



# Evaluation Summaries

## Building the Foundations for Combating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Anglophone Africa

### Quick Facts

**Countries:** Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Uganda, and Zambia

**Final Evaluation:** April 2006

**Mode of Evaluation:** Independent

**Technical Area:** Child Labour

**Evaluation Management:** IPEC

**Evaluation Team:** International and National Consultants

**Project Start:** September 2002

**Project End:** May 2006

**Project Code:** RAF/02/P51/USA

**Donor:** The United States Department of Labor (5,301,486 US\$)

**Key Words:** Capacity Building, Employers' Organizations, Social Dialogue, Child Labour

### Background & Context

#### Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

The technical cooperation programme entitled "Building the Foundations for Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Anglophone Africa." (CBP) focused on five core countries and was developed against the backdrop of experiences with national programmes in Kenya, Zambia, Uganda, Ghana and Nigeria. These included a combination of awareness-raising, training and capacity-building and direct-action elements. Kenya has benefited from activities of the ILO's International Programme on Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) since 1992 and the other four countries

have had programmes implemented during the period of 1999-2002.

The project had two immediate objectives:

At the national level, the immediate objective was that "*governments, workers' and employers' organizations, NGOs and other partners will have the technical skills and organizational capacity to formulate and implement policies, programmes and other initiatives to facilitate prevention of the worst forms of child labour, and protection, withdrawal, rehabilitation and reintegration of children participating in the WFCL.*"

At the sub-regional level, it was expected that at the end of the project "*knowledge and experience on child labour and good practice interventions will be identified and shared.*"

At this level, in addition to the core countries, activities were to benefit non-core countries such as Ethiopia, Malawi, South Africa and Tanzania.

Reflecting the project's flexible and demand-driven approach using a "menu of models of interventions", national activities were implemented in four stages with national self-evaluation-cum planning workshops at each stage for systematic involvement of all partners, an effective information exchange, the documentation of experiences and close monitoring of implementation, allowing for possible corrections.

#### Purpose, scope and objectives of the evaluation

The evaluation looked at the project as a whole and addressed issues of project design, implementation, lessons learned, replicability

and recommendations for future programmes and any specific recommendations for use in any future intervention.

The specific purpose of the evaluation, in addition to assessing achievement and effectiveness, were:

- To assess the overall impact of the project at different levels such as at policy level, organizational (partner) level, beneficiaries level, community level and household level.
- To analyse strategies and models of intervention used, document lessons learned and potential good practices, and provide recommendations on how to integrate these into planning processes and implementation of future IPEC activities in the project countries.

A particular focus should be to identify elements of effective models of intervention and assess the modalities of the menu of interventions approach including its potential use and its strengths and weaknesses.

The evaluation addressed the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

### **Methodology of evaluation**

The evaluation was carried out using a desk review, field visits to Ghana, Kenya, Uganda, Nigeria and Zambia for consultations with project staff and project partners and other key stakeholders. A series of half day workshops were held in each of the project countries and a sub-regional level workshop was held in Lusaka, Zambia at the end of the field visit.

### **Main Findings & Conclusions**

The findings of the evaluation reflect numerous successes with regard to the achievement of objectives.

In all countries some **institutional mechanisms** exist, albeit with varying degrees of capacity, to take forward programmes to eliminate the WFCL. The institutional structure at national level, however, was not always fully supportive of project

implementation. Child Labour Units (CLU) and National Steering Committees (NSC) were mostly found to be weak and had limited capacity to effectively coordinate child labour related activities or to efficiently endorse Action Programmes (AP). It is clear that at a national level the capacity of the CLU need to be enhanced (in all areas) so that they are able to effectively serve as the mechanism to coordinate national activities against the WFCL. NGOs are the main Implementing Agencies (IA) in the WFCL with different levels of capacity and resources.

**Capacity** in relation to the child labour content-specific needs of each country has been achieved, and in this regard the objective has been met. With regard to a common understanding of capacity building, this was not clear to all stakeholders. An initial flaw in the design process was that capacity building was narrowly considered which impacted on the project throughout its life cycle. Ignoring human resource, institutional and infrastructural support and capacity has huge implications for the effective and successful implementation of the project. Although the preparation of Action Programmes and reporting procedures have been cumbersome, capacity of partners have been built in the process with an improvement in their ability to do Action Programmes and in meeting the reporting requirements. However, much work still needs to be done in this regard, with the possibility of simplified formats that still allow for accountability but are less technically inclined.

