

**WEST AFRICA COCOA/COMMERCIAL
AGRICULTURE PROGRAMME TO COMBAT
HAZARDOUS AND EXPLOITATIVE CHILD LABOUR
(Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Guinea and
Nigeria)**

TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Premised upon the information and data available, and within the limits of human error, the following is a summary of the evaluator's independent and impartial assessment of the results and effects of WACAP:

Background

The terminal evaluation exercise (carried out from 3rd to 20th April, 2006 and encompassing desk research, two (2) field visits and participation in three (3) workshops), sought to assess the results and effects of the West Africa Cocoa/Commercial Agriculture Programme to Combat Hazardous and Exploitative Child Labour (WACAP), funded by the United States Department of Labour (USDOL) and the Cocoa Global Issues Group (Cocoa-GIG), and implemented by the ILO through its International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) in five (5) project countries, namely: Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Guinea and Nigeria.

Project Design and Implementation

- The regional design of the project was a useful platform for the sharing of experiences, approaches and ideas within the WACAP-community and with other projects.
- The project document was comprehensive in describing the overall sub-regional project and rightly identified, among other things, Increased Income of Rural Families; Extended Capacity and Relevant Education Systems; Regional Initiatives to Combat Child Trafficking; Child Labour Legislative Framework and Enforcement Systems, as some of the pre-requisites for the achievement and consolidation of the results of WACAP.
- WACAP was programmed to go through a pilot phase from September 2002 to October 2005 with Abidjan as Regional Head Office. But due to the political crisis that erupted in that country, the Head office had to be shifted to Accra resulting in considerable delays in project implementation.
- The effective start of WACAP was in July 2003 in Ghana and a little later in the other project countries. And the effective end of the project was April 2006 (i.e. 33 months). WACAP has therefore clearly failed to travel its full duration of 37 months. It is pardonable that the project started late due to unforeseen circumstances, but then what explains the inability to last its full duration? This question is particularly relevant in the light of the fact that some, if not most, of the action programme implementers realized that extra time was needed to complete their work (reference here is being made to the addenda to the action programmes).

- WACAP implementation was done with a lot of concern and commitment on the part of the project managers and implementers without exception, and its interventions were received with much interest and enthusiasm by the beneficiary communities, families and children, a lot more of whom had lined-up to be rescued by WACAP. But the door was shut on them 4 months prematurely.

Achievement of Project Objectives

By dint of hard work and tenacity of purpose on the part of its managers and implementers, WACAP succeeded remarkably in achieving all its objectives:

Capacity Building

It is commendable that capacity-building training programmes were conducted in all the project countries to the benefit of public and private sector partners at the national, district and community levels. Notable among them is the enhanced capacity of officers at the national and district levels to manage the Child Labour Monitoring Systems established in all the project countries.

Awareness Raising and Social Mobilization

In all the project countries, awareness at the national and community levels about the harmful effects of child labour is very high—thanks to WACAP's determined awareness raising campaigns. This is manifest in the fact that the governments of all the 5 project countries are at various stages of preparing national programmes to combat hazardous and exploitative child labour. Ghana took the lead in preparing a 5-year national programme to eradicate child labour in all the 67 cocoa farming

districts in the country. Many WACAP-communities have adopted self-help initiatives (levying themselves, etc.) to help protect their children from child labour.

Withdrawal and Protection of Child Labour Victims

Probably the key achievement of WACAP was the identification and withdrawal of children involved in hazardous child labour, and mainstreaming them into formal school and vocational training programmes. Available data reveals that 6,223 withdrawn children were put into formal education systems, whilst 3,457 went in for vocational training programmes (see Table 1, page 33). Additionally, more than 1,000 families were given assistance to engage in income generating activities as a means of protecting them against the root cause of child labour—poverty.

Child Labour Monitoring Systems

Child Labour Monitoring Systems (CLMS) were established in Ghana, Cameroon, Guinea, Nigeria and Cote d'Ivoire under the purview of the respective Ministries responsible for labour and employment in the various countries, to collect, collate, and analyze data on children involved in, or at risk of entering, child labour as well as monitor the progress of those withdrawn.

CLMS is not only useful for monitoring the child labour situation, but would also provide important statistical data for development planning purposes in the project countries.

Knowledge Base and Information Dissemination

Community members, farmers, teachers and government officials all received tailored training programmes on child labour issues. These training programmes coupled with the various field research activities carried out during the project have resulted in the creation of broad knowledge-base on the prevalence and nature of child labour in the cocoa and commercial agricultural sectors in West Africa. But it is not immediately visible that “...a viable information dissemination system” has come into being as envisioned in the project document.

Intended and Actual Outputs

The quantifiable output targets of WACAP have been achieved in all instances. The project targeted to withdraw and/or prevent 9,700 children from child labour. But the actual number achieved was 11,722, registering an achievement rate of 120.8%. Also, the targeted number of families to be supported to enhance their income generating capabilities was achieved nearly 4-fold (see page 36 for details)

Observations and Conclusions

1. Country level project documents should have been prepared, guided by the overall regional project document, to focus on the peculiarities of the individual countries. This would have made the project managers’ and implementers’ work a little easier.
2. The development objective of the project was clearly and concisely formulated. But some of the immediate objectives were heavily worded making them difficult to understand and to place equal importance on their multiple constituent parts. (*Elaborated on page 22*).

3. Significant time and material resources would be saved if the reporting requirements/formats are revised and made simpler.

4. The preparation and approval requirements of action programmes took an average of 4 months to complete, resulting in considerable loss of implementation time.

5. Final Evaluation Workshops:

- The evaluator should have had the opportunity to attend the national evaluation workshops of all the countries to interact with a wider range of WACAP stakeholders in the project-countries.
- The Accra and Abidjan National Workshops were one-day events at which adequate time was provided for the formal opening sessions characterized by speeches and very limited time given to the actual evaluation presentations, interactions, and experience sharing. In attendance at the Abidjan workshop were direct beneficiaries of WACAP, one of whom gave an insightful testimony of the usefulness of the literacy classes organized under the project.
- The Turin Workshop had more or less ample time for its content and was conducted professionally, save that there was the unfortunate arrangement whereby the workshop was formally closed a day before the independent evaluator had the opportunity to share impressions and seek further clarifications. Participants' reaction to the evaluator's work was, understandably, lacking interest and co-operation because they had been categorically informed the previous day that WACAP did not have any chance of continuing into a second phase.

- During the second half of the penultimate day of the Turin workshop, participants split up into the component groups of the ILO tripartite structure and came up with very encouraging statements of commitment to continue the fight against child labour. But what was not clear is whether those statements were binding on themselves as individuals or on the governments, employers' associations and workers' unions they represented at the workshop.

6. WACAP was relevant, effective and efficient in helping fight the problem of hazardous child labour and in delivering its results to the target group. And the project is sustainable in terms of the awareness created, the capacities built and the readiness of WACAP stakeholders to continue the fight against hazardous child labour. But in terms of the 6,223 children remaining in school, WACAP cannot be said to be sustainable. There should have been an exit strategy to hand over the withdrawn children to well established institutions/organizations to see them through basic education at least.

7. Time and material resource constraints notwithstanding, WACAP achieved its set targets and objectives remarkably well—thanks to the dedicated work of the project managers and implementers. WACAP has, in fact, attained a higher level of objectives achievement than most projects and that certainly deserves very high commendation.

8. Total project funds divided by the number of direct beneficiaries gives an average cost of US\$467 per beneficiary over the project duration. That gives a daily cost of roughly 43 cents per direct beneficiary—implying WACAP was very economical.

