International Labour Organization

IPEC International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour

IPEC Evaluation

Preventing and Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Selected Formal and Informal Sectors in Bangladesh BGD/00/P50/USA P.270.10.359.050

An Independent Mid-term Project Evaluation

By

An Independent Evaluation Team

May 2003

CONTENTS

Acronyms and abbreviations		**ii**
Names and abbreviations of the implementing partners		**iii**
Executive summary		**iv**
1.	**Background and objectives of the evaluation**	**1**
1.1	Project description	1
1.2	Objectives of the evaluation	2
2.	**Process and methodology of the evaluation**	**3**
3.	**Presentation of main findings**	**5**
3.1	Project design and relevance	5
3.1.1	Problem and need identification	5
3.1.2	Project formulation and logical structure	5
3.1.3	Institutional arrangements	7
3.1.4	Important changes in the external environment	8
3.1.5	Significant changes in project design during implementation	8
3.1.6	Omissions from the design	10
3.2	Achievement of immediate objectives	10
3.2.0	Preparatory outputs	10
3.2.1	Research and documentation	11
3.2.2	Social protection	15
3.2.3	Continued workplace and community monitoring	18
3.2.4	Advocacy and awareness raising	21
3.2.5	Institutional capacity and national statistics	22
3.3	Additional outputs and impacts	23
3.3.1	NGO capacity development	23
3.3.2	Overloading of formal primary schools	24
3.4	Efficiency of project implementation	24
3.5	Sustainability of project impacts	25
3.5.1	Programme Facilitating Committees and CWGs	25
3.5.2	Capacity of formal schools	26
4.	**Further analysis of important issues identified**	**28**
4.1	The role of economic empowerment in withdrawing children from hazardous labour	28
4.2	Child workers not covered by the project intervention	29
4.3	Feasibility of progressing to an area-based approach	30
4.4	Lessons that can contribute to the Time Bound Programme (TBP)	30
5.	**Conclusions, lessons, potential good practices and recommendations**	**32**
5.1	Conclusions	32
5.2	Lessons learnt	33
5.3	Potential good practices	34
5.4	Recommendations	34

Appendix 1	**Terms of reference**	**37**
Appendix 2	**Summary of progress of Action Programmes**	**47**
Appendix 3	**People, groups and organisations consulted**	**50**
Appendix 4	**References and documents consulted**	**55**
Appendix 5	**Diary of evaluation consultant**	**56**
Appendix 6	**Terms of Reference for self-evaluation component**	**57**

Acronyms and abbreviations

APC	Action Programme Coordinator
BBS	Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics
BSAF	Bangladesh Shishu Adhikar Forum (Child Rights Forum)
CDW	Child domestic worker
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
CWG	Community Watch Group
GoB	Government of Bangladesh
IGA	Income generating activity
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
JCLWG	Joint Child Labour Working Group
MOLE	Ministry of Labour and Employment
MPME	Ministry of Primary and Mass Education
NFE	Non-formal education
NGO	Non-government organisation
NSC	National Steering Committee
PFC	Programme Facilitating Committee
SPIC	Sector Project Implementing Committee
SPTF	Sector Project Task Force
TBP	Time Bound Programme
ToR	Terms of reference
USDOL	United States Department of Labour
WFCL	Worst forms of child labour

Names and abbreviations of the implementing partners

BDSC	Bangladesh Development Service Centre
BEES	Bangladesh Education Extension Services
BMS	Bangladesh Mohila Sangha
BRAC	Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee
BVDP	Bangladesh Village Development Programme
CB	Chhinnamukul Bangladesh
CDS	Centre for Development Service
DCI	Development Centre International
ESDO	Eco-Social Development Organisation
Lighthouse	-
NM	Nari Maitree
OSDER	Organisation for Social Development and Research
PIPASA	People's Integer Progressive Association for Social Activities
PMK	Pali Mongal Karmosuchi
SATU	Social Advancement Through Unity
SEEP	Social and Educational Enhancement Programme
SEPOC	Society for Environmental Pollution Control
SETU	Human Resource Development Organisation
Shoishab Bangladesh	-
SMSKS	Surjamukhi Mohila Samaj Kalyan Sangstha
SSS	Society for Social Services
SUF	Society for Underprivileged Families
UDDIPAN	United Development Initiatives for Programmed Activities
Upakar	-

Executive Summary

The purpose of this evaluation is to review the project's approach, strategy and implementation, assess the extent that project objectives have been met and the impact on target groups. The evaluation should serve as a learning tool, drawing lessons and identifying potential good practices from project experience, provide recommendations for the remaining period of the project and suggest a possible way forward for the future. An independent evaluation team carried out the evaluation.

The project, launched in September 2000, has an extended completion date of September 2004, and aims to remove 30,000 children from hazardous occupations in 5 formal and informal sectors in different locations in Bangladesh. It also aims to prevent younger siblings from entering child labour, to provide an increased understanding of the worst forms of child labour and to strengthen the Ministry of Labour and Employment (MOLE). These actions are to contribute to the systematic prevention and elimination of the worst forms of child labour.

The project design is based on a good understanding of the technical and the social political context. It is sensitive to gender issues in both the need identification and in the implementation strategy. There is a logical relationship between the activities and the outputs and objectives. The institutional arrangement for project management was not in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and had to be revised. The plans to link the project with the district administration have proved to be unrealistic and probably not necessary. The capacity and commitment of labour representation was not assessed in the design, and as this is not strong, the project has not yet been able to involve them in implementation. The project has no intervention to support the government to enact or to implement child labour legislation.

The implementation of the Action Programmes within the project was delayed by 9 months due to a variety of reasons. The project has been extended for 13 months within the planned budget in order to compensate for these serious delays in project start-up.

A comprehensive database has been established to monitor project activities and impact, and more importantly to monitor the status of all the children. The feasibility of partner organisations maintaining the database is questioned and issues of data protection and privacy need to be looked at.

Quantitative outputs in terms of services supplied to child labourers and their families are very good for this stage of the project. 93% of the target children are receiving non-formal education. 29% have been withdrawn from hazardous working conditions and although difficult to predict with certainty, this is expected to rise to near the target as the combined effects of children's education, parental awareness raising and economic empowerment take effect. Only 7% of employers have taken on guardianship responsibilities for Child Domestic Workers (CDWs). This will rise substantially, but it is likely to be well short of the target. 95% of CDWs are receiving Non-Formal Education (NFE) and are enjoying various benefits. There are very positive qualitative indications that the status of child workers and their families have improved, and the children themselves have expressed that they have benefited.

The target of preventing 15,000 younger siblings from entering child labour was revised to 6,021 on the basis of physical identification. Achievement is currently 75% and although this will rise, it is unlikely that the target will be achieved.

Many Programme Facilitating Committees (PFCs) and Community Watch Groups (CWGs) have been formed and are meeting, but the majority of them are very dependent on support and motivation from the project. Most lack leadership that is concerned with the needs of the working children and their families. Stakeholders made recommendations on how these institutions, that are very important for sustaining the project impact, can be revised and improved.

The project has not yet carried out any activities for raising awareness on Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL) issues at the national level. There have been very comprehensive and successful awareness raising activities at the local level by the implementing partners and there has been a positive change in public attitude.

The National Child Labour Survey has been delayed by 2 years mainly as a result of lengthy negotiations with the Government of Bangladesh (GoB) and frequent changes in their personnel. The survey is now under way with a planned completion date of June 2003. Until now there has been little capacity building of the MOLE.

The capacity and commitment of partner NGOs to work in WFCL has been developed, and these organisations are likely to provide ongoing support which will assist in sustaining some of the project interventions.

The success of mainstreaming a large number of (ex)child workers into formal schools is seriously compromising the ability of these schools to maintain the level of education that they were providing. Class numbers have doubled and there is a shortage of materials and accommodation. Some of the mainstreamed children have dropped out of formal school. The problems associated with this year's (January 2003) enrolment have not yet been resolved and the unusually large enrolment will be repeated in January 2004. There is an urgent need to liaise with other organisations and projects to resolve this.

Economic empowerment of working children's' families is not a single critical ingredient for the withdrawal of children from hazardous work, but it is one of a number of contributing factors, and it has an important role.

Within the working area there are still a number of children working in the hazardous sectors identified by the project. There are a number of reasons for this and there is a need for a second round of interventions to work with them and to stop further children entering.

In areas where the project has worked intensively, there is potential to capitalise on the positive change in attitude and to withdraw all children from hazardous work through a further phase of activity.

The final chapter of the report summarises the lessons learnt through experience, the potential good practices identified and the recommendations that have been made. These can all contribute to the Time Bound Programme starting in Bangladesh.

Background and objectives of the evaluation

1.1 Project description

The project 'Preventing and Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Selected Formal and Informal Sectors in Bangladesh' is funded by the United States Department of Labour (USDOL) and was launched in September 2000 by the International Labour Organisation's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (ILO/IPEC). The original completion date was August 2003. In order to provide sufficient time for the in the project 24 Action Programmes[1] to deliver the outputs/services and eventually create sustainable impact, a one-year project extension, with no change to the total budget, has been granted until 30th September 2004.

The project is operational in five prioritised informal and formal sectors, namely bidi industry, construction sector, leather tanneries, match factories and child domestic work. It focuses on children working in hazardous occupations under the most intolerable conditions ranging from exposure to chemicals and other harmful substances as well as being subject to long, difficult working hours. The project originally aimed to remove about 30,000 children from hazardous occupations and to prevent another 15,000 younger siblings from replacing them in the labour market. It intends to achieve these goals through various strategies varying from providing social protection to monitoring workplaces and communities.

To foster the broad based partnerships at the national level, the project has been implemented with the involvement of constituents and social partners under the purview of a Sub-committee appointed by the National Steering Committee (NSC) of the Ministry of Labour and Employment.