In terms of **institutional capacity**, the traditional partners of the ILO were relatively weak and did not contribute effectively to the implementation of the project. Tripartite partners in some countries did not see the value of working with NGOs not the value of some of the strategies used such as the withdrawal of children. NGOs were however the main implementers of the various Action Programmes. They were well equipped to work with communities, set up child labour committees and child rights clubs and do awareness raising programmes. The limitations however seemed to be at an

institutional level with skills in project management, proposal writing and report writing to mention a few. Capacity was also limited at times with regard to infrastructural support to carry out a set of activities so for example, an NGO did not have transport to do proper monitoring of its activities.

The sub-regional work did not feature that prominently and the participation of NGO partners was limited in most cases. Attempts to set up an internet-based discussion forum did not work well because of technical and other logistical problems that were not foreseen. A sub-regional newsletter was also planned but its effectiveness and impact was not easy to ascertain because partners were not aware of the newsletter. On the other hand, the good practices documentation has been welcomed by all and partners are looking forward to seeing the final product which will be able to share experiences across the five countries.

In terms of overall **impact of the project**, the project strategies were generally appropriate, well integrated into national development policies and relevant to national development strategies and priorities. At the *policy level* there are draft policies in place as an attempt to create the necessary legislative environment to address the challenges of the WFCL. Workers and Employers Organizations have also incorporated elements of child labour into their policies and programmes. In some countries child labour has been included in the Poverty Reduction Strategy, which is a major victory in efforts to mainstream child labour. The implications are that all government agencies should have child labour programmes and budgets in their plans.

At the level of *Implementing Agency* the impact of the project has been quite substantial. Organizations have been able to respond to a number of interventions from the level of policy development, awareness raising, mobilising communities, empowering child labour committees and child rights clubs. The most tangible impact has been in direct action where children have been withdrawn or prevented and placed in schools or vocational training. Innovative approaches have been used which included using national artists,

different forms of media and introducing the participation of children through the Supporting Children's Rights through Education, the Arts and the Media (SCREAM) pack as well as child rights clubs.

Networking among implementing agencies has also had some positive impacts both from the point of view of sharing information and of creating linkages to collaborate around events and areas of work. Partners with more capacity have helped those that were not as strong and required support. This is however an area that could be enhanced.

At the level of *beneficiaries* the most notable impact has been the withdrawal and prevention of children. Those children that were placed in school have benefited from this programme. Youth who were involved in vocational training had also benefited from this programme and in all instances having the opportunity to learn a skill takes them one step further away from having to return to, or get involved in child labour. The formation of child labour committees at community level has really demonstrated the potential strength and impact of this programme. The ownership for tackling the issues around child labour is then taken to source and addressed at this level. Parents were enlightened and made aware and this encouraged some of them to withdraw their children, the community identified and reported cases of child labour and took it upon themselves to intervene.

**Project implementation** was seriously hampered by the unnecessary length of time for AP to be finally approved and funds released. Progress reports also are time consuming and exceptionally cumbersome. What emerges from the evaluation is that the systems and structures in ILO are not conducive to some developmental programmes like the CBP, which requires the kind of environment that is more responsive, enabling and geared towards building the capacity of partner organizations. Lengthy bureaucratic procedures coupled with time delays and what seems to be confusion about the role of the Area Offices as well as how capacity building is understood; can in fact hinder the process of capacity building. Decentralisation in the

regions has not facilitated the process in terms of time; it seems to have simply added another loop into the already cumbersome system because decision making is not decentralised.

The **role of the Country Programme Coordinator (CPC)** was supportive and partners were assisted as much as possible to speed up the process, although delays in approvals and disbursements were beyond their control. Although CPC tended to have many obligations, on an informal basis the national IPEC staff (which included CPC's and Finance Administration Assistant (FAAs) worked with many of the partners to guide them in the finalisation of their proposals, as well as with their narrative and financial reporting and on a one-to-one basis helped to build their capacity. The CPC have a key role to play in building the capacity of IA, and in coordinating and pooling together the various strands of such a programme. To give them the respect and credibility to guide this process they too need to have the capacity to do so.

Efforts to **mainstream the elimination of child labour** have been effective with a number of good practices documented. In all countries work has been done to incorporate the elimination of child labour into the social work curriculum, and to a large extent this has been successful or certainly a large amount of work has gone into finalising the process. In Zambia the Department of Education through ZAMISI has made much progress in developing a Manual on Child Labour that targets secondary schools and colleges. In three countries child labour has been included in the country's Poverty Reduction Strategy (Ghana and Uganda) or National Development Plans (Zambia).