Recommendations

1. In future, adequate provision should be made for the independent evaluator to do field work in a representative sample of the project communities.
2. It is ILO/IPEC policy that each project country is given strictly one project vehicle. But in the situation where the regional head office shares one vehicle with the office of the national co-ordinator, there are bound to be mobility constraints. This policy should be carefully examined in future project planning.
3. To reduce the impact of the mobility problem on project implementation, future projects should make possession of or access to suitable vehicles a priority criterion for selecting implementing agencies, particularly NGOs.
4. The approval requirements and structures, and the reporting formats of the ILO should be simplified to save time and material resources for greater project results. The budgeting and disbursement procedures should also be simplified so that project funds are released early enough to beat inflation and other phenomena in weak economies.
5. With the structures and capacities built by the pilot phase in place, a second phase would produce a lot more direct beneficiaries and at the same time consolidate the results of the first phase. **It is therefore strongly recommended that the donors seriously consider doing WACAP phase II.**

6. In the event that WACAP fails to go into phase-II, an ex-post evaluation should be conducted 3 to 5 years after the end of the project to measure the real impact of WACAP on the beneficiary communities, and draw further lessons for future project planning.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Background of ILO/IPEC

The aim of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)—a technical cooperation programme of the International Labour Organization (ILO)—is to progressively eliminate child labour by strengthening national capacities to address the problem and promote worldwide movement to combat it. The partner agencies of the ILO and IPEC in any given country are not just only the traditional tripartite group comprising the Ministry of Labour (representing government), Employers' and workers organizations, but also include other public and private sector partners such as NGOs, professional associations, etc.

IPEC gives support to partner organizations to develop and/or implement measures aimed at preventing child labour, withdrawing children from hazardous labour and improving the non-exploitative working conditions of older children permitted by law to work. According to the ILO, about 353 million children are engaged in economic activity worldwide and that in countries such as Kenya, Brazil and Mexico between 25 and 30 percent of the labour force used in the production of agricultural commodities are children below 15 years old.

1.2 General Background of WACAP

It is estimated that 80 million African children (i.e. 1 in every 3 children) aged 5 to 14 years are economically active. The overwhelming majority of these children are engaged in the agricultural sector as the economies of African countries largely depend on agriculture.

The West Africa Cocoa/Commercial Agriculture Programme to Combat Hazardous and Exploitative Child Labour (WACAP) was initiated in September 2002 following persistent media reports that large numbers of children were being trafficked, exploited, and even possibly enslaved on cocoa plantations and other commercial agricultural concerns in the West African Sub-region. Particularly implicated in the media reports was Cote d'Ivoire and, perhaps for that reason, WACAP was originally planned to be headquartered in Abidjan. But due to the eruption of the crisis in Cote d'Ivoire, the sub-regional headquarters of WACAP had to be moved to Accra, Ghana. The relocation of the project headquarters resulted in considerable delays in its implementation in the participating countries.

WACAP consisted of 5 component parts, namely:

- Capacity Building
- Awareness Raising/Social Mobilization
- Child Labour Monitoring System
- Social Protection, and
- Knowledge Base and Information.

Each of the components was implemented in every programme country through one or more direct action programmes tailored to the social, economic and cultural conditions of the country.

WACAP was funded by the United States Department of Labour (USDOL): US\$5, 000,000, and the Cocoa Global Issues Group (Cocoa-GIG):

US\$1,000,000, and was executed by ILO/IPEC. At the sub-regional level, WACAP implementation was headed by a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA). A Country Programme Co-ordinator (CPC) in each of the 5 project countries headed WACAP implementation at the national level.

1.3 The Evaluation Report

The evaluation report comprises 7 chapters. Chapter 1 is the Introduction in which brief backgrounds of ILO/IPEC and WACAP are given. The second chapter spells out the evaluation scope and methodology. Chapter 3 reviews the design and implementation of WACAP, whilst the fourth chapter examines the achievement of WACAP objectives. Lessons learnt and good practices are presented in Chapter 5. The penultimate chapter assesses overall project performance, and the last chapter gives conclusions and recommendations.

This report has been designed to be concise and straight to the point, spelling out the evaluator's impressions, views and judgment with supporting information/data from real project cases as reported on in various reports, at workshops, or observed on the field. To give them a context, the evaluator's observations/impressions, conclusions and recommendations are revealed under the headings they belong and are in italic or bold characters.

2.0 EVALUATION SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Evaluation Scope and Purpose

Scope

According to the Terms of Reference (TOR), the scope of the evaluation “includes all project activities including Action Programmes”, and

“...should look at the project as a whole and address issues of project design, implementation, lessons learnt, replicability and recommendations for future programmes...”

The evaluator’s reaction to the scope of work is that the issues of project design, implementation, lessons learnt, replicability and recommendations for future programmes have been exhaustively investigated and the findings/conclusions discussed in the evaluation report. But it was impracticable to deal with/examine all individual project activities and Action Programmes and report on them in any meaningful detail.

Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to “assess whether the objectives of the project were achieved by comparing the intended outputs with the actual outputs. The evaluation should assess the general impact of the project at different levels such as at the policy level, organization/partner level, beneficiaries level, community and household level. The evaluation should try to assess the effectiveness of the project operation/implementation and management both at the implementing agency level and at IPEC level...” The evaluation was very much guided by the elaborate purpose partly quoted above, and also by a host of questions raised under “Suggested Aspects to be Addressed” in the Terms of Reference (the full text of the TOR is attached as **Appendix II**).

2.2 Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation methodology consisted of:

- Desk Research
- Field Visits and
- Participation in Workshops (Accra, Abidjan and Turin)

Desk Research

The desk research aspect of the evaluation was aimed at acquainting the evaluator with as much information on the project as possible by studying documents and reports such as the Project Document, Mid-term Evaluation Report as well as various reports written in each one of the 5 project countries.

The major setback in carrying out this all-important component of the evaluation was that the total time allowed (the first 4 days of the contract period) was woefully inadequate. Besides, the evaluator's preparedness to squeeze in more time by working overtime and putting in non-contract days was frustrated by the fact that the country reports for Cameroon, Guinea and Nigeria were simply not available.

Field Visits

The importance of field visits in an evaluation exercise consists in the fact that they offer the evaluator(s) the opportunity to interact directly with the beneficiary communities, families and children. The field visits provided for in the Terms of Reference were only two (2), one project site each in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire.

It was only in the case of the field visit to the Suhum Adakwa community in Ghana that the evaluator was able to carry out some interaction with the community members. The visit of the Asikoi community in Cote d'Ivoire had little provision for any meaningful interaction with the project beneficiaries as it was marked by speeches, fanfare and the legendary African hospitality.

In future, the independent evaluator in a terminal evaluation exercise should be given more time to work on the field, as experience shows that

such visits may well bring out information (positive or otherwise) that has not been covered in the implementers'/partners' reports. A case in point is the revelation in the Suhum Adakwa community to the effect that one of the positive by-products of WACAP was the noticeable reduction in theft cases since the inception of the project.

Participation in Workshops

Participating in the Accra, Abidjan and Turin workshops afforded the evaluator the opportunity to listen to and interact with all the managers of WACAP as well as a cross-section of WACAP partners/implementers. A revealing testimony on the beneficiary effects of the literacy classes intervention in Cote d'Ivoire was given by a direct beneficiary at the Abidjan workshop. But unfortunately, direct WACAP beneficiaries were absent at the Accra and Turin final evaluation workshops. Some level of beneficiary participation at the workshops would have compensated for the rather inadequate provision for field visits.

Observation: the Accra and Abidjan National Workshops were one-day workshops at which adequate time was provided for the formal opening sessions characterized by speeches and very limited time given to the actual evaluation presentations, interactions, and experience sharing. The Turin Workshop had more or less ample time for its content. But the arrangement whereby the workshop was formally closed on the previous day before the evaluator was given the opportunity to share his impressions and seek confirmations, further clarifications, etc. was not good enough. The evaluation exercise was greeted with lack of interest and little co-operation as the WACAP managers and partners at the workshop were all demoralized to hear the confirmation that the project had ended without any chance of going into a second phase.

