ILO/IPEC acts as an executive agency of the project. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is the financing/donor agency of the project and has

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

The independent evaluation covers the project's Phase III (January 2011 - December 2013) from its start until the time when the evaluation missions have been carried out to the three participating countries: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan (within the period from 17 June to 5 July 2013). It has been taken under the request of ILO/IPEC Headquarters (HQ) by a team of independent evaluation consultants.

The specific purpose of the evaluation is to assess the project against the performance and objectives' measurement indicators developed in the logical framework of the project, to identify lessons learned and potential good practices aimed at suggesting models of interventions that can be applied further and to provide recommendations to project stakeholders to support the completion, expansion and/or further development of supported initiatives.

Methodology of evaluation

The approach is to implement a chain of actions: **read** (studying the ILO guiding documents and project documentation) → **plan** (preparing evaluation instruments and work schedules, preparing for field visits and interviews in the three participating countries [by the evaluation team], briefing phone interviews [with the Project Manager/Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) at ILO/IPEC HQ, ILO/IPEC EIA and ILO regional office in Moscow - by the evaluation TL], preparing the evaluation Inception report [by the evaluation TL]) → **interviewing** (carrying out the structured/semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions in the three participating countries) + **see** (performing on-site visits and physical verification of the information) → **think** (performing analytical work) → **discuss** (discussing evaluation findings through stakeholders' workshops/meetings with NPCs) → **write** (drafting three country-level evaluation reports [by the evaluation team members] and the overall project evaluation report [by the evaluation TL]) → **feedback incorporation** (analysing the comments obtained from key stakeholders involved and incorporating them into the overall evaluation report or explaining the reason for non-incorporation).

The *evaluation instruments* were developed during the inception phase of the evaluation process and have been used by the evaluation team during the course of the evaluation process. The key instruments are:

1. Grouping all project stakeholders for interviews during the field missions and suggesting major tools for interviews.
2. The table summarizing reflection on the IO achievements against relevant indicators of the logical framework.
3. Checklists of questions and issues to be covered by each sub-section and the evaluation criteria of the country-level evaluation reports and overall evaluation report describing and analysing the key aspects of the project intervention logic (based on evaluation questions suggested in the ToR per evaluation criteria and with indication of target groups to be interviewed).
4. The structure and table of contents of the national evaluation reports and the overall evaluation report.

The key *tools* for information collection start with a review of project documents and will be followed by field missions where targets groups identified above will be used as key information providers through: (1) individual interviews, (2) focus group discussions/meetings, and (3) workshops with NPCs and key stakeholders (where appropriate) at the end of the field missions.

Main Findings & Conclusions

Project design

- The project's Phase III was designed in line with the strategies of ILO and IPEC and fits into the current political agendas in the field of CL in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan;
- The project's Phase III approach to use the combination of upstream policy-related interventions (enabling environment) with downstream service-oriented activities (direct action) at the community level has proven to be relevant;
- The approach to involve all categories of the project stakeholders in project implementation with an emphasis on tripartite cooperation in the field of CL has been chosen correctly;
- Priority sectors (informal urban sector and agriculture) have been chosen correctly for all participating countries;
- The design of Phase III lacks risks analysis: assumptions were formulated in a general manner without taking into account country-specific circumstances;

- The logical framework of Phase III represents a quite formal matrix only generally reflecting key areas of the project intervention;
- Human resources were scarce and the timeframe was insufficient for selected project activities;
- Gender statistics has been well maintained during the course of the project;
- Future project designs need to have consultation with social partners prior to their final formulation.

Project effectiveness

- The project has made a valuable contribution to the achievement of its development objective;
- The main impact of the project at development level is that the problem of CL is now recognized by the three Governments in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan;
- Currently the ILO/IPEC project represents the key organization addressing the issues of CL in all three participating countries in a systemic way;
- The project has generally achieved its IOs in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan in accordance with the logical framework developed for Phase III;
- The achievements of the project at the national level are seen as a major contribution to the process of addressing and Elimination of Child Labour (ECL) in all countries involved;
- Coordination of CL issues from the national side is still lacking in all three countries;
- Understanding/commitment of the Governments on CL has increased due to the project;
- Three main social partners are not yet working together on a full scale to address CL issues although tripartite agreements have been signed in all countries involved;
- The ownership of CL issues is increased among relevant stakeholders but not yet fully used for coordination, lobbying and development of implementation mechanisms;
- The project has succeeded in up-scaling IPEC tools and models through piloting them with further support provided to integrate these tools into national level systems;