The broad objective of the project is to contribute to the systematic prevention and elimination of worst forms of child labour in Dhaka, Chittagong, Tangail, Rangpur, Kushtia, Narayanganj and Munshiganj. Specifically, the project is designed to achieve five immediate objectives as follows:

(a) A strong foundation for the systematic prevention and elimination of worst forms of child labour in the selected sectors and regions will have been prepared through increased research and documentation;
(b) The worst forms of child labour in the selected sectors and regions will have been substantially reduced through the direct action programs aimed at the withdrawal, social protection and rehabilitation of at least 30,000[2] children in a time-bound and systematic manner;
(c) At least 15,000[3] younger siblings will have been prevented from entering the worst forms of child labour through economic empowerment of parents and the introduction of a continuous mechanism for workplace and community monitoring;
(d) Instances of commitment made and action taken against the worst forms of child labour by the government, social partners, families, communities and the general

[1] Sub-projects or specific components of the project
[2] September 2002 Project revision requests number to be changed to 30,887
[3] September 2002 Project revision requests number to be changed to 6,021

public, jointly and separately, will have been increased through advocacy and awareness raising; and

(e) The capacity of government, in particular the Ministry of Labour and Employment (MOLE), in addressing the worst forms of child labour country-wide will have been increased through the strengthened institutional capacity and updated national statistics on the child labour situation.

There are currently 24 Action Programmes being implemented through non-government organisations (NGO) partners in the 5 sectors mentioned above and assistance is being provided to the Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS) to carry out the National Child Labour Survey.

1.2 Objectives of the evaluation

In line with ILO/IPEC policies and procedures and as given in Chapter 8: Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation of the project document, the project is to undertake a mid-term evaluation. The evaluation is to assess the soundness of the project approach and strategies, to review the effectiveness and efficiency in delivering outputs, to assess the extent project objectives have been met or will be met, and to examine potential impact on target groups. The current evaluation is the first evaluation for this project in its current project cycle. The mid-term evaluation should serve as a learning tool for the project management team.

The purposes of the mid-term evaluation are to:

- review the ongoing progress and performance of the project
- examine the likelihood of the project achieving its objectives
- examine the delivery of the project inputs/activities
- investigate the nature and magnitude of constraints
- analyse factors contributing to the project's success.
- provide all stakeholders with the information needed to assess and possibly revise work plans, strategies, objectives, partnership arrangements and resources
- identify the potential impact on policy and strategies
- suggest a possible way forward for the future
- identify lessons learned and potential good practices.

The scope of the evaluation includes all project activities to date, including the Action Programmes but will also look at the project as a whole and address issues of project design, implementation and other special concerns.

2. Process and methodology of the evaluation

This evaluation is based on the terms of reference (ToR) produced by ILO/IPEC (Appendix 1). These state that the ToR is based on the outcome of a participatory consultative process on the nature and specific purpose of the evaluation. The ToR suggests some specific topics and special concerns that should be covered by the evaluation.

The evaluation was carried out by a single independent consultant[4] from the 6th of March until the 7th of April 2003. The diary of the consultant for this period is in Appendix 5.

The project and its implementing partners carried out the first stage of the evaluation and this was for each Action Programme partner to carry out a self-evaluation based on ToRs written by the project[5] (Appendix 6). These self-evaluations were completed by 23 of the 24 partners and the reports were available for review by the consultant when he arrived in the country.

Project documents, including reports and selected correspondence files, and the self-evaluations conducted by the Action Programme partners were reviewed. A list of these documents is given in appendix 4. Semi-structured interviews were carried out with key informants in Dhaka and project staff gave an overview of the project and its activities.

Use was made of the Project's detailed monitoring and reporting processes, including the thorough six monthly reports made to ILO and the USDOL. No attempt was made to duplicate the collection of the quantitative data available from these sources. During field visits and interactions with implementing partners, observations of office records and systems were made in order to verify the project monitoring systems.

Following the overview provided by the staff and from documentation, visits were made to the locations where the Action Programme partners were implementing their activities. Visits were made to Hazaribagh and Ramna in Dhaka, Narayanganj and Rangpur. In these locations semi-structured interviews were held with Action Programme partner staff, children, parents, participants in credit and income generating schemes activities (IGAs), Programme Facilitating Committee (PFC) and Community Watch Group (CWG) members, employers, formal school teachers and headmasters. Focus group discussions were held with homogenous groups of children, employers, labour representatives, savings and credit group members, PFCs, CWGs, Social Monitors, Action Programme Coordinators (APCs), NGO Executive Directors and the Sector Coordinators.

A family game called Jenga was used to help facilitate the focus group discussions with the children and with some of the other groups. This helped the participants to relax and also facilitated all of the participants to contribute to each part of the discussion.

In order to make the maximum use of the limited time available for the field visits, formal group meetings were prepared in advance by the implementing partners and the project. On each occasion the consultant made discrete enquiries about the process and criteria used to select the participants for these interactions. In addition, opportunities were taken to make

[4] Mr. Keith Jeddere-Fisher

[5] These self-evaluations are part of the established ILO-IPEC procedures for evaluation at the Action Programme level.

short unplanned visits and to talk informally with children and adults within the working areas.

Observations were made throughout the field visits, and specific site visits were made to non-formal education (NFE) centres, young sibling centres, pre-vocational training classes, credit beneficiaries, health centres, street dramas, factories and production areas and government schools.

At the beginning of every interaction, an introduction was given, explaining the purposes of the evaluation and emphasising the learning objectives. In most situations it was possible to develop a good open environment where challenges as well as achievements were acknowledged. In virtually every meeting at least one member of the project staff was present in addition to the consultant. This was necessary in order to provide introductions and at times interpretation. This may have limited the frankness of the discussion to some degree, but had the important benefit of the staff hearing for themselves the comments and experiences of those involved.

Two stakeholder workshops were held. One was for half a day with stakeholders involved with child domestic workers (CDWs) in Dhaka, which was predominantly an information collection exercise in order to get an overview of the work with CDWs. Generally the interactions with homogenous groups were more effective forums for learning.

The second stakeholder workshop was for two days at the end of the country visit and was attended by national and local stakeholders. The children and their parents were not represented at this interaction, although their views and comments were presented. Due to international security concerns at the time of the workshop, it was not possible for any representatives of the donor to be present. The consultant made presentations on the project's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats as he saw them. There was discussion in order to obtain consensus on these main points and then intensive small group discussion on eight issues that had been identified as critical to the future success of the project. Many of the recommendations and points made in the resulting presentations and discussions have been incorporated within this report. The workshop concluded with a summary of the project's potential good practices and some recommendations for the future.

A full list of individuals, groups and organisations consulted during the evaluation mission is given in Appendix 3.

It was not possible to visit all of the sectors in all of the geographical regions. There were interactions with children from all five sectors, and visits were made to the workplaces of all sectors except for the match factories. However, conclusions have been drawn based on those locations visited and the stakeholders met. There are significant differences between the sectors and between locations, and some of the points made and conclusions drawn may not be valid in all situations. Generally, different analyses have been made for the CDW sector compared with the other four sectors.

A draft of this report was circulated to USDOL, ILO and the Project, and consolidated comments received from them have been incorporated in this final version[6].

[6] As part of the consultative process to prepare consolidated comments, several comments and suggestions related to follow up has been exchanged between stakeholders and will serve as the basis for adjustment of project strategy.

3. Presentation of main findings

3.1 Project design and relevance

3.1.1 Problem and need identification

The project document gives a thorough description of the socio-economic, cultural and political background in Bangladesh. There is a detailed analysis of the problems and causes of child labour in Bangladesh and additional details are given concerning the five sectors that the project is designed to address. There are many other sectors of 'worst forms of child labour' (WFCL), (the Eradication of Hazardous Child Labour in Bangladesh Project, a US-AID funded MOLE implemented project, lists 16 sectors in the metropolitan areas of Dhaka and Chittagong), and some other organisations have different definitions of 'hazardous child labour'. For example UNICEF includes CDWs who are living with their families in this category. The USDOL-funded WFCL programme only works with those CDWs who are living apart from their families, as this increases their vulnerability as they often have no contact with anybody except their employer. The project document does not provide any justification for the selection of the five sectors chosen. Discussions with NSC members suggest that the selection was an interactive process between them, ILO and USDOL. There is agreement that the sectors chosen were appropriate. The geographical areas are also clearly defined.

One of the sectors selected is male dominated (leather) while another is female dominated (CDW). The other three sectors have a mix of boys and girls working in them. The only location where the tribal communities are involved is in the match industry in Chittagong. This is due to sectoral and geographical selection and not due to any discrimination.

The baseline survey was a 100% census, and with the subsequent physical identification of the children by the implementing partners, there was a robust process for the identification of vulnerable and hidden groups. There was no evidence of any particular groups being overlooked or ignored.

Although all of the main issues are covered, the causes of child labour are only discussed briefly in the project document. The causes are clearly complex, and this issue is explored in more detail in section 4.1, where the link between savings and credit, income-generating activity (IGA) and withdrawal of child labour is discussed. If there is a better understanding of the causes of child labour, then it may be possible to design more specific interventions in order to address the issues.

3.1.2 Project formulation and logical structure

The project intervention is based on a very thorough and logical process designed to identify and withdraw all of the targeted 5-17 year old children from hazardous work and to prevent their younger siblings from entering such work. There are different strategies depending on the age, interest and ability of the children, with the objective that all of them will either enter formal education or be prepared for an appropriate vocation. An alternative strategy is designed for the CDWs of all ages, where the objective is to give them access to education, health, recreation and basic needs, through guardianship agreements with their employers, while continuing in work.

The approach with CDWs has similarities with the approach that UNICEF uses for children in all sectors, termed 'Earn and Learn'. UNICEF uses this because of the difficulty that children who have been working face when trying to return to or start formal education.