Recommendations: In future, national evaluation workshops of projects the size and complexity of WACAP should take at least two (2) days with the full participation of officialdom, project managers and implementers, and project beneficiaries.

2.3 Evaluation Limitations

Organizational Limitations

The main organizational limitations of the evaluation include the following:

- The project managers, implementers and beneficiaries are many and located in five (5) different countries with limited or no accessibility at all to the evaluator.
- The independent evaluator faced constraints due to the time and resource limitations for the present evaluation exercise.
- Confirmation of the hiring of the independent evaluator as well as the invitation to Turin came at the eleventh hour making planning, travel arrangements and visa collection a nerve racking experience.

Technical Limitations

The technical limitations are the arrangements and conditions that affect/influence the content of the evaluation report:

- The independent evaluator had very limited interaction with WACAP beneficiary communities and families. Thus, the independence of the evaluation may be limited to the extent that it is heavily dependent on the reports written by project managers and implementers.

- The evaluator has very limited knowledge on the complicated internal administrative arrangements and procedures of the project executing agency (ILO/IPEC) and thus runs the risk of not fully understanding why things happened the way they did during project implementation.
- The enormity of work involved in evaluating a regional project and the time limitation from beginning to end of the evaluation exercise required a team of at least two (2) independent evaluators working together.

The above organizational and technical limitations notwithstanding, the independent evaluator exercised full professional competence and objectivity in studying the project reports and interacting with WACAP stakeholders, this Terminal Evaluation Report contains my independent and impartial observations, findings and conclusions.

3.0 PROJECT DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

3.1 Project Design

In scrutinizing the project design, the evaluator looked closely at

- The inputs, activities, outputs, and objectivities linkages in the logical framework of the project.
- Prevailing pre-WACAP information on child labour in the project countries.
- Beneficiary needs identification.

Logical Framework

The project design as outlined in the project document identifies the Development Objective of WACAP as being “to contribute to the effective

prevention and elimination of hazardous and exploitative child labour in commercial agriculture in West Africa”. To achieve this goal, 5 Immediate Objectives (one from each of the 5 component parts of the project) had to be achieved. The attainment of each one of the 5 Immediate Objectives was in turn to be realized through the achievement of 2 or more project outputs, and these outputs are to be produced by carrying out a number of activities to which resources (inputs) are committed. For means of verification of the attainment of project outputs, the project document rightly identified reports and records of the implementing agencies, among other things.

The vertical logic of the project design is evident in the vertical linkages between activities, outputs and objectives. Except that the project document failed to determine the inputs required to carry out the various activities at the West African sub-regional level, but rather captured them (inputs) in budget items corresponding to ILO budget lines. This was apparently in an effort to show the amount of money expected from each one of the donors. Also not well documented in the project design are the assumptions underpinning the attainment of the project outputs and objectives. Otherwise, the project design was logical and coherent.

Pre-WACAP Information on Child Labour

The project design at the formulation level did not have the benefit of knowing the approximate numbers of child labour victims in commercial agriculture in the various countries, save in the case of Cote d'Ivoire where some preliminary assessment had been carried out. To cover this information gap, rapid assessments and/or baseline studies were conducted at the beginning of project implementation in all the project-countries.

Beneficiary Needs Identification

The needs of the victims of child labour and their families were not clear at the time of project design. Beneficiary needs assessment was carried out only during project implementation.

Granted that rapid assessments and baseline studies to estimate the numbers and needs of child labour victims in the project countries prior to project preparation may have been difficult and time consuming, country level project documents (guided by the components and parameters in the overall regional project design and at the same time zeroing in on the peculiarities of the individual countries) should have been prepared soon after the baseline studies. The preparation of project documents at the country level could have been completed in the first 3 months of WACAP implementation, and would have gone a long-way to help optimize project results as implementing agencies would have been called in to align themselves with already identified needs..

3.2 Formulation of Project Objectives

The objectives of WACAP are quoted here for the purpose of easy reference to their formulation.

Development Objective

The development objective of WACAP is to contribute to the effective prevention and elimination of hazardous and exploitative child labour in commercial agriculture in West Africa.

Immediate Objectives

The immediate objectives of the project are the same as the objectives of the 5 project components, namely:

- By the end of the project, selected public and private sector partners and concerned agencies have strengthened capacity to plan, initiate, implement, monitor and evaluate action to combat child labour.
- By the end of the project, there is increased awareness/social mobilization among the children, families and communities and within concerned public and private sector agencies on issues related to child labour, particularly to hazards for children in the cocoa/agricultural sector and viable alternatives to child labour.
- By the end of the project, model (pilot) interventions have been tested for the withdrawal of children from work, removal of workplace hazards for those of working age, and provision of appropriate social protection options for them and their families are available.
- By the end of the project, the situation of children withdrawn and prevented from child labour is being monitored and verified in selected areas through credible, affordable and feasible/sustainable child labour monitoring system.
- By the end of the project, there is an enhanced knowledge base through action-oriented research and a viable information dissemination system.

The development objective is clearly and concisely formulated. But the immediate objectives are heavily worded making them difficult to understand and to place equal importance on their multiple constituent parts. For example, the second immediate objective is a lengthy one-sentence statement, the last bit of which is hanging: “**...and viable alternatives to child labour**”. The importance of the need to create viable alternatives to child labour is completely lost in the statement. An example of this lack of attention to that component part of the objective which could have been beneficial may be seen in the light of WACAP-Ghana not proactively supporting efforts by ICOUR to invent a device for scaring away birds from the rice fields of the project communities in Navrongo. This single action could have freed the bulk of the remaining 700 child labour victims in the area, who work on the rice fields from dawn to dusk trying to scare away swarms of invading birds.

Project Targets:

Most of the project output targets were stated in a qualitative form making it difficult and perhaps disputable to determine their degree of attainment. The only quantitatively formulated targets are 3 out of the 4 outputs related to immediate objective 3 as stated below:

- About 9,700 children under the age of 18 years, who have been withdrawn from work under the programme, educated and made aware of child labour and occupational safety and health issues.
- At least 500 adult family members (particularly women of families of children withdrawn from hazardous work) capacitated and skilled to enhance their income-earning potential.
- About 70,000 children, aged 13 to 18 years, are prevented/protected from engaging in hazardous work through OSH outreach activities in collaboration with STCP efforts.

Unlike the rest of the output targets, these 3 outputs were easily and readily broken down into quantitative targets at the national level and remarkably achieved (see table on page 23 for details)

3.3 Project Implementation

Implementation Approach

WACAP was implemented through a comprehensive programme executed in stages in each of the five (5) project countries, taking into full account the conditions and peculiarities of the individual countries.

Implementation involved the execution of several action programmes designed to provide comprehensive, multi-sectoral and integrated support packages on prevention, withdrawal of children engaged in hazardous work, and to provide viable alternatives to child labour victims and their families. One or more action programmes were sub-contracted to implementing institutions (public institutions, trade unions and associations, and NGOs).

Managing the project on the field was carried out by country-level offices headed by Country Programme Co-ordinators (CPC) who directly supervised the activities of the implementing institutions/partners, while a sub-regional office headed by the Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) provided international supervision, guidance and direction to ensure efficient use of resources and to help in the capitalization of experiences. *The project management and implementation approach was apt and effective and therefore worthy of replication.*

Capacity and Commitment of Implementing Agencies

The level of commitment exhibited by project implementers in the 5 countries was, on the average, very encouraging. But, as a rule, the implementing agencies lacked the capacity to make good the 10% contribution required of them as envisaged in the project document. They also did not all have the technical capacities required to do Action Programme Summary Outlines (APSO), which were essentially project documents that required elaborate logical frameworks and detailed budget.