Project efficiency

- The project is efficiently managed by the National Project Coordinators (NPCs) in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan; long procedure of

NPC's replacement in Kazakhstan has affected the project efficiency;

- Pro-active and result-oriented management from CTA side and financial management of ILO Moscow sub-regional office are observed;
- Professional implementing partners were chosen in the framework of Phase III;
- Direct beneficiaries were correctly identified and assistance was provided to those who actually needed it;
- Delays with implementation of the project activities have been observed;
- CL outcomes are included into DWCPs along with other outcomes or technical components and in this regard the project work is contributing to the achievement of the DWCP outcomes. However, practical interaction with ILO Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) in three participating countries differs but generally it has not been at a high level;
- The Technical Progress Reports (TPR) represent comprehensive and informative documents but they lack analysis of achievements and are not fully "reader-friendly".

Project relevance

- Relevance of the project for various stakeholders involved differs depending on the level of their involvement, their roles in the project and their responsibilities for addressing CL issues;
- The project cooperation with tobacco companies in Kazakhstan and the pilot project in tobacco sector in Kyrgyzstan has been particularly relevant for ECL in this sector;
- The potential of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) has been underused for implementation of the project's tasks;
- Vocational Education and Training (VET) and youth employment are becoming the most relevant and outstanding tasks in all three participating countries because of a highly imbalanced labour market.

Sustainability

- The project has built the basis for sustainability of its achievements in all three countries;
- Problems regarding relevant law enforcement and development of implementation mechanisms with appropriate budget allocations remain outstanding;

- Without further presence of ILO/IPEC in CL elimination work the prospects for national coordination of institutions involved in ECL are low;
- Institutional frameworks in CL in participating countries remain quite fragmented and institutional ownership is observed only among those social partners which have been more directly involved in the project activities.
- Vertical and horizontal structure required for appropriate mechanism of CL monitoring has been demonstrated through pilots and can be used as a model in the future.

Recommendations

To ILO/IPEC:

1. To develop a well-structured training programme for tripartite partners at all levels basing it on the available legal framework for ECL, the assigned responsibilities in administrative structure and on evidence from implementation of pilot models, methodologies and tools developed in the framework of the project in three participating countries. This training programme will allow tripartite partners to determine their clear roles for practical implementation of measures aimed at elimination of WFCL.
2. To share TPRs with key project partners with a view of obtaining their feedback, increasing the ownership on the project and ensuring two-way communication between the CTA and the NPCs aimed at increased effectiveness.

To NPCs in three countries and CTA:

3. To focus attention on analysis of gaps and outstanding issues per IO needed for support to development of implementation mechanisms for the further elimination of WFCL in each participating country.
4. To undertake internal assessment of the outcomes of regional cooperation and exchange of experiences and to summarize those practices which have been adopted by participating countries.
5. To organize a final presentation of all project results achieved per country and by the project as a whole demonstrating the regional dimension of the work done.
6. To present the results of the evening school pilot project in Kyrgyzstan to donors and relevant stakeholders in all three countries with a view to

further potential support to this important aspect of ECL.

To NPC in Kazakhstan:

7. Till the end of the project life – to provide support to modifications to the new NAP in cooperation with Coordination Council (CC) and social partners.

To the project social partners in three countries:

8. Following capacity building delivered by the project and direct participation in the project activities, social partners in all three countries need to be more proactive in the lobbying, initiation and development of required changes to legislation and in implementing practical actions aimed at the elimination of WFCL.

For sustainability of the project outputs

To NPCs in all three countries:

9. To develop sustainability and follow up plan for further continuation of the work in the field of CL elimination with duly assigned roles and responsibilities of relevant national stakeholders and potential sources of funding.

To NPC in Kazakhstan:

10. To facilitate lobbying before the Government to provide financial resources for further functioning of the CC in Kazakhstan.
11. Consideration should be given in the project design to alternative or additional mechanisms of coordination and lobbying of the CL issues (other than CC on elimination of WFCL).
12. Continued awareness raising and structured capacity building in CL issues among all relevant stakeholders still needs considerable attention in the design of similar interventions.
13. Prevention measures have to be particularly emphasized: more emphasis on work with parents/families representing risk groups is required.
14. Introduction of coordination meetings involving three participating countries and CTA is advisable. More frequent interactions between the project in the field and CTA, and periodic missions from the ILO/IPEC Evaluation and Impact Assessment (EIA) unit to participating countries are advisable.