An unexpressed assumption in the WFCL project is that all of the 5-12 year olds and many of the 13-16 year olds who are mainstreamed into formal education will continue until the end of primary education. The ability of the GoB to provide adequate educational facilities to keep the interest of the children is identified in this evaluation as a major external threat, and this is discussed in detail in section 3.5.2.

Although it is not presented as a Logical Framework Matrix, the project document presents a logical sequence of activities leading to outputs leading to immediate objectives leading to a development objective[7]. There are also indicators identified for each of the objectives although no 'means of verification' as is customary with a logical framework. ILO/IPEC prepares the means of verification as part of the Project Monitoring Plan (PMP) at the beginning of the project. There is no analysis of assumptions and the risk associated with them, so that it appears that issues like the one above concerning the sustained mainstreaming of children in formal education have not been identified[8]. Although it is impossible to predict all of the threats, a thorough analysis of assumptions enables the project to act proactively to minimise the risk in some areas.

Lesson:

- **Assumptions and the associated risk should be identified during project preparation and the design or implementation modified as necessary.**

The initial listing of indicators in the project document is presented as tentative, and has been revised to provide a more realistic basis for regular reporting.

The project document includes a tentative project implementation schedule. This tentative timeline was broadly realistic. The baseline surveys took considerably longer than planned and this contributed to the delay in initiating the action programmes. The delay in project implementation was due mainly to institutional arrangements at the project management-level and these are discussed in detail in section 3.2.0.

Due to these delays at the beginning of the project, the project workplan has been revised on two occasions, once around January 2001 and once in January 2002. The latter is the one which is currently used for reporting purposes, and it is clearly identified in the reports as being revised at that date.

[7] While the project document has all elements of a logical framework, at the time of project design structured design matrixes were not used throughout ILO/IPEC. Such matrixes are now consistently used in ILO/IPEC project documents.

[8] The PMP does cover the assessment of assumptions and external factors, including identification of ways to monitor these.

3.1.3 Institutional arrangements

Sector Project Task Force (SPTF)/Sub-committee of the NSC on IPEC

The project document proposed that a SPTF be formed under the chairmanship of ILO to be the central project advisory committee reporting to the NSC on IPEC. However the NSC revised these arrangements at the first meeting in December 2000, replacing the SPTF with the Sub-committee of the NSC under the chairmanship of the Joint Secretary, MOLE. This revision was made in order to bring the management structure in line with the agreement between the GoB and the ILO.

The Sub-committee of the NSC is an effective body for the representation of different national level stakeholders including employers and workers. The industries that the project is working in are not specifically represented by either the employers or workers. At times the Sub-committee has not been an efficient mechanism for project management decision making. Individual influence has been used to direct some decisions and certain key decisions have been held-up, waiting for the sub-committee to convene and while the sub-committee considers details.

Sector Project Implementation Committees (SPIC)

The project document proposed that SPICs would be established on a district basis in each area that the project is active in. They were to have representation from the district level administration and government agencies, employers, workers and civil society.

The necessary arrangements for the establishment of the SPICs were agreed at the April 2002 NSC Sub-committee meeting and again in July, but the MOLE has not yet sent the necessary instructions to the district administration. There are now doubts expressed by all parties over the effectiveness of a committee at this level. Programme Facilitating Committees (PFCs) and Community Watch Groups (CWGs) have been developed at a more local level, and these may be more appropriate bodies for cooperation and monitoring among the implementing partners.

Workers representation

There is no description in the project document of the capacity and commitment of the labour representatives.

As mentioned in the section on the Sub-committee of the NSC, the trade union federations represented on the Sub-committee do not have any direct links with the industries that this project is working with. At the local level there are no trade unions for CDWs, and they are not apparent in the construction (brick and stone breaking) sector. In the bidi sector there are the Bidi Shramik Union and the Bidi Majdur Union. However they do not have links with any central federations and all the other stakeholders say that the activities of these union representatives are those of labour recruiters, not labour representatives.

Six trade unions put in proposals for Action Programmes but to date none of these have been approved due to the difficulties mentioned above. One agreement for awareness raising within the leather industry is likely to be approved shortly. Some trade unions have felt excluded from the project and in response have refused to cooperate at the plant level.

The inability to find appropriate labour representatives to work with has been a constraint on the project implementation and this was not identified during the project preparation. This issue was discussed at the stakeholders' workshop and the national-level federation representatives made a commitment to address the issues of appropriate local-level representation in the bidi industry.

Recommendation:

- **The project needs to find ways of encouraging appropriate trade union representation at both the central and plant levels, and then to work with them for the achievement of mutual goals.**

3.1.4 Important changes in the external environment

The Government of Bangladesh ratified the ILO Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention No. 182 and its Recommendation 190 on the 18th December 2000. This was a very positive change in the working environment and the objective of some of the project's advocacy and awareness raising activities was achieved. The Project's immediate objectives remained valid.

National elections were held during September 2001 and there were regular disruptions during the six months leading up to these. 22 days were directly lost due to national strikes between January and June 2001, and the disruption extended beyond these specific days as meetings had to be cancelled and rearranged. This disruption occurred during the baseline survey. During this politically sensitive time, it was not possible for the NSC to meet.

In February 2002 the GoB announced that it would provide a stipend of Tk. 100 - 125 per family with primary school-going children. The status of implementation is not clear with some claims that it has been active since July 2002 but only for the 40% poorest families. This is likely to have a positive impact on withdrawing young children from hazardous work, but may increase the number of 13-16 year old children going into work as there is no stipend for them. There may also be a sudden increased burden on primary schools.

3.1.5 Significant changes in project design during implementation

At the very beginning of the project the change in management structure incorporating the NSC Sub-committee has been described in section 3.1.3.

The most significant change from the design is the 13-month project extension and target revision. The extension was required due to extensive delays at the beginning of the project. The reasons for the delays are reviewed in section 3.2.0. Given the delays, it became essential to extend the project so that the Action Programmes could operate for the planned period in order to deliver the planned outputs and achieve the expected impact. This extension involved some transfer within budget lines (keeping programme budget lines intact), but did not require any overall change to the budget.

Agreements with the partners were signed in November and December 2001 for Action Programmes that would be completed in May 2004, while the agreement between ILO and

USDOL still had a project completion date of September 2003. It was identified in the technical Report No 3 in June 2001 that an extension to the project of at least 6 months would be required in order to give sufficient time for the Action Programmes to carry out their activities. It was also acknowledged in this report that this extension would be necessary prior to the processing of the Action Programme agreements.

After a number of requests from the donor (January/February 2002, July/August 2002 and October 2002) the formal project revision form was submitted in November 2002 and revision was approved in December 2002 for a revised project completion date of 30.09.2004. While for a period of 13 months ILO had signed commitments with the partners that were beyond the commitment of the donor, USDOL, there has been no on-going effect on project implementation.

Lesson:

- **If delays to project start-up means that action programmes will need to continue beyond the planned project completion date, then requests for an extension should be made to the donor immediately so that agreements with implementing partners are within the agreed project timeframe.**

In the same project revision, changes were made to some of the targets based on the results of the baseline surveys and physical verification by the partners. A significant reduction was made to the number of young siblings who will be prevented from child labour, from 15,000 to 6,021. The initial target figure was based on approximately half of the withdrawal target and was not a calculated estimate based on any demographic data. It is appropriate to change this target in response to the actual situation.

The other revisions to the target were marginal (3-6%) increases in the number of working children to be withdrawn and the number of families benefiting from services. Again these revisions were made based on the actual figures found during the physical identification of children and families. Given the small scale of these changes it would be more appropriate to explain the variation from the target rather than to revise the figure.

A number of appropriate changes have been made to the implementation process based on the reality in the field. These include:

- During the physical identification of children working in the bidi industry, it was found that many of them combine this work with attending formal school. This situation had not been anticipated and the implementing partners initiated additional activities including after school coaching, recreational activities and physical education in order to provide the children with a productive and stimulating alternative to working.
- An additional intervention has been prepared for the 15-17 year olds who are going to receive vocational training. Prior to this training (and due to commence in June 2003), they will be able to attend a two month non-formal education to develop literacy and numeracy skills.

3.1.6 Omissions from the design

The project document gives a summary of the current legal framework related to child labour issues in Bangladesh, and notes it's lack of effectiveness for a number of reasons; "They include the absence of uniform minimum age provisions and insufficient penal provisions in the laws; lack of awareness about the laws and their enactment; and inadequate training, manpower and resources of the Inspectorates." The programme approach and strategy does not take up any of these issues, and there are no activities designed to either strengthen the law or the application of the law.

Lesson:
- **IPEC project designs should consider the need to support the government in the enactment of appropriate child labour legislation and/or the application of these laws.**

3.2 <u>Achievement of immediate objectives</u>

3.2.0 Preparatory outputs

All of the preparatory outputs have been completed and the project activities are running effectively. However there have been serious delays with agreements being signed with implementing partners in November and December 2001 against a target date of mid February 2001, a delay of nine months The reasons and consequences for these delays, and the lessons that can be learned from them are reviewed below.

The project was planned to commence on 1.09.2000 but the Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) took up his position on 1.10.2000. Only preliminary activities could be carried out until the management structure was re-negotiated as has been described in section 3.1.3. Agreement was made at the NSC meeting on 19.12.2000 and the formal project revision was submitted on 31.01.01.

The first meetings of the NSC Sub-committee were held on 15.04.2001 and 16.05.2001 when contracts for the baseline surveys were approved and criteria for short-listing potential implementing partners and for considering action programme proposals were approved. During the time waiting for these meetings preparations were made for the subsequent activities which reduced the negative consequences on the overall timeframe.