Evidently however, the manpower and technical capacities of governmental and non-governmental implementing agencies were markedly enhanced through the well planned training programmes delivered at the beginning and in the course of project implementation.

Action Programmes

In all, a total of 93 (minus the addenda) action programmes and mini-programmes were carried out in the 5 countries. After a careful study of the reports on the implementation of the action programmes by various agencies in the programme countries, **the evaluator is convinced that the action programmes were relevant and complemented one another in a way that eliminated duplication of efforts.** Synopses prepared by the Country Programme Co-ordinators on the achievements, challenges and constraints of the action programmes are attached as **Appendix I.**

Of particular importance to the core focus of WACAP are the action programmes that paved the way for the actual withdrawal, prevention and protection of children from hazardous labour. The average maximum duration of these action programmes was about 18 months, which in the evaluator's opinion was too short. A small extension in the implementation time of such action programmes would have resulted in the withdrawal of

proportionately larger numbers of children from child labour, because they were already identified and waiting to be withdrawn. A case in point is the withdrawal of 100 children from cocoa farms by CEDEP in Ghana within a relatively short period of time at the tail end of WACAP.

Reporting Requirements

The reporting system under the project was elaborate and strict. This is good for monitoring and evaluation purposes. At the beginning of their involvement in the project, all partner institutions of WACAP were trained on the technical and financial reporting format/requirements of the ILO/IPEC.

This training notwithstanding, there were many instances of Status Reports, Progress Technical Reports, etc. going to and fro between implementing agencies and the project offices before being finalized for submission to Geneva. As rightly observed on page 43 of the mid-term evaluation report, reports were often too detailed and contained repetitions.

Recommendations: Lengthy reports are time consuming at both ends (the writer's and the reader's), and also turn to waste valuable stationery resources. Therefore, the reporting format under ILO/IPEC projects should be revised in a way that cuts out unnecessary detail to save scarce time and material resources.

Implementation Constraints

There is no gainsaying the fact that WACAP implementation was done with a lot of enthusiasm and commitment at all levels: ILO/IPEC, Project Country Governments, Project Management at the sub-regional and national levels, and Implementing Agencies (governmental and non-governmental). However, there were many administrative/procedural,

budgetary and logistical challenges during project implementation. These problems have been briefly discussed below.

Approval Administrative/Procedural Constraints

The evaluator is satisfied that officials of ILO/IPEC as well as the sub-regional and national management teams of WACAP worked very hard to get approvals through, and that there were instances whereby mini-programmes (which did not have to go through PROCUREMENT) were approved within a couple of days. The direct action programmes, however, often took an awfully long time to get approval. Starting from satisfying the procedural requirements such as preparing and submitting APSOs, etc. at the project-country level to receiving approval from Geneva took an average of 4 months (*this was confirmed during the evaluation exercise in Turin*). In practice, actual disbursement of funds for the implementation of action programmes could take an additional period of 2 months in cases whereby the implementing agency had to open a special bank account, etc. Besides, disbursements were not en-bloc but in tranches, and getting the next tranche disbursed involved submitting reports that had to be accepted by ILO/IPEC.

Taking 4 to 6 months from the point of identifying the problem on the field to the point of coming back to tackle it is not a helpful arrangement for a project as short as WACAP. Delays in the approval of field work are, in fact, not desirable in any project situation because they usually result in significant qualitative and quantitative losses in project output.

Taking into consideration ILO's financial rules and procedures, alternative measures should be considered, such as for instance a decentralized account be opened with the CTA of the Project, and the Head of the ILO country-office as principal signatories from which disbursements are made for action programme activities.

Furthermore, again considering ILO rules and regulations one could consider that to cut down on the length of time required for processing approvals from ILO/IPEC Head Office in Geneva and save more project time for field work, projects of the size and complexity of WACAP should be placed under the directorship of a very senior official in the Head Office with authority to approve APs in line with administrative arrangements and requirements of the ILO. All approval requests are sent directly to the office of the project director, and once this office gives the nod every other requirement is considered satisfied. For the purposes of respecting the internal checks and balances in place in the ILO, the office of the project director could be made to render period accounts to, or defend its decisions before, the appropriate units of the organization.

Budgetary Constraints

It has been observed that the action programmes had very tight budgets and often ran into difficulties during execution. The practice in the ILO (like in all the organs of the United Nations) is to cost everything to the last dollar. This in principle is good for probity and accountability. But in weak and inflation stricken economies like those of the WACAP-countries, and in the face of the difficulty in getting budgets revised once they have been approved, budgeting for action programmes and mini-programmes should have been allowed to make provision for the eroding effects of inflation, taking into account the lifespan of the action programme and the rate of inflation in the given country.

A case in point is the action programme for “combating child labour through awareness raising/community mobilization, withdrawal and re-integration of children working on cocoa farms in Ondo State, Nigeria” (implemented by the Tonikoko Multi-Co-operative Farmers Association, TFA). The budget for this action programme provided for the

procurement of 500 wheelbarrows to help eliminate the hazardous practice of children carrying heavy loads on their heads from the farm. But due to inflation, by the time the money was ready for buying the wheel barrows it was enough for only 250 pieces—inflation had eaten away exactly half the programmed number of wheel barrows.

Logistical Constraints

The problem of inadequate logistics for field work—ranging from the lack of means of transport to insufficient DSA—was cited by nearly every implementing agency as the No.1 constraint to field work. For example, the DSA for implementing agencies in Ghana was ₵100,000, which is not enough money to cover the cost of an overnight stay in an averagely decent guest house in a small town like Navrongo or Suhum (both WACAP sites).

Understandably, the project could not have provided implementing agencies with vehicles because of the cost involved. Therefore, to reduce the impact of the mobility problem on project implementation, future projects should make possession of suitable vehicles a priority criterion for selecting implementing agencies, particularly NGOs.

The problem of inadequate means of transport was encountered by the evaluator when it was time to carry out the very first and only WACAP field visit in Ghana. The only project vehicle serving the offices of the CTA and the CPC was naturally engaged in so many errands on the day of the visit that the field trip was very much delayed resulting in limited interaction time with the visited community.

It is ILO/IPEC policy that each project country is given strictly one project vehicle. This policy is good in the sense that it helps save resources for the greater benefit of the target group. But definitely, there is a problem with

the arrangement whereby the CTA's office has to share the same vehicle with the office of the CPC. Such an arrangement in practice means that at any given time-t, at least one of the two important offices is without a means of transport because the other is using it. In the event of routine maintenance or a breakdown of the vehicle, both offices are completely grounded. In future, the office of the CTA should be given a separate vehicle for ease of work. It could be a salon car as the CTA and his/her assistants may not be doing as many field trips as the CPC.

Time Constraints

The pilot phase of WACAP was originally planned to last 37 months from September 2002 to October 2005. But due to the delayed start the closing date was extended to January 2006, and later a non-cost project extension further shifted the deadline to April 2006.

The country programmes started in the second half of 2003, except in the case of Cote d'Ivoire which started at the beginning of 2004. The first action programme to be implemented was the rapid assessment baseline study conducted in Ghana in December 2003, followed closely by that of Cameroon in February 2004 (incidentally, the baseline studies in Nigeria and Guinea were not conducted at the beginning of WACAP implementation in those countries, and that of Cote d'Ivoire predated the beginning of WACAP).

Most of the social protection action programmes which had to do with the sensitization of communities and the actual withdrawal and protection of children from hazardous child labour did not start until well into the second half of 2004. This left the action programme implementers with less than 2 years to deal with the age-old, multi-faceted and complex problem of child labour.

Not only the action programmes and mini-programmes, but nearly all other aspects of WACAP (including the terminal evaluation exercise itself) suffered enormous time constraints. It is important for ILO/IPEC to make donors understand that complex and age-old problems like child labour take considerable lengths of time to resolve—anything less than eight (8) years is not good enough.