Various **methods were used in awareness-raising:** workshops, production and dissemination of awareness-raising materials, such as booklets, posters, radio and TV programmes, video presentations, drama, and music performances. At schools, the formation of child's rights clubs empowered children to participate in raising awareness. This was done through drama, drawing, poetry and music. The few schools visited where there were child rights clubs was very impressive.

The formation of **Child Labour Committees** has been a tangible indicator of mobilising communities to become aware, able to identify children in these situations, and have them withdrawn and returned to school was itself seen as an indicator of its success. A number of success stories have emerged as good practices to indicate the extent to which awareness raising has led to the withdrawal of children.

The implementation of a **Child Labour Monitoring System (CLMS)** has not been that effective and seems to be beyond the capacity of this project. To implement an effective CLMS, at a country, organization and community level requires a good coordination and integration system which is not yet in place. It seems more appropriate that an entire programme be dedicated to developing and implementing a CLMS which is going to be essential to assess the impact of programmes to eliminate the WFCL.

The lack of **coordination and synergy of IPEC programmes** at the country level was problematic with a perception of rivalry amongst the different IPEC programme managers. Although the pooling of resources among different IPEC programmes was meant to facilitate greater co-ordination, this was not the case.

## Recommendations & Lessons Learned

### Main recommendations and follow-up:

*For IPEC management and the ILO:*

- The Programme should be extended for a further 3 to 5 years.
- Scope should be more holistic and provide an integrated approach that takes into account content-specific capacity, as well as human resource, institutional and infrastructural support that might also be needed to effectively implement the programme.
- Reduction in bureaucracy in proposal writing and disbursement of funds to speed up the process. Consider devolving power from Geneva, to ILO field offices and to country programmes so that increasingly

some significant financial approval is done in the country where the action takes place. An approval committee can be instituted to approve certain amounts of funds in the country. A review of this process is recommended as well as an increased focus on training in proposal writing and reporting for ILO-IPEC partners.

- Extend the duration of similar regional capacity building projects to 4 - 5 years, or if a project is of shorter duration, the outputs should match the time frames.
- Greater coordination and synergy between the different ILO/IPEC programmes to avoid unnecessary confusion among stakeholders and to maximise the resources that are available. Where new country programmes are going to be implemented the ILO-IPEC should ensure that previous ILO-IPEC country programmes do not overlap.
- As part of a learning and reflection process ILO/IPEC should take recommendations on previous evaluations and mid-term reviews seriously, otherwise it defeats the purpose of learning from one programme to the next, and lessons learned are lost.
- Clear guidelines on the role and responsibilities of the NSC should be incorporated into a standard Terms of Reference and be part of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). The composition of NSC to be reviewed and additional partners included.
- Standard monitoring tools should be developed that could be adapted for each project if necessary, that will help to track outcomes and assess the impact (this goes beyond activity and progress monitoring which are captured in progress reports and checklists). There is also a need for developing project monitoring tools for increased qualitative monitoring. Monitoring tools should also be implemented at a community level, with CLC members being empowered on how to implement them.
- The tracking and tracing methodologies should be finalised and a standard system

put in place for all projects – this should be an integral part of all projects.

- Future projects should build upon and further expand networking and linkages undertaken by the CBP. More creative networking instruments could be devised, for example, promoting visits among partners to each others projects, more frequent review meetings (quarterly in place of waiting for six months)..
- A national task force of key government agencies involved in CL issues should be established on CLM. This should be a separate investment as a regional project, possibly where a TBP is in place or foreseen.
- There is a need for increased direct collaboration with local governments i.e. to give them an opportunity to directly implement activities as a way of fostering involvement and ownership of child labour interventions by local government structures.
- Place a Technical Assistant in the Ministry of Labour for a period of 3-5 years to strengthen the CLU and support to the functioning of the NSC

*For the donor:*

- In future for IPEC interventions aimed at building capacities for implementing agencies, provision of financial resources should be secured and transport and resources if this is what is needed to build capacity effectively. Investment in such material resources should also be conceived as a concrete aspect of building capacity of IAs.
- Budgetary limitations that are beyond control of the project should be open to negotiation rather than excluding key areas of work. Field offices should have access to a contingency fund that can be easily accessed (and must be accounted for). In this way complimentary activities that are not necessarily planned for in advance, can be accommodated as well as currency fluctuations that negatively affects project budgets.