The preparation of action plan proposals was managed very efficiently as the following sequence of events demonstrate:

- ➔ 16.05.2001: Approval of criteria for shortlisting partners and selecting action programme proposals
- ➔ 18 .05.2001: Invitation published for interested organisations to submit applications to work as implementing partners by 31.05.2001
- ➔ 8/9.06.2001: 40 short-listed partners attend Action Programme Proposal workshop
- ➔ 30.06.2001: 39 Action Programme proposals submitted
- ➔ 11.07.2001: 25 NGOs selected by the NSC Sub-committee as implementing partners

Baseline surveys were commenced in April 2001 and the last one completed in August 2001 (scheduled start and completion dates were 1.10.2000 and 30.11.2000 respectively). Many of the project activities are described in the project document as 'based on the results of the

baseline surveys ….'. Until these were completed progress on other activities was constrained although partner selection and proposal preparation was started based on estimated figures. When the baseline figures were available partners were able to revise their proposals.

National elections were held during September 2001 and there were regular disruptions during the six months leading up to these. 22 days were directly lost due to national strikes between January and June 2001, and the disruption extended beyond these specific days as meetings had to be cancelled and rearranged. During this politically sensitive time, it was not possible for the NSC to meet.

The 24 implementing partners were agreed at the NSC Sub-committee meeting on 11.07.2001 (scheduled date 7.02.2001, a delay of 5 months) and formally approved by the NSC on 27.09.2001 (scheduled date 15.02.2001, a delay of 7 months) after the MOLE had requested a joint ILO/MOLE field verification exercise.

The proposals were sent to ILO/IPEC on 24.10.2001 and 12.11.2001 after some delays, due to a failure in the computerised ILO Financial Management System in Dhaka, for technical and financial clearance. Formal agreements were signed with the partners on 15.11.2001 and 1.12.2001 (scheduled date 16.02.2001, a delay of 9 months).

The reasons for the overall delay of 9 months can be summarised as follows:

- Assignment of CTA	1 month from project start
- Reformulation of management structure	5 months from project start
- First NSC Sub-committee meeting	8 months from project start
- Implementation of baseline surveys	3 months longer than planned
- NSC Sub-committee agreement of partners	5 months later than planned
- National elections	22 days of strikes
- NSC formal approval of implementing partners	2 months longer than planned
- Problems with Financial Management system	1 month - not planned
- Technical and financial approval by ILO/IPEC	1 month - not planned

Lessons from delays in project start-up:

- **Project management structure needs to be compatible with existing agreements within the country**
- **Realistic time should be allowed for appraisal and approval of project decisions and agreements by the government and by IPEC**
- **Necessary to have an efficient system for approval of major project implementation decisions**

3.2.1 Immediate Objective 1:

At the end of the project, a strong foundation for the systematic prevention and elimination of worst forms of child labour in the selected sectors and regions will have been prepared through increased research and documentation.

Baseline survey

10 baseline surveys have been conducted covering all 5 sectors in 8 geographical areas. The 2 surveys on CDWs were used solely to identify the children to be included in the project. The other 8 surveys have had reports prepared and are available as a reference on the 4 sectors covered. These surveys were used to design the Action Programme interventions and formed the basis of the database that is used to identify and track the progress of the working children and their families.

The surveys were started later than planned and took longer to complete as discussed in the previous section.

Project database

A database has been developed that can retrieve a profile on each child (family information, child education, working conditions, health, socio-economic condition etc.) and also monitors other project outputs and activities. The initial data in the database is based on the information collected during the baseline surveys and modified during the physical identification of the children and their families by the partner organisations. The database is expected to provide information for both project monitoring and the longer-term assessment of impact by tracking the children and their status in the areas of work, health, education and training.

Training has been provided to each partner on how to maintain and update the database, and this process has been started since mid-December 2002. There is currently a large backlog of information to enter, as all of the project outputs and changes to the children and their families need to be recorded.

Due to the backlog of data to be entered, the database is not currently providing the information for the six monthly reporting. As data needs to be entered individually for each child and their family, it is possible that the database will never be current enough to form the basis of up-to-date project reporting.

The subjects covered by the database-monitoring system include:

- Child Labour Profile with information on the child, their photo, their family, address, education, work status, height and weight, partner interventions
- Skill Development with information on trainings available and conducted, names of trainers and participants
- Economic Empowerment with information on IGA groups and their members and loan disbursements
- Workplace Monitoring with information about PFCs; their members, meetings and key decisions, and the workplaces they have visited.

Potential good practice:

- **The child tracking part of the database means that each child is treated by the project as an individual, not as a statistic. If specific children drop out, they cannot be replaced by a different anonymous child. This is a very effective system for current monitoring of the children and as a tool for longer-term impact assessment.**

Database maintenance and sustainability

It is the responsibility of each partner organisation to update the database for their children and working area. As this process has only started in December there is still a large amount of work to do. APCs recognise the challenge, but believe that the child tracking system is essential and that they will be able to maintain the database once the backlog has been caught up.

It is too early to judge whether the database is too extensive for the partners to maintain, even now with the support of the project. At the end of the project period the PFCs and CWGs are expected to maintain the database and that the information will be available as the basis of any long-term impact assessments. It is possible that individual partners would maintain their database, or parts of it, but there would be no linking mechanism.

Coordination between project databases

The MOLE is uncertain about what they will do with the database at the end of the project. There is some talk of transferring the data to them at the end of the project but if that is what is required, then support and capacity building will be required first. There is also a lack of clarity whether it would be useful if the databases of the different projects had a common framework so that data could be transferred between them.

Data protection and privacy

Each implementing partner has a copy of their part of the database and the central office has the data from all of the partners. There is a password protection system in order to control unauthorised access, but this is understood by some of the partners as a means of protecting the database from damage rather than from misuse. The PFCs and CWGs can have access to the database in the partners' office, and there is some discussion that it may be useful if they take over the database at the end of the project for ongoing monitoring. There is a lot of personal data kept on the database, including photos of the children, and the issues of privacy and child protection do not seem to have been considered carefully. This is an issue that must apply to other child labour projects with computerised databases. The consultant is not qualified to give any recommendations on this matter beyond identifying the need to develop a policy and code of practice concerning the electronic storage of children's personal data.

Recommendation: Within three months a review of the database is carried out by project staff, implementing partners, MOLE and other projects, and a child labour monitoring expert, covering the following areas:

- **Clarify what the specific objectives of the database are**
- **Review the data fields in relation to the specific objectives**
- **Identify and discuss alternative systems including sampling systems**
- **Review the feasibility of partners maintaining it during the project period**
- **Discuss the longer term needs of MOLE**
- **Discuss issues of compatibility between databases of different projects**
- **Discuss the rights of the children and their families to privacy and develop working practices so that this can be safeguarded.**

Impact assessment surveys and research on project experience

The project document proposes that impact assessment surveys are carried out at the end of the second and third years and that research will be carried out on specific project experiences towards the end of the project. No work has been done on these activities yet and the project management believes that the current extensive monitoring system is collecting sufficient data to feed into the planned research, and there is no need to carry out any separate impact assessments at this stage. This view is justified in the context of the data being regularly produced by the project and the stage of project implementation.

Coordination among child labour projects

The Joint Child Labour Working Group (JCLWG)

The JCLWG was formed with ILO involvement in 1999 in response to a felt need for broader cooperation, information sharing and joint advocacy initiatives in order to tackle the problem of harmful child labour in Bangladesh. Their goal was to:
Achieve greater programme synergies through systematic sharing of information and lessons learnt from the various activities of the group members, as well as planning joint research agendas, policies and strategic plans.

The USDOL-funded WFCL programme has attended in order to provide a briefing on the National Child Labour Survey but there are strong requests from some of the participants in the JCLWG for the project to attend these meetings regularly so that its experiences can be shared more widely. There is some confusion concerning the formality of this group and whether ILO should only have one formal representative, or whether ILO projects can be represented individually. It is clear from the goal statement that this is a forum for sharing information and informal cooperation as well as possibly leading to formal cooperation.

Recommendation:
- **The project should regularly participate in the JCLWG for information sharing and cooperation with other like-minded projects and organisations**

Coordination Meeting of Child Labour Projects in Bangladesh

The MOLE has instigated a series of coordination meetings since about April 2002 in order to discuss progress and avoid duplication in project activities. The UNICEF, USAID and ILO supported projects participate, including the USDOL-funded WFCL programme. There has been useful discussion concerning sectors and geographical areas that each project should be working in.

The USDOL-funded WFCL programme has also been able to share its experience and working methodology for baseline surveys and child tracking system with the other projects, especially the recently established USAID-funded MOLE-implemented Eradication of Hazardous Child Labour in Bangladesh Project.

One incident of overlapping partners, NFE schools and children was identified and the USDOL-funded WFCL programme acted swiftly to correct the situation.

3.2.2 Immediate Objective 2:

At the end of the project, the worst forms of child labour in the selected sectors and regions will have been substantially reduced through the direct action programs aimed at the withdrawal, social protection and rehabilitation of at least 30,000 children in a time-bound and systematic manner.

Quantitative outputs and impacts

A summary of the achievements against targets of each of the Action Programmes, and summarised for each sector, for a selected number of indicators as of 28.02.2003 is in Appendix 2. This table is based on a draft of the data supplied by the project in the Technical report No. 10 highlighting the most significant achievements and adding some additional analysis.

Based on the data in appendix 2 and other project reports, the achievements against targets for each of the indicators for this output have been summarised for each sector in the table below.

When reviewing the progress against targets, four important points need to be noted.