3.4 Effectiveness of Project Management

In the course of the evaluation exercise, the external evaluator had the opportunity to closely observe the Chief Technical Adviser, the Programme Officer, and the Country Co-ordinators for Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire at work and found them all to be devoted, professionally competent, effective and resilient. The evaluator's impression about the remaining Country Co-ordinators (for Cameroon, Guinea and Nigeria) met at the Turin workshop is that they all came-across as deeply knowledgeable about the project in their countries and showed that they were very much on top of their jobs.

In all the 3 workshops attended by the evaluator, the implementing/partner agencies were represented by people who made good presentations and showed drive, commitment and personal interest in helping eradicate child labour.

The evaluator's conclusion therefore is that the secret behind the high achievement level of WACAP in the face of the project's time and material resource constraints, lies in the formidable teamwork, professionalism and dedication of the project's managers and implementers in all the 5 countries without exception.

3.5 Advantages and Setbacks of Regional Design

The regional design of WACAP has many advantages including the following:

- The regional design makes it possible for donors of varied interests to pool resources together and finance the project.
- The regional design is a solid platform for experience sharing and cross-fertilization of ideas on how to tackle the problem of child labour.
- It allows for marshalling a global force to combat the global problem of child labour. Clearly, the synergy of the WACAP-countries working together is greater than the sum total effect of the 5 countries working as individual units.
- The regional design of WACAP is in keeping with other ILO/IPEC projects. This made it possible for WACAP to learn from the experiences of, and dovetail well with, other ILO/IPEC projects like STCP, LUTRENA, etc.

The setbacks of the regional design of the project are the following:

- Supervision of project implementation in the various countries from a central office such as that of the Chief Technical Advisor may have been difficult and unbalanced.
- The problems, interests and voices of some member-countries may have been overshadowed by those of other member-countries. A case in point is that a lot was said about Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire at the Turin workshop and practically nothing was heard about the Guinean experience (a meeting between the evaluator and the team from Guinea late into the night of 19th April, 2006 revealed that there were very interesting experiences from that country too).

The evaluator's conclusion is that the aggregate advantage of the project's regional design far outweighs the aggregate setback.

Therefore, the regional nature of WACAP's design is worthy of replication in future projects.

4.0 ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES

4.1 Immediate Objectives

The achievement of the objectives of WACAP was examined in the light of the extent to which the five (5) component parts of the project have been realized, as discussed below.

1. Social Protection for Child Labour Victims

The key achievement of WACAP is the identification, sensitization, withdrawal and integration of children affected directly by hazardous child labour practices and mainstreaming them into regular formal school system and vocational training. Table 1 below presents available data on the sex distribution of children withdrawn and placed in formal education or vocational training establishments.

Table 1: Profile of Withdrawn Children by Gender and Placement

Education	Formal Education			Vocational Training			
Country	Male	Female	Sub-total	Male	Female	Sub-total	Total
Cameroon	529	485	1,014	169	200	369	1,383
Cote d'Ivoire	1,803	1,199	3,002	1,633	1,569	3,202	6204
Ghana	524	347	871	57	72	129	1,000
Guinea	225	129	354	54	47	101	455
Nigeria	466	516	982	10	15	25	1,007
TOTAL	3,547	2,676	6,223	1,923	1,903	3,457	10,049

Source: WACAP Reports

The table above shows that a total of 10,049 children were withdrawn or prevented from exploitative child labour and placed in formal or vocational training institutions in the project-countries during the entire duration of the project. Not captured in the table above are those who benefited from non-formal education training, mainly in Cote d'Ivoire, numbering about 1,550. *This brings the absolute total of WACAP beneficiary-children to 11,600. That is certainly a commendable effort within the limited space of 3 years.*

2. Child Labour Monitoring Systems

The Child Labour Monitoring System (CLMS) involved the design and implementation of feasible, credible and transparent child labour laws

and monitoring systems through community groups and relevant public players. The CLMS was successfully operationalised in Ghana Cameroon, Guinea and Nigeria and was coordinated by the Child Labour Units of the respective Ministries responsible for Labour and Employment in the various countries.

The established CLMS systems in the project-countries are not only useful for monitoring the child labour situation, but also come in handy as tools for the collection, collation and analysis of vital statistical data for planning purposes.

3. Knowledge Base and Information Dissemination

Improved knowledge on child labour issues at the national, regional and community levels was recorded in all the programme countries. This was the result of the capacity building component of the project which involved teachers, child labourers, families and communities. In Guinea for example, 1,330 teachers received training on child labour, 60 families received training in financial management and business management practices; while 10 groups comprising 300 women were trained in the management of their businesses.

4. Networking among Implementing Agencies

At all levels of WACAP's implementation, effective and strong networking was achieved among the implementing agencies. This resulted in greater synergy among the implementing agencies to carry the fight against child labour beyond WACAP.

5. Intervention Services to Adult Beneficiaries

In recognition of the importance role parents and other adult members of the family could play in the fight against child labour and the influence poverty has in the practice of child labour, direct intervention services were rendered to adult family members to help raise income and capacity levels. Table 2 below gives an overview of such interventions.

Table 2: Intervention Services to Adult Beneficiaries

Country	Skills Training		Income Generation		Other Services		Total
	Male	Fem.	Male	Fem.	Male	Fem.	
Cameroon	60	10	10	10	-	-	90
Cote d'Ivoire	-	-	-	290	40	300	630
Ghana	-	-	-	-	-	-	- (?)
Guinea	-	-	4	56	15	10	85
Nigeria	-	-	10	40	400	-	450
Total	60	10	24	396	455	310	1,255

Source: WACAP Reports

The total number of adult WACAP-beneficiaries is 1,255 made up of 539 males and 716 females (some beneficiaries may, however, have been counted more than once because they benefited from more than one service).

4.2 Intended and Actual Outputs

Table 3: Intended and Actual Outputs.

Country	Targeted Output		Actual Output		Rate of Achievement in %-tage (Families)	Rate of Achievement in %-tage (Children)
	No. of Children to be withdrawn or	No. of Families to be supported	No. of Children withdrawn or	No. of Families supported		

	Prevented from CL		prevented from CL			
Cameroon	1,000	100	1,383	605	605%	138.3%
Cote d'Ivoire	6,000	150	7,478	600	400%	124.6%
Ghana	1,000	150	1,000	266	177.3%	100%
Guinea	700	50	799	340	680%	114.1%
Nigeria	1,000	50	1,062	60	120%	106.2%
Total	9,700	500	11,722	1,871	374.2%	120.8%

Source: WACAP Reports

Table 3 clearly shows that output targets on number of children to be withdrawn and prevented from child labour, and number of families to be supported were over achieved. However, on one hand, the achievement rate of targets on children withdrawn and prevented from child labour (whereby the overall total output target was exceeded by 20.8%) is highly commendable. On the other hand, the rather very high over achievement of the numbers of supported families, averaging almost 4-fold the targeted number, suggests that target-output was too modest and non-challenging. Or, perhaps, the achieved results were overstated in a few cases.

4.3 Impact of Project Results

The simple matrix below seeks to illustrate the usefulness/impact of the various WACAP outputs on its stakeholders (ranging from the donors to the beneficiary child).

Table 4: Matrix of WACAP's Impact on Beneficiaries

WACAP Output	Beneficiary Group	Benefit Obtained
1. Identification and withdrawal of children from child labour	(i) 10,049 children from 37 communities in	10,049 innocent children doomed to a bleak future can now look up to the future with

	Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Guinea and Nigeria	hope.
	(ii) The world community.	Some of these children will Grow into world class experts serving not only their countries but the international community
2. Child Labour Monitoring Systems (CLMS)	(i) The govern'ts of WACAP countries. (ii) The cocoa industry as a whole (donors and WACAP-countries).	CLMS has been established in each of the WACAP countries and serve as a useful tool for collecting and processing data of national importance. Provided the data required for certification that the cocoa was produced reasonably free of child labour.
3. Capacity building and child labour awareness training programmes	(i) All implementing agencies (ii) Several communities, parents and children. (iii) Community and District CLCM (iv) Government officials at the national and district levels. (v) Many teachers in the WACAP-countries. (v) Farmers and farmers' groups	Trained on sensitization and training methods as well as on IOL/IPEC technical and financial reporting requirements. Awareness of the harmful effects of child labour on the future of the families and communities created. Trained on how to monitor child labour and collect data on victims for onward transmission to the CLMS. Received training on the ill effects of child labour, and on how to operate the CLMS systems established. Developed and used the Manual for Education Practitioners was used to train teachers on improved education delivery and to sensitize them on child labour issues. Farmers' Training Manual used to train them on the detriments of child labour.
4. Support for the	(i) About 420 family	Given direct support to engage

development of income generating ventures	members mainly women	in income generating activities and trained in basic business management techniques.
5. Occupational Safety and Health outreach activities.	(i) F arming communities in all WACAP countries. (ii) I n 2 of the 6 WACAP communities in Nigeria	E ducated on the proper handling of agro-chemicals and on occupational health and safety. A CASA (NGO of doctors, etc.) gave free medical services, diagnosis and treatment to withdrawn and other children.

5.0 LESSONS LEARNT/GOOD PRACTICES AND SUCCESS STORIES

5.1 Lessons Learnt/Good Practice Stories

Lessons Learned in Cameroon

- The need for implementing agencies to institute incentives as a way of inducing commitment from stakeholders.
- Need to develop a realistic budget to carry out action programmes.

- Need to ensure that financial resources are adequate to cater for all identified children in the communities.
- The need for WACAP to spell out clearly the terms and conditions of service.
- In view of the taxing nature of training delivery, there is the need for IPEC to simplify its methodologies of strategic planning and accounting.
- Need to ensure that all components of the delivery system which have serious impact on withdrawn child labourers are fully incorporated.

Lessons Learnt Cote d'Ivoire

- The creation of a network of implementing agencies served as a useful framework for the exchange of experiences within the entire WACAP implementation structure.
- The literacy programme went beyond its purpose to actually prepare the identified children for enrolment or re-enrolment into the formal school system. For example, in the Gagnoa district 130 out of the 397 children sent through non-formal education enrolled in the formal school system for the 2005/2006 academic year. Also, the creation of mobile schools proved useful as some communities are too far from the nearest school.
- The involvement of central and local government officials in the activities of WACAP paid dividends.
- The participation of traditional rulers in the sensitization of people was very useful.
- The construction of schools out of local materials was at least a make shift solution to the lack or nonexistence of school infrastructure.

- Literacy centres established at Abengourou and Agnibilekrou were also attended by parents (particularly mothers).
- The creation of income generating activities management committees in the villages.
- The implementation of a literacy programme for the beneficiaries of income generating activity support packages. Out of 316 trained beneficiaries, 156 were female.
- Decentralization of the coordination of vocational training centres to facilitate the pursuit of vocational training.
- The organization of ex-child labourers into an association made for better delivery of support packages and also helped in their social integration.
- The creation of service provider groups contributed towards solving the problem of inadequate labour force.

Lessons Learned in Ghana

- The perception that children working on the farms is a way of transferring skills in farming to the children and preparing them to take over the management of the farms from the elderly folks has changed.
- There is the need for effective collaboration among Ministry of Manpower, Youth and Employment, COCOBO and other stakeholders to sustain what has been initiated.
- There is the need for continuous sensitization of the general public, decision makers and implementers on child labour issues.
- Need for further research and studies to address child labour issues.
- There is the need to integrate counselled child labourers into the national programme to combat child labour.
- Need to network for ideas, information and materials.

- Need to depend on existing structures in the community such as channels of communication, decentralized system of governance.
- Accessibility of schools is crucial for effective social protection.
- The need for child welfare and development issues to be brought to the fore as well as youth issues to be integrated into the development agenda of government.
- Changed perception of public officials that child labour does not exist was crucial to attainment of project objectives.

Lessons Learnt in Guinea

- Communities' desire to ensure ownership of the project was helpful.
- The solution to fighting poverty is fighting against all forms of servitude.
- The need to forge a network of actors to fight child labour.
- Sensitisation through rural radio increases awareness and helps to mobilize and induce participation of people in programme interventions.
- The participatory approach is the best strategy for addressing child labour concerns.

Lessons Learnt in Nigeria

- The need to mainstream concerns of working children into the educational policies of government.
- The need to incorporate child labour concerns into the government poverty reduction programmes especially at the community level.
- The need to improve access and quality of education at the community level.
- The need to provide adequate educational support to withdrawn children so that the project supports their education to completion.

- Community-driven and community-based membership is critical for sustainability.
- Issues of sensitization are better community-driven.
- Need to provide more support to Community Based Organisations to carry out sensitization as a way of sustaining project results.
- Need to focus more on strengthening co-operative groups at the Community level than supporting individual family members.
- Technical assistance to project beneficiaries is crucial for successful implementation of the programme.
- Community sensitisation and capacity building are key actions in the elimination of child labour.

Overall Regional Lessons

The pilot phase of WACAP provided useful lessons for stakeholders and for future project designing, including the following:

- It is important to integrate and mainstream child labour concerns into the educational policies and programmes of governments.
- Undertake aggressive and continuous sensitization of the general public, decision makers and implementers on child labour issues.
- Utilize existing social and political structures in the communities rather than create new ones. For example: traditional channels of communication in the communities, and the use of decentralized structures in the country.
- Need for effective collaboration between and among implementing agencies, government Ministries, departments and other stakeholders to sustain what has been initiated.
- Need to develop a network for sharing ideas, information and materials.

- Undertake further research and studies to address child labour issues.
- Employ adequate material resources to support the implementation of action plans in combating child labour.
- Make maximum use of radio and television as well as print media in disseminating information on child labour concerns.
- In the absence of a comprehensive exit strategy difficult to consolidate the gains of the project.

5.2 Success Stories

The following, in the evaluator's opinion, are some success stories of WACAP implementation:

- The sub-regional model of WACAP was a solid platform for networking, sharing of ideas and lessons on the sensitive and global issue of child labour. This networking was not only within and amongst the project countries, but also with other countries. For example, WACAP got the Child Labour Monitoring System idea from Kenya and, in turn, Kenya is learning from the Educators Manual developed by WACAP.
- The experience in Cameroon is that there has been a considerable change in the attitude and the mentality of stakeholders, because many now understand the difference between socialization and child labour. It has been estimated that about half the country's population of 18 million have been sensitized on child labour issues. This feat was achieved through the extensive use of agricultural extension officers, and the print and electronic media in that country.

- WACAP brought about development and inculcated a new sense of responsibility in most of the beneficiary communities towards their own further development. With many of them calling upon community members to pay special levies for the up-keep of their children in school and other development projects, the WACAP communities could be said to be on the right path to demonstrating that no community, and by extrapolation no country, is too poor to care for its children. Examples of WACAP communities challenging themselves to the task abound, including the people of Asikoi village in Cote d'Ivoire levying themselves 200 CFA per person to help finance some activities initiated by WACAP. Still in Cote d'Ivoire, beneficiaries of the income generating interventions organized themselves into associations and the revenues they generated were divided into 3 parts—one part for the association, another part to the individuals involved, and the last part went to help support children enrolled in school.
- WACAP did not succeed in sending only children, engaged in or at risk of entering hazardous child labour, to school, but also their parents—many illiterate parents, particularly mothers, keenly competed with their children at the literacy classes organized by WACAP-Cote d'Ivoire; and in all the project-countries, many parents and other adult family members attended training programmes on basic book-keeping and business management. Education was truly the kingpin of WACAP's success—in Guinea, formal schools were built from informal arrangements that started in the community mosques, and various make-shift places.