1. The targets are set against the physical identification of children and families by the implementing partners. A 100% achievement would mean that the partners are still in contact with every child labourer identified at the beginning and that each one has stopped working in hazardous work. This is an ideal which cannot be achieved and the project does not define what level of achievement would be described as successful. Reasons for not being able to achieve this ideal include; some families, especially in the construction sector have a seasonal livelihood strategy which takes them away from the project interventions, there have been instances of forced evictions of families from their slums, and some CDWs are kept at home by their own families when they return for holidays or they may get married. The challenge of the movement of child workers into and out of the projects working areas is discussed in section 4.2.
2. The definition that the project uses for withdrawal from hazardous labour is that the child is completely removed from the hazardous workplace. For CDWs it is when the employer agrees to take responsibility for the child as a guardian which includes agreeing to provide certain facilities such as access to education and health services.
3. In the design of the project it is expected that some of the targets will be fulfilled early in the intervention, while others will only be completed towards the end. Often the children are involved in the earlier stages of the process, attending NFE classes and other activities, while still being involved in hazardous work. For this reason it is necessary to see the number of children who are in the process of being withdrawn from hazardous work, as well as those who have already been completely withdrawn.
4. The detailed project reports provide data that is dis-aggregated by gender. For simplicity of presentation most of the summary tables presented here are aggregated. The dis-aggregated data has been reviewed and gender inequalities are related to the working sector. The leather sector is 100% boys, the CDW sector is 80% girls and the other sectors are roughly balanced. As the CDW sector contains 5,250 children, compared to the leather sector with only 447, there is a slight majority of girls benefiting from each of the project interventions.

Indicator	Bidi	Con-struction	Leather	Match	CDWs	Total
Children supplied with NFE	11,993	1,310	102	786	5,000	19,191
Percentage of target	95%	86%	64%	69%	95%	93%
Children supplied with counselling/health/ referral services	22,489	1,838	0	1,248	4,600	30,175
Percentage of target	82%	81%	0%	83%	88%	82%
School-going children receiving coaching or PE	4,745	68	-	-	-	4,813
Percentage of target	74%	100%	-	-	-	73%
Children mainstreamed to formal education	6,508	540	0	206	51	7,305
Percentage of target	75%	40%	0%	29%	2%	54%
Families benefiting from credit or IGA	5,497	575	-	478	-	6,550
Percentage of target	40%	46%	-	55%	-	41%
Children supplied with prevocational or vocational training	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percentage of target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Children withdrawn from hazardous work	7,565	699	0	209	-	8,826
Percentage of target	34%	40%	0%	18%	-	29%
CDWs with safer working conditions	-	-	-	-	353	353
Percentage of target	-	-	-	-	7%	7%

- means that there is no target in that sector

From the information in this table a number of points can be drawn:

- In the leather sector, where there is only one partner working, progress has been slow due to difficulties in relationships with, and cooperation from, employers and unions. Progress is expected to improve.
- The number of children receiving NFE and counselling/health/referral services is already high and it is expected that the number of children receiving health services will rise.
- The number of school-going children receiving coaching is lower than planned. It is unlikely that this will increase substantially.
- The number of children already mainstreamed to formal education is higher than expected at this stage and it is likely that this target will be achieved in all sectors except for leather and CDWs. In the leather industry most of the children are living away from their families and this makes it very unlikely for them to give up all kinds of work and attend formal school. For CDWs, it requires their employer to provide the necessary financial support and to release them for school hours and this is not easily compatible with their objective of employing them
- The large number of children being mainstreamed into a limited number of formal schools is a serious threat to the sustainability of this achievement and is considered in detail in section 3.5.2

- Although savings and credit groups have been formed as expected, progress in disbursing loans has been slower than planned due to difficulties in identifying suitable IGA opportunities and delays caused by the partner organisations in providing their contribution of micro-credit capital. Credit provision will increase over the rest of the project but this target may not be achieved fully. All of the recipients of credit have so far been women, as they are usually the participants in the parents groups. In some instances the credit is used by the husband.
- The pre-vocational training has been postponed because the project wanted to allow as many of the 13-14 year olds to be mainstreamed into formal schools as possible. Now the remaining 13-14 year olds will receive pre-vocational training and following this the vocational training will be run. The vocational training was planned for 2003
- The number of children already removed from hazardous work is more than expected at this stage, and with the number of children and families involved in the 'process activities', it is expected that at least 90% of the target will be achieved. Removing children from hazardous labour occurs when a number of simultaneous processes reach a successful conclusion; the child is enjoying NFE or formal education, the child's parents want their children to stop working, and the parents have sufficient income
- It is a large social and financial responsibility for the employers of CDWs to take on the responsibility of guardianship. The partners working with CDWs have expressed that the target for guardianship is higher than can be achieved. Although there are some employers who are willing to do this, and appreciate that the quality of the work of their CDW has improved, the achievement of this target will be low, possibly in the region of 50%. Despite this there will be significant improvements in the quality of life of the CDWs, as for example, 95% of them are participating in NFE and through this will have obtained information about their fundamental rights.

<u>Qualitative outputs and impacts</u>

During interactions with children there were many different expressions of how they felt that the project had affected them. They included:

- *I am able to play and receive education*
- *I receive medical attention*
- *We talk to each other and do story telling*
- *Our parents are getting loans*
- *We receive education materials*
- *I receive education about personal hygiene*
- *I know about cleaning my nails weekly*
- *We have sports equipment and we learn to paint*
- *I am able to read*
- *We are trained in music and dancing and I have learnt to act*
- *We have a teacher*
- *I have a realisation of what is good and bad*
- *Previously I was an unknown person. Now I go to school and people know me and I am proud of it.*

Some points that are more qualitative in nature have been clearly identified by a number of stakeholders on different occasions. Although it was not possible to verify these independently, they do at least show some important perceptions about the impact of the project, and they do not contradict any of the other findings. They include:

- Children are going to school instead of the (bidi) factory
- Parents, especially mothers, are taking more responsibility for their children's education and future
- Improvements in children's personal hygiene
- Mothers are more active outside of their homes
- Diet and nutrition has changed in many families, with increased vegetable consumption and an increase in the protein intake of children.

Potential good practices for the withdrawal of children from hazardous labour:

- **There is a clear methodical process for the withdrawal of children from hazardous labour, that has interventions aimed at education, awareness development and economic empowerment, and has a variety of strategies aimed at children of different ages and interests.**
- **The concept of employers taking on the responsibility for guardianship of their CDWs is, despite its challenges, a very good model for sustainably improving the quality of the living and working conditions of CDWs**

3.2.3 Immediate Objective 3:

At the end of the project, at least 15,000 younger siblings will have been prevented from entering the worst forms of child labour through economic empowerment of parents and the introduction of a continuous mechanism for workplace and community monitoring.

Young siblings

Based on the physical identification of children by the implementing partners, this target was revised to 6,021 in the November 2002 project revision, based on the physical identification of the children. Details of the achievement of indicators for this objective are given in the table below.

Indicator	Bidi	Con-struction	Leather	Match	CDWs	Total
Young siblings prevented from entering work	3,932	344	-	211	-	4,487
Percentage of target	76%	63%	-	63%	-	75%
Families benefiting from medial check-ups and health care	12,426	1,075	-	612	-	14,113
Percentage of target	90%	86%	-	71%	-	89%

As child workers in leather and CDW are separate from their families, there are no targets in these sectors.

There will be some increase in the numbers of young siblings being prevented from entering work by attending the pre-school and it is expected that achievement of this target will be in the region of 90%.

When the project finishes in 2004, these pre-schools are unlikely to be continued. At that time those children who are old enough and capable enough are likely to be enrolled in class 1

of a formal school. There will also be younger children for whom there will be no provision and there is a danger that these children will get involved in child labour.

Child labour free workplaces

There have been reports of employers declaring their work places 'child labour free' in response to the community awareness raising and motivational activities of the implementing partners. However it has since been acknowledged by the project that some of these declarations were premature, and that it was more appropriate to promote this after the PFCs have become well established. It is not possible to report on the number of child labour free workplaces there are, but there is certainly a social and political interest to achieve this.

Programme Facilitating Committees and Community Watch Groups

23 out of a target of 30 PFCs and 19 out of 20 CWGs have been formed. These are committees led by the Union Parishad Chairperson, involving local government authorities, employers, worker's representatives and local elites. They are to meet quarterly in order to pass resolutions on community action, sign agreements with employers for child labour free factories and to prepare long-term plans of action to combat child labour. In the project design these are the community organisations that should sustain and continue the impact of the project. All of the committees should have been formed by now and it is unlikely that many more will be formed. Where they have not yet been formed, it is usually due to a lack of cooperation between employers, worker's representatives and the implementing partner.

The quality of these committees varies tremendously depending on the interest and commitment of those involved. A number of generic points can be made, although there are individual committees which are different.

- The PFC/CWGs do give legitimacy and influence to the implementing partner, and draws local elites onto an anti-child labour platform. PFC/CWG members are encouraged to make speeches at inaugurations and special day observances
- The Union Parishad Chairperson, and therefore the chairperson of the committee often has no personal interest in child labour issues
- If the child labour families are migrant workers (construction), or the children's parents are not living in the same constituency (leather and CDW), the chairperson often has no political interest in their well-being
- If there has been a change in power in central government (as has occurred recently), then local leaders may lose influence and interest in their role and be absent until local elections have been held
- Local political leaders are often large employers and therefore have a conflict of interest
- Most of the PFCs visited expressed a feeling of dependency on the project, looking to the project to sustain them. As one Action Programme Coordinator put it: "*We are still trying to make the PFC effective. They are not yet trying to make our programme effective. Through the PFC we are trying to make sure that people do not play a negative role*"
- Partners held conflicting views on whether it is necessary for the Union Chairperson to be involved. The advantage is that they automatically bring the committee into the permanent local government mechanism. The disadvantage is the lack of commitment and interest identified above.
- From interviews with members of these committees, the CWGs generally appear to have a greater interest in the welfare of the children and show a stronger commitment to

monitoring project achievements and even continuing some of the activities. CWG members are not commercially linked with the children and are less active in party politics. They are more likely to be socially concerned members of the community.