- Child Labour Monitoring Systems (CLMS) have been institutionalized in all the WACAP countries with well established databases that do not only serve the purpose of reporting on child labour issues, but also provide useful data for national development planning purposes. As a direct consequence of the awareness raising and sensitization at the national level, backed by real figures from the CLMS databases, all the WACAP-countries are at various stages of completing national programmes to combat hazardous child labour. In the particular case of Ghana, a National Cocoa Child Labour Elimination Programme covering all the 67 cocoa growing districts (compared with only 4 covered under WACAP) to eliminate child labour in the cocoa sector by 2011. Against the backdrop of initial high profile denials that there was child labour in Ghana's cocoa sector, this is a very welcome development, to say the least.
- Yet another success story of WACAP is the vitally important assistance given in the cocoa certification effort of the project countries. In Ghana, the first CLMS report was used to achieve the first cocoa certification requirement. And as the International Confectionery Association's representative said in her remarks at the Turin Workshop in April 2006, "The cocoa and chocolate industry remain fundamentally committed to achieving certification that cocoa is farmed free from the worst forms of child labour in 50% of the cocoa growing regions of Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire by July 2008". Ms. Sue D'Arcy further intimated: "...we have refined our understanding of what certification will mean. Three years ago we were novices but thanks to our experiences within WACAP we've learnt a lot".

- In Nigeria, sensitization of farmers on child labour issues has a good chance of actively continuing for the next 5 years. This is because WACAP-Nigeria targeted and trained the STCP Farmer Field School Facilitators on child labour issues, who in turn, reached 1,200 farmers with the child labour message, and the process will be on-going for the next 5 years that STCP still has to operate in Nigeria. The life-sustaining collaborative relation between STCP and WACAP dates back to the beginning of WACAP in that country, when STCP officers worked around the clock to pave the way for WACAP agents to gain access to the target communities and explain their real mission. Without STCP, WACAP would most likely have been rejected by the cocoa farming communities of the Ondo State, because it had been widespread rumored that WACAP was a Western ploy to bring down the world market price of cocoa under the pretext that children were being hazardously and exploitatively used in cocoa production.

6.0 OVERALL PROJECT PERFORMANCE

The analysis in this chapter goes beyond the implementation factors examined in Chapter 3 above and concentrates on the effects and impacts of the work done under the project so as to be able to reach objective conclusions on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of WACAP's results.

6.1 Project Relevance

The relevance of WACAP was examined in the light of the following two (2) fundamental questions:

- Did WACAP contribute towards solving the problem of child labour in the project-countries?
- Was WACAP able to address the needs of the target group?

The straight and emphatic answer to these questions is YES!... WACAP is now a household name in all the project communities, and their awareness about the harmful effects of child labour is high. The real numbers of children withdrawn and prevented from hazardous child labour given in table 1 above is sufficient proof of the contribution of WACAP towards solving the problem of child labour in the project countries.

Thanks to WACAP, governments and local authorities who, hitherto, did not realize that the problem of child labour existed under their purview now recognize the enormity of the problem and are willing to fight it. A case in point is the government of Ghana which initially disagreed that there was child labour in the cocoa sector, but has now prepared an elaborate “National Cocoa Child Labour Elimination Programme 2006 – 2011” (as a component of the larger national Time-Bound Programme, TBP) to extend the fight against the Worst Form of Child Labour (WFCL) beyond the initial 4 WACAP coverage areas to all the cocoa farming districts in the country. Similarly, national programmes to fight against and eventual eliminate child labour are at various stages of completion in all the other WACAP–countries. Also worthy of mention is the fact that WACAP contributed to the Cocoa Certification effort in some of the project-countries.

6.2 Project Effectiveness

The effectiveness (or otherwise) of WACAP is tested from the standpoint of the extent to which the project has been able to achieve its set

objectives and to reach out to the target beneficiaries. A critical question where is whether WACAP succeeded in changing the situation of the beneficiaries for the better, and this is where the technical difference between project relevance and effectiveness comes in—WACAP could be relevant in terms of helping solve the identified problem, but if the process of solving the identified problem resulted in unanticipated less positive effects for the target beneficiaries (communities, families and children) then the project could not be said to be effective. So the evaluator paid particular attention to finding out whether there were any instances whereby WACAP led to cultural, social or economic unanticipated effects.

Happily, there did not seem to be any such less positive unanticipated effects created by WACAP. On that score, and to the extent that the project succeeded in achieving its output targets and objectives, it is the evaluator's professional opinion that WACAP was very effective.

6.3 Project Efficiency

The economical or extravagant application of resources was of critical concern in the evaluation exercise. However, unit cost auditing was beyond the scope of this evaluation (if need be an external auditor may have to be contracted for that). Therefore, the evaluator's judgment on the economical, or otherwise, use of project resources was based mainly on the experiences related by implementing agencies and on the evaluator's own encounter with the costing processes under the project. Aggregate expenditure was reasonably justifiable in relation to the quantity and quality of result chalked by the project. The evaluator's conclusion therefore is that WACAP was very economical, and even sometimes very thrifty.

An equally critically important exercise under the efficiency test was the painstaking computations to ascertain the proportion of total project funds spent on action programmes that directly benefited the core target group (children, their families and communities). The results of this exercise have been captured in the table below.

Table 3: Proportion of Project Funds Spent on Core Target Group

WACAP Countries	No of Action Prog.	Total Amount Disbursed (in US\$)	Amount Spent on APs Directly Benefiting:			Core Target as % of Total
			Core Target Group (in US\$)	CLMS (In US\$)	Others (in US\$)	
Cameroon	18	330,533	202,803	61,290	66,440	61.4%
Cote d'Ivoire	24	981,745	543,756	302,799	135,190	55.4%
Ghana	24	603,070	191,943	320,148	90,979	31.8%
Guinea	14	237,588	157,360	19,560	60,668	66.2%
Nigeria	15	241,086	122,666	62,328	56,092	50.9%

Total	95	2,394,022	1,218,528	766,125	409,369	50.9%
--------------	-----------	------------------	------------------	----------------	----------------	--------------

Source: Computered by Evaluator

In terms of the proportion of project funds spent on action programmes that directly benefited the target group, Guinea was the most efficient, followed by Cameroon. Cote d'Ivoire was the third most efficient. Nigeria came fourth, and Ghana was the least efficient. The overall picture is that 50.9% of action programme funds went to the direct benefit of the target group. Child Labour Monitoring System (CLMS) establishment and related costs were relatively very high in Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana, accounting for 30.8% and 53.1% of the total country-programme funds respectively. In the case of Ghana, CLMS related cost outstripped by far the total cost of all action programmes directly benefiting the target group.

6.4 Project Sustainability

Sustainability of the results of WACAP must be evaluated at two (2) levels:

- Sustainability of the awareness created on the harmful effects of child labour and the desire/willingness to do something about it at the community, district and national levels.
- Sustainability in terms of maintaining the withdrawn children in school in the hope that they would get the benefits of education and help fight the child labour canker in future.

The awareness created on the ill-effects of child labour on the health, education and future of the affected children is going to last, presumably, forever. The ability to sustain the fight against child labour will, however, vary from family to family, community to community and, indeed, from country to country within the larger WACAP-community. Undisputedly, the two (2) main causal factors of child labour are poverty and unawareness/ignorance (of its long term effects) on the supply side of the child labour equation. In the cases where parents engage their own children in child labour, the same poverty and unawareness are to blame. But on the demand side, the reasons for engaging in child labour are the opportunistic desire to exploit, greed and, to some extent, ignorance.