These findings on the status of the PFCs and CWGs were presented to the stakeholders' workshop and time was spent discussing what mechanisms and institutions are appropriate to sustain and further the project impacts.

There were a number of useful suggestions concerning the PFC and these included:

- Having a 2-tier system with a Child Labour Elimination Committee at the community level where there would be greater involvement of parents and children and increased ownership. This would be supported by the PFC
- The name of the PFC should be changed so that it is seen as independent from and more permanent than the project
- There was discussion on the leadership, with some arguments for a committed owner or labour representative taking the chairperson's role, while others felt that without the legislative authority of the Union Chairperson, it would be impossible to sustain.

The discussion on the CWGs was able to reach the following consensus:

- The CWG should be community or area-based instead of Ward-based. The groups would be formed considering the number of CDWs being assisted and that there should be separate groups for housing societies and colonies.
- Suggestions were made for the membership of the committee and that the chairperson can be any respected member of the community
- The Ward Commissioner should be an advisor
- Suggestions were also made for the role and activities of the CWG.

Recommendations concerning PFCs and CWGs:

- **PFCs: Further discussions should be facilitated between locally elected representatives, employers, labour representatives, parents and implementing partners in order to develop a functional institution that can sustain the withdrawal of child labour at a local level. This institution does not need to have the same form in every location.**
- **CWGs: The proposal presented at the stakeholders' workshop should be discussed with all of the CDW partners and the existing CWGs, and changes made/additional committees formed as they think best.**
- **For both institutions it is important that the local representatives make the decisions, as it is their institution which is expected to continue beyond the life of the project.**

3.2.4 Immediate Objective 4:

At the end of the project, instances of commitment made and action taken against the worst forms of child labour by the government, social partners, families, communities and the general public, jointly and separately, will have been increased through advocacy and awareness raising.

Advocacy and awareness raising at the national-level

One of the aims of the project was to help build consensus concerning ILO Convention 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour and to generate support for its ratification. The Government of Bangladesh ratified it in December 2000 before the project could contribute. There has then been no awareness raising activities carried out by the project at the national level until now. There are currently preparations for the Bangladesh Shishu Adhikar Forum (BSAF) to implement an Action Programme with this objective. Until December 2002 BSAF had been implementing an Action Programme with the ILO country office.

There is a lack of clarity amongst politicians, government officers and the public over what is meant by 'worst forms of child labour' and there would appear to be opportunities to implement programmes in response to this.

Recommendation concerning awareness raising at the national level:

- **The project should look for opportunities, either alone or in collaboration with other organisations and projects, to raise the awareness about the worst forms of child labour**

Advocacy and awareness raising at the local-level

This has until now been carried out by the implementing partners. Awareness raising has been carried out very effectively using a wide variety of media including; inauguration ceremonies, observance of special days, posters, leaflets, calendars, billboards, street dramas involving children, video shows, newspaper reports, individual household meetings and parents coordination meetings. These have had an influence on the communities where the partners are working, with a significant understanding developed about the harmful effects of child labour in the relevant sector and many parents are positive about sending their children to school.

These activities are contributing to a social and political culture, which is against the use of child labour. This is especially noticeable in an area like Rangpur where a number of implementing partners are working in a limited area.

Labour federations have also been invited to submit action plans for awareness raising at the local level and a number have been prepared. However most of these federations have not been able to demonstrate their local representation in the localities and sectors that the project is working in. A proposal to work in the leather sector is likely to be approved shortly.

Potential good practice in awareness raising:

- **Implementing partners have carried out effective local awareness raising campaigns using a wide variety of media, and this has had an influence on the total community.**

3.2.5 Immediate Objective 5:

At the end of the project, the capacity of government, in particular the MOLE, in addressing the worst forms of child labour countrywide will have been increased through the strengthened institutional capability and updated national statistics on the child labour situation.

National Child Labour Survey

Discussions over the proposed National Child labour Survey were initiated with the Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS) within the first three months of the project. At the beginning of 2001 the BBS were busy conducting the National Census. A meeting was held with the Secretary of Statistics' Division, Ministry of Planning in April 2001 and there was an expectation that technical and administrative arrangements could be completed in order to initiate the survey by July 2001. There were bureaucratic difficulties from the GoB side with signing the agreement, and this was compounded by the relevant Secretary being changed three times in a three-month period. There was little progress from October 2001 until March 2002 apart from some negotiations on the wording of the agreement which was signed in June 2002. IPEC's Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour (SIMPOC) has been an important partner in this process providing guidelines and advice and making regular field visits.

The survey is now under way with a planned completion date of June 2003 although that is likely to slip. The fieldwork for the Establishment Survey and Household Survey are complete and the Baseline Surveys are due to be started imminently in five sectors.

The National Child Labour Policy is currently under preparation and unless this is severely delayed it seems unlikely that the results of the Survey will be able to contribute.

The Technical Committee has had negotiations on the selection of the sectors for the baseline surveys. The controversial issue has been over whether to include sex-workers or not. The BBS has declined to include this citing technical limitations although the difficulty is more to do with the political dangers of a culturally sensitive issue. The Technical Committee members did not request their organisations to make submissions at the ministerial level and the sex-worker sector has been excluded.

The BBS are appreciative of the technical support and rapid response that is available because this survey is being conducted through the WFCL project. They feel that the communication is easier with this arrangement.

Capacity building of MOLE

The ILO country office has been assisting the MOLE with the National Child Labour Policy, an initiative that has developed following the ratification of ILO Convention 182. Apart from

coordination with and support for the USAID/MOLE Elimination of Hazardous Child Labour in Bangladesh Project, WFCL has not been active in capacity building of MOLE.

There are now opportunities through this project for ILO to provide ongoing support to the preparation of the National Child Labour Policy and MOLE has recently made some requests for technical and material assistance.

Recommendation concerning capacity building of MOLE:

- **The project should provide technical assistance to the MOLE in finalising the draft Child Labour Policy.**

3.3 Additional outputs and impacts

3.3.1 NGO capacity development

The NGO sector in Bangladesh is very well developed with many capable NGOs committed to poverty eradication and other similar social objectives. However, when the project was established, none of the NGOs working currently with the project had an understanding of, or concern for child labour. Part of the project implementation process has been the provision of training on child labour issues, proposal writing, project management, financial control and database management to key NGO staff. This training has been provided centrally and followed up at the field sites.

The project has been conducted through and with the assistance of 24 implementing partners (the partners had to contribute a minimum of 10% of the cost of the action programme), all of them established NGOs. These NGO have built up knowledge, skills, and experience in the elimination of hazardous child labour and there is now a pool of professionals and organisations that are able to work effectively in child labour issues. Where a number of NGOs have been working in close proximity due to the density of child labourers in an area, there have been positive experiences of cooperation, sharing experiences and resources.

It is harder to assess whether this knowledge about child labour issues has become a belief that children should be removed and protected from hazardous child labour. If this has been established then there is potential for these NGOs to incorporate child labour issues into their other social development work.

The established NGOs in Bangladesh, including many of those that have been partners in this project, are institutions with a long-term presence and mandate, and some of which have a high degree of self-financing capability. By working through these institutions, and by selecting wherever possible an NGO that was already active in that locality, there is now in each project location, a capable NGO that may be interested in maintaining the project initiated saving and credit schemes and more importantly in providing ongoing support and encouragement to the PFCs and CWGs.

Potential good practices with implementing partners:

- **By working through NGO partners, knowledge and skills for the elimination of the hazardous child labour have been developed. Commitment to this goal may also have been developed.**
- **By selecting locally established NGOs, there are now long-term institutions that may be willing to provide ongoing monitoring and support to the children, families and PFC/CWGs**

Recommendations relating to implementing partners:

- **Partner NGOs should be encouraged to incorporate hazardous child labour issues into their social mandate.**
- **Partner NGOs should be encouraged to provide ongoing monitoring and support to the children, families and PFC/CWGs**

3.3.2 Overloading of formal primary schools

As a result of mainstreaming many child workers into formal primary school, there has been a negative impact on these schools. This is discussed in detail in 3.5.2 as it is a critical issue effecting the sustainability of project impact.

3.4 Efficiency of project implementation

When potential partner organisations were preparing proposals they were required to keep within prescribed budget limitations. For the different sectors the cost per child withdrawn from child labour was given to the NSC as follows:

Bidi	US$ 100-115
Construction	US$ 100-115
Match industry	US$ 100- 115
Leather tannery	US$ 79 – 85
CDW	US$ 56 – 60

The main difference between the sectors is due to there being no economic empowerment for families of leather workers and CDWs, as they live apart from their families.
The table in appendix 2 gives the budgeted cost per child for each partner based on the agreements made. The budgeted cost per child for each sector is as follows:

Bidi	US$ 107
Construction	US$ 133
Match industry	US$ 150
Leather tannery	US$ 132
CDW	US$ 74
Average for all children	US$ 105

There is some variation in the cost per child between partners due to:

- The total amount was set for the number of children based on the baseline survey information, whereas the number of children was later amended on the basis of physical identification but the budget was not changed.
- Some of the children and their families are much more dispersed than others
- Shoishab, working with the CDWs, runs an emergency hotline facility for all of the CDWs
- UDDIPAN is working in four separate match factories, and as well as the 232 children they plan to remove from hazardous work, they are also providing NFE and other assistance to an additional 228 who are working at home and are not classed as working in a hazardous environment

The Project reports that the initial budget range that was given to the NSC was known to be conservative. This was done purposefully in order to contain the costs in the partners proposals because previous per child costs under the ILO Country Programme had been considerably higher than this. When the action programmes were finalised between the projects and partners, more precise estimates were made based on the number of children identified by the baseline survey and the specific interventions that were planned.

There is no benchmark of what it costs to withdraw a child from hazardous labour in Bangladesh, so it is not possible to say if this is an efficient use of resources. As a comparison the USAID/MOLE project, working in a range of sectors in Dhaka and Chittagong metropolitan areas say that they have a cost of about US$ 90 per child, a cost lower but similar to the WFCL project. However the USAID/MOLE intervention only covers NFE and vocational training. The WFCL project also provides awareness raising, after school coaching and recreation, pre-vocational training, family health facilities, economic empowerment and significant day-care and medical facilities for young siblings (the average cost per child is calculated on the number of working children, and does not include their young siblings).

Another way of putting a value on withdrawing a child from labour and getting them into formal schooling is to calculate the size of the investment that the GoB is willing to give to families to motivate them to send their children to school. For a single child it is Tk. 100/month, which over the five years of primary school is Tk. 6,000 or US$ 102, the same as the average cost per child withdrawn from child labour by WFCL. Given that the WFCL project provides the additional benefits of health care, vocational training and economic empowerment for families, then the WFCL investment compares favourably.

3.5 Sustainability of project impacts

3.5.1 PFCs and CWGs

The project design envisaged that community-based organisations, consisting of employers, workers and families would become involved in monitoring the project activities and gradually shoulder the entire responsibility of sustaining the project impacts. The strengths and the weaknesses of the PFCs and CWGs have been discussed in detail in section 3.2.3. After approximately one year out of the two years of Action Programme implementation most of these institutions are very weak and are not functioning effectively. Some of the CWGs are

stronger and expressed a commitment to continue motivating employers to improve the working conditions of the CDWs and to release them to attend school and are also considering raising funds in order to continue the NFE classes in their area.

At this stage it is possible to review and revise these institutions so that they may more effectively fulfil their expected role of monitoring and controlling child labour in their locality. Some recommendations for this are given in section 3.2.3. Even if these institutions do begin to function effectively in the next year, they will almost certainly require some ongoing support and encouragement. This would be in the areas of clarifying roles and responsibilities, planning and facilitating links with other institutions. This support could be provided centrally or on a regional basis.

There have been shifts in social and cultural attitudes to hazardous child labour in the project areas, but there are also opposing forces. These include the need for income, benefits to employers of a cheap and flexible workforce and the role of labour organisers or middlemen who benefit from the exploitation of children. A critical momentum for positive change has not yet been established, and until there are a sufficient number of committed and qualified members of the community able to maintain this pressure, there is the threat that the gains achieved could be lost.

Recommendation for the support to PFCs and CWG:

- **The project should consider an area or central-based facility, for a limited period of time beyond the end of the project, to support and encourage the PFC/CWGs to fulfil their responsibilities (perhaps two years).**

3.5.2 Capacity of the formal schools

As a consequence of the success of the project of providing NFE to working children and then mainstreaming many of them into formal schools, some of the local schools have been swamped by children entering class one and two. This is not an issue where the number of children is small or where they are scattered, but where large numbers of children have been working in a small area, particularly the construction and match workers in Narayanganj and the bidi workers in Rangpur.

Mainstreaming into formal schools may occur at any time, but most children join at the beginning of the school year. The two main intakes during the project period are January 2003 and 2004. The mainstreaming that occurred in January 2003 has highlighted this issue, and it will occur again next year.

To illustrate the issue, the large Aliganj Primary School in Narayanganj, has 238 children in class 2 (said to be divided into 6 sections each with a teacher, although observation revealed about 80 children in each classroom) and 23 have been mainstreamed by the implementing partner. Next year the partner expects to mainstream 145 children into class 2. The headteacher thought that classroom space would be sufficient, but that they would be faced with difficulties over the teaching staff.

In rural locations many schools have a single teacher for each class. The number of primary schools in the Haragach, Rangpur area was assessed along with the number of children who

have been mainstreamed and will be mainstreamed next year. The situation is shown in the table below.

Partner	Location	No. of Gov. schools	Mainstreamed until February 2003	Plan for 2004*
SSS	Haragach	Total of 26 in Haragach Pourashava and Haragach Union	1712	842
SEPOC	Haragach		224	163
ESDO	Haragach		832	315
BRAC	Haragach		393	1201
Lighthouse	Tapodhan	8	792	350
CB	Mornia and Gajaghanta	11	1343	
BDSC	Haragach and Serai	11	484	233
Total		56	5,781	3,104

* Does not include entrance from younger siblings. Maximum potential siblings is 3,802

The average figure from this data is 100 children joining each school and in practice some are more and some less. Average class sizes are already 80 - 100 and there is one school (Sarai Munshipara Government Primary School) which now has 195 children in class 1, 99 of them mainstreamed from an implementing partner.

The government provides schoolbooks for free, but even when implementing partners have been willing to purchase them, it has not been possible to obtain the necessary numbers. Schools submit information on estimated numbers in September of the previous year, but the need for accommodation and teachers cannot be resolved in a short time.

The child workers who have been mainstreamed are used to an interactive class of 30 in the NFE school and there is a high risk that they will become disillusioned with their new school and drop out. Some mainstreamed children have already returned to their NFE class. Next year there will be no NFE class and the children may then return to their old workplace. There must also be a negative effect on the quality of education that students enrolled in the normal way experience.

This issue was discussed at the stakeholders' workshop where there was a representative of the Ministry of Primary and Mass Education (MPME) present. This discussion created a realisation of the challenge but did not generate any ideas for solutions.

Recommendation regarding school places for mainstreamed children:

- **The project urgently needs to involve the MPME, District and Thana Education Offices, UNICEF and other education-related projects to alleviate the immediate crisis and to prepare for next year's intake**

4. Further analysis of important issues identified

4.1 The role of economic empowerment in withdrawing children from hazardous labour

The off-the-cuff reason given for the prevalence of child labour is the poverty of the families concerned. However the reality is clearly much more complex. There are three main contributing factors which are; lack of interest in the education that is available by children, lack of awareness of the hazards of child labour by their parents and a shortage of family income. Overcoming all three of these factors provides a comprehensive approach to the elimination of hazardous child labour. In some circumstances a single factor approach may be successful but this is less likely.

Responses from parents are conflicting although some of this is due to different roles and concerns of men and women. Mothers who are receiving credit strongly expressed that now that they are aware of the health dangers of their children being involved in bidi work, they would not allow them to work there even if assistance for IGA was not available. Fathers are said to have reported that they would only stop their children from working after they had seen their family income increase.

All credit recipients met said that they had withdrawn their children from work (this is a requirement stipulated by some implementing partners but not all), even though many of the IGA schemes were not yet producing a return. This meant that while the loan was being repaid there was an additional financial burden on the family. The additional payments were said to be met generally by the parents working additional hours.

There are also social/cultural issues involved, as a number of informants talked about fathers who did not work while sending their children to work. This is especially prevalent where wages are low and the fathers do not consider it worth their effort.

The effect of the saving and credit activity goes beyond immediate economic empowerment. Other positive effects recorded were:

- The opportunity to get access to credit is a motivating influence for families to withdraw their children from working
- The savings group meetings and IGA activities have exposed the women to the outside environment more. The mothers are out of their house more, and are contributing and involved in outside activities. Restricted movement keeps women in bidi work and then the children assist their parents.
- Migratory families that have received credit for an IGA have become settled, enabling their children to benefit from education

Although some partner organisation would disagree, it can be argued that economic empowerment is not essential in order to withdraw children from hazardous work. However as one part of an overall strategy, it clearly plays a very important role, and increases the effectiveness of awareness raising, health care and the provision of NFE schools.

4.2 Child workers not covered by the project intervention

There are some children who were identified by the initial survey and are no longer participating, and others who are now in the area but not covered by the project interventions. The reason for this is the movement of children and/or their families. No cases of children being missed by the initial identification were reported.

In the CDW sector some children stay at home when they return for holidays and festivals, while some others have got married. The numbers of those dropping out are recorded by the partners and the project, although it is not shown in the reporting formats. Within this sector the rate of drop out has been 5 - 8 %. Their employer has then replaced these with new children, but they have not been included in the project interventions. This has led to some motivated employers having their CDW excluded. The project is now making arrangements for these children to join the NFE classes and participate in the other activities.

In the other sectors there are a number of factors:

- Some families have a migratory livelihood system, moving back to the rural areas at certain times of the year and then possibly moving on to a different urban location
- Some families have been forcibly moved from their squatter settlement and have possibly moved outside of the project area
- Some families have moved into the project areas due to loss of land from river cutting or other reasons and the children taken up hazardous child labour
- Some children have been recruited by labour middlemen from just outside the project area to work within the area in order to replace the withdrawn children

The migratory livelihoods are strongest amongst those working in the construction sector. To date the project is no longer in contact with about 12% of the initial children who participated from this sector. Those families that have received credit for an IGA have all become settled in the area. There are no figures on the number of children who have started working since the beginning of the project but there are certainly some.

In Haragach, Rangpur, the partners have estimated that about 2,100 new children have started working in the bidi industry, either because their families have migrated into the area, or because they have been recruited from the fringes of the project area to work in the factories. The original number of child workers in this area was about 18,000.

In all sectors apart from CDWs the children who arrive in the area and take up hazardous work have not been included in the project interventions.

The question of what can be done for these recently arrived children was discussed at the stakeholders' workshop. It was felt that although some limited assistance could be provided for them, such as access to the health facility and possibly the vocational training, it would be more appropriate to identify the children specifically and design a new two-year intervention for them. To incorporate them in existing NFE classes for the remainder of the project period would be insufficient for most of them.

The need to stop the recruitment of new children was also identified as important, and it is expected that the action to be taken by trade union federations to develop appropriate local-

level representation in the bidi industry as recommended in section 3.1.3 will contribute to this.