Methodologically correctly, WACAP did not concern itself to much with the demand side because it (demand) thrives on the poverty and unawareness/ignorance of the suppliers of child labour. This was manifest in the extensive awareness raising campaigns in the communities and the direct interventions, albeit proportionately few, that sought to help raise income levels of affected families.

The paralyzing poverty in most of the rural communities is bound to have a debilitating effect on their capacity to sustain the fight against child labour after WACAP and this is why programmes at the national level to fight child labour after WACAP are the only hope. It is therefore reassuring to note that all the project-countries are at various stages of developing national programmes to fight and eventually eradicate child labour. In the light of this development, it is within the limits of reasonable optimism to conclude that the results of WACAP, in terms of the awareness created and willingness to continue the fight against child labour, are sustainable.

Unfortunately, the same straight forward and positive conclusion cannot be made about sustainability in terms of the maintaining the withdrawn children in school. It is heart warming to note that the main criterion used in all the countries for the selection, withdrawal and placement of child labour victims in school was that the hardest hit by need, want and poverty came first. But it is disturbing to realize that there were no concrete exit strategies to hand over the children to identifiable groups and/or institutions that would see them through to, at least, the end of basic school (and even beyond, why not?).

The problem with the absence of such an exit strategy is that some (if not most) of the children placed in school are likely to drop out because their families may not be able to sustain them in school (*an exception may be the case of Ghana where the Constitution stipulates Free Compulsory Universal Basic Education for all children and government has started implementing the so-called capitation grant scheme, whereby the state pays all forms of school fees for all children in public schools at the basic level*).

It is even more disturbing to infer that some of such drop-out children are not likely to be willing to re-engage in farming activities because of the awareness about the harmful effects on their health. To draw this scenario to its logical conclusion, it is not out of place to say that some of such drop-out children are likely to engage in social vices such as waywardness, hooliganism, stealing and burglary in their communities and beyond. The possibility of the occurrence of such social vices is a possible negative impact of WACAP that must be investigated in an ex-post evaluation 3 to 5 years down the road after WACAP.

7.0 OBSERVATIONS CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To give the observations, conclusions and recommendations a context, they were first made under the appropriate chapters and sub-chapters of the report before being summarized here.

7.1 Observations and Conclusions

1. Rapid assessments and baseline studies to estimate the numbers and needs of child labour victims in the project countries prior to project

preparation would have been difficult and time consuming, but country level project documents (guided by the components and parameters in the overall regional project design and at the same time zeroing in on the peculiarities of the individual countries) could and should have been prepared soon after the baseline studies. This would have made the project managers' and implementers' work a little easier.

2. Final Evaluation Workshops

- The Accra and Abidjan National Workshops were one-day events at which adequate time was provided for the formal opening sessions characterized by speeches and very limited time given to the actual evaluation presentations, interactions, and experience sharing.
- The Turin Workshop had more or less ample time for its content, but had the unfortunate arrangement whereby the workshop was formally closed a day before the independent evaluator had the opportunity to share his impressions and seek further clarifications. Participants' reaction to the evaluator's work was, understandably, lacking interest and co-operation because they had been categorically informed the previous day that WACAP did not have any chance of continuing into a second phase.
- The evaluator should have been given the opportunity to attend the national evaluation workshops of all the countries to interact with a wider range of WACAP stakeholders in all project-countries.

3. The development objective of the project was clearly and concisely formulated. But some of the immediate objectives were heavily worded making them difficult to understand and to place equal importance on their multiple constituent parts. For example, the second immediate objective is such a lengthy one-sentence statement, the last bit of which **"...and viable alternatives to child labour"** ran the risk of not attracting

the required attention. An example of this lack of attention to that component part of the objective which could have been beneficial may be seen in the light of WACAP-Ghana not proactively supporting efforts by ICOUR to invent a device for scaring away birds from the rice fields of the project communities in Navrongo. This single action could have freed the bulk of the remaining 700 child labour victims in the area, who work on the rice fields from dawn to dusk trying to scare away swarms of invading birds.

4. Of particular importance to the core focus of WACAP are the action programmes that paved the way for the actual withdrawal, prevention and protection of children from child labour. An extension in the implementation time of such action programmes would have resulted in the rescue of proportionately larger numbers of children from child labour. A case in point is the withdrawal of 100 children from cocoa farms by CEDEP in Ghana within a relatively short period of time between January and March 2006.

5. Lengthy reports are time consuming at both ends (the writer's and the reader's), and also tend to waste valuable stationery resources. Therefore, the reporting format under ILO/IPEC projects could be revised in a way that cuts out unnecessary detail to save scarce time and material resources.

6. Taking 4 to 6 months from the point of identifying the problem on the field to the point of going back to tackle it is not a helpful arrangement for a project as short as WACAP. Delays in vital decision taking are, in fact, not desirable in any project situation because they usually result in significant qualitative and quantitative losses in project output.

7. Time and material resource constraints notwithstanding, WACAP achieved its set targets and objectives remarkably well, thanks to the dedicated work of the project managers and implementers. WACAP has, in fact, attained a higher level of objectives achievement than most projects and that certainly deserves very high commendation.

8. Clearly, WACAP was relevant, effective and efficient in helping fight the problem of hazardous child labour and in delivering its results to the target group.

9. In terms of the awareness created, the capacities built and the readiness of WACAP stakeholders to continue the fight against hazardous child labour, WACAP is sustainable. But in terms of maintaining the 6,223 children in school, WACAP cannot be said to be sustainable. There should have been a clear-cut exit strategy that handed over these children to well established institutions to see them through basic education at least.

10. The absolute total number of WACAP direct beneficiaries, i.e. child labour victims and those at risk of getting into child labour as well as adult beneficiaries, is 12,855 over a period of 3 years. The total project funds of US\$6,000,000 divided by total direct beneficiaries gives an average cost of US\$467 per beneficiary over the entire project life. That works out to a daily cost of roughly 43 cents per direct beneficiary. This is not just only economical, but it is also money well spent on a worthy course and cause.

7.2 Recommendations

1. In future, the independent evaluator in a terminal evaluation exercise should be given more time to work on the field, as experience shows that such visits might well bring out information (positive or otherwise) that was not covered in the implementers'/partners' reports. A case in point is the revelation in the Suhum Adakwa community (the only project site the evaluator visited in Ghana) to the effect that one of the positive by-products of WACAP was the noticeable reduction in theft cases since the inception of the project.

2. In future, national evaluation workshops of projects the size and complexity of WACAP should take at least two (2) days with the full participation of government officials, project implementers and project beneficiaries.

3. It is ILO/IPEC policy that each project country is given strictly one project vehicle. This policy is good in the sense that it helps save resources for the greater benefit of the target group. But definitely, there is a problem with the arrangement whereby the CTA's office has to share the same vehicle with the office of the CPC. Such an arrangement in practice means that at any given time-t, at least one of the two important offices is without a means of transport. In the event of routine maintenance or a breakdown of the vehicle, both offices are completely grounded. The evaluator strongly recommends that, in future, the office of the CTA should be given a separate vehicle for ease of work. It could be a salon car as the CTA and his/her assistants may not be doing as many field trips as the CPC.

4. Understandably, the project could not have provided implementing agencies with vehicles. Therefore, to reduce the impact of the mobility problem on project implementation, future projects should make

possession of or access to suitable vehicles a priority criterion for selecting implementing agencies, particularly NGOs.

5. With the structures and capacities built by the pilot phase in place, it is the evaluator's conviction that a second phase with about the same level of funding would produce three-fold the number of direct beneficiaries chalked by the first phase, and considering the undeniable need to consolidate the respectable gains of the pilot phase, it is the evaluator's professional opinion that WACAP or some other framework to build on the achievements so far be considered.