Recommendations relating to children not covered by the project:

- **The number of children who have dropped out of the project interventions before completion should be reported in the six-monthly reports**
- **Partners should accurately identify and monitor the child workers not covered by the project intervention, assisting them where possible**
- **On the basis of the numbers of child workers identified, the project could design a follow up programme using selected partner agencies to completely remove child labourers from these sectors in these localities.**

4.3 Feasibility of progressing to an area-based approach

As noted in section 4.2 above, there are still some children working in the project target sectors within the project area. In addition, there are also child workers in these same locations involved in other WFCL sectors; rickshaw pulling, CDW, tea stall, sales person in medicine shop, brick breaking etc.

In the areas where child labourers were concentrated, there has been a considerable shift in social and cultural attitudes and actions in relation to child labour. In each of these areas the largest child labour sector has already been addressed and the numbers of remaining child labourers will be less than the original number in a single sector.

Based on the above analysis, an area-based intervention would be feasible, and could utilise the existing skills and infrastructure of the implementing partners. On the negative side is the lack of commitment and enthusiasm shown by many of the locally elected political leaders.

Recommendation concerning an area based-approach:

- **In areas where there has already been an intensive intervention and many children have been withdrawn from child labour, and especially where there is a supportive local political environment, there is potential to carry out an intervention to remove all forms of WFCL.**

4.4 Lessons that can contribute to the Time Bound Programme (TBP)

There was a lack of clarity concerning who was the focus person in Bangladesh for the TBP. As the donors for the preparatory phase for the TBP are leaving the technical aspects to IPEC, this needs to be clarified[9].

Although interested in the outcome of this evaluation, the one TBP donor consulted had nothing to contribute to it.

[9] There were verbal reports that the WFCL CTA had been appointed as the temporary focus person but there has been no formal appointment.

The lessons learned, the good practices identified and the recommendations from this evaluation can all contribute to the TBP.

5. Conclusions, lessons, potential good practices and recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

Strengths

- 8,800 (29% of the target) children withdrawn from hazardous work (4,500 girls)
- 19,200 (93%) child labourers supplied with NFE or basic education (11,000 girls)
- 4,800 (73%) school going child labourers benefiting from project activities (2,800 girls)
- 7,300 (55%) children mainstreamed into formal education (3,600 girls)
- 30,200 (82%) children supplied with counselling/health services (17,100 girls)
- 4,500 (75%) young siblings prevented from becoming child labourers (2,250 girls)
- 6,500 (41%) families benefiting from IGAs and/or credit schemes
- 14,100 (89%) families benefiting from medical check up and health care

- Project extension was obtained to make up for the delays in start-up
- The NSC Sub-committee is an effective forum for the representation of stakeholders
- Clear and methodical process to withdraw children in a sector in an area from WFCL
- Thorough monitoring system for project inputs, activities and some impacts
- Detailed child tracking system that also monitors welfare impacts
- Many NGO partners are permanent institutions in the locality
- The partner organisations have developed knowledge, skills and experience in tackling WFCL
- Partners have carried out very comprehensive awareness raising programmes using many media, and the total community have been influenced
- Virtually always mothers who receive the IGA training and access to loans
- Some Community Watch Groups (CWG) are active and committed to continue motivating employers
- ILO project representation assists National Child Labour Survey

Weaknesses

- Delays in project start-up of 6 – 9 months
- Sector Project Implementation Committees (SPIC) not established
- Many Programme Facilitating Committees (PFC) are not committed and/or inactive
- Many PFCs have a feeling of dependency on the project
- The NSC Sub-committee is not an efficient forum for project implementation
- No activity to facilitate the application of existing labour legislation
- Trade union involvement in project implementation has been limited.
- Labour representatives at the local level see no benefits from the project
- There is no provision for young siblings who cannot enter Class 1 when the NFE centres close
- No Action Programme for raising awareness at the national level.
- National Child Labour Survey delayed. Results may be too late to contribute to Child Labour Policy
- Sex-worker sector not included in the National Child Labour Survey

Opportunities

- Government of Bangladesh has ratified ILO convention 182 on the elimination of WFCL
- Child Labour Policy is being drafted
- International disapproval of WFCL
- Child tracking system gives potential for follow up and impact assessment
- Many local politicians are also employers
- Some CWGs are committed to continuing after the project stops
- Local-level PFC sub-committees have greater ownership and commitment
- Guardianship system for CDWs
- In Haragach, Rangpur and probably a number of other areas a change in cultural values is occurring

Limitations/Threats

- The capacity of primary schools to absorb the influx of children
- Capacity of PFCs and CWGs to monitor children withdrawn from WFCL
- Privacy concerns over the child tracking system
- No influence over the parents of CDWs
- Movement of parents and children:
    - Seasonal livelihoods of some families
    - Child labour drawn in from outside the area to fill the vacuum not covered by the project
- Only ILO representation in the Joint Child Labour Working Group, not project representation
- Lack of proper labour representation at the local level
- Frequent transfers of government officials

5.2 Lessons learnt

Lessons from project implementation have been identified as they have arisen in the report. They are collected here and the section number given at the end can locate the background information for each lesson.

Lesson from project design: (3.1.2)

- Assumptions and the associated risk should be identified during project preparation and the design or implementation modified as necessary.

Lesson from implementation: (3.1.5)

- If delays to project start-up means that action programmes will need to continue beyond the planned project completion date, then requests for an extension should be made to the donor immediately so that agreements with implementing partners are within the agreed project timeframe.

Lesson from project design: (3.1.6)

- IPEC project designs should consider the need to support the government in the enactment of appropriate child labour legislation and/or the application of these laws.

Lessons from delays in project start-up: (3.2.0)

- Project management structure needs to be compatible with existing agreements within the country
- Realistic time should be allowed for appraisal and approval of project decisions and agreements by the government and by IPEC
- Necessary to have an efficient system for approval of major project implementation decisions

5.3 Potential good practices

These are collated from where they have arisen through the report.

- The child tracking part of the database means that each child is treated by the project as an individual, not as a statistic. If specific children drop out, they cannot be replaced by a different anonymous child. This is a very effective system for current monitoring of the children and as a tool for longer-term impact assessment. (3.2.0)
- There is a clear methodical process for the withdrawal of children from hazardous labour which has interventions aimed at education, awareness development and economic empowerment, and has a variety of strategies aimed at children of different ages and interests. (3.2.2)
- The concept of employers taking on the responsibility for guardianship of their CDWs is, despite its challenges, a very good model for sustainably improving the quality of the living and working conditions of CDWs. (3.2.2)
- Implementing partners have carried out effective local awareness raising campaigns using a wide variety of media, and this has had an influence on the total community. (3.2.4)
- By working through NGO partners, knowledge and skills for the elimination of the hazardous child labour have been developed. Commitment to this goal may also have been developed. (3.3.1)
- By selecting locally established NGOs, there are now long-term institutions that may be willing to provide ongoing monitoring and support to the children, families and PFC/CWGs. (3.3.1)

5.4 Recommendations

Many of these recommendations have their origin in comments or suggestions made by participating stakeholders, particularly at the final workshop. Recommendations from throughout the report are compiled here. For background to the recommendation refer to the section which is referenced after each recommendation.

Recommendation concerning trade union representation: (3.1.3)

- The project needs to find ways of encouraging appropriate trade union representation at both the central and plant levels, and then to work with them for the achievement of mutual goals

Recommendation concerning the database: (3.2.1)

- Within three months a review of the database is carried out by project staff, implementing partners, MOLE and other projects, and a child labour monitoring expert, covering the following areas;
  - ➔ Clarify what the specific objectives of the database are
  - ➔ Review the data fields in relation to the specific objectives

- ➔ Identify and discuss alternative systems including sampling systems
- ➔ Review the feasibility of partners maintaining it during the project period
- ➔ Discuss the longer term needs of MOLE
- ➔ Discuss issues of compatibility between databases of different projects
- ➔ Discuss the rights of the children and their families to privacy and develop working practices so that this can be safeguarded.

Recommendation concerning project coordination: (3.2.1)

- The project should regularly participate in the Joint Child Labour Working Group for information sharing and cooperation with other like-minded projects and organisations

Recommendations concerning PFCs and CWGs: (3.2.3)

- PFCs: Further discussions should be facilitated between locally elected representatives, employers, labour representatives, parents and implementing partners in order to develop a functional institution that can sustain the withdrawal of child labour at a local level. This institution does not need to have the same form in every location.
- CWGs: The proposal presented at the stakeholders' workshop should be discussed with all of the CDW partners and the existing CWGs, and changes made/additional committees formed, as they think best.
- For both institutions it is important that the local representatives make the decisions, as it is their institution which is expected to continue beyond the life of the project.

Recommendation concerning awareness raising at the national level: (3.2.4)

- The project should look for opportunities, either alone or in collaboration with other projects and projects, to raise the level of awareness about the worst forms of child labour

Recommendation concerning capacity building of MOLE: (3.2.5)

- The project should provide technical assistance to the MOLE in finalising the draft Child Labour Policy.

Recommendations relating to implementing partners: (3.3.1)

- Partner NGOs should be encouraged to incorporate hazardous child labour issues into their social mandate.
- Partner NGOs should be encouraged to provide ongoing monitoring and support to the children, families and PFC/CWGs

Recommendation for the support to PFCs and CWGs: (3.5.1)

- The project should consider an area or central-based facility, for a limited period of time beyond the end of the project, to support and encourage the PFC/CWGs to fulfil their responsibilities (perhaps two years).

Recommendation regarding school places for mainstreamed children: (3.5.2)

- The project urgently needs to involve the MPME, District and Thana Education Offices, UNICEF and other education-related projects to alleviate the immediate crisis and to prepare for next years intake

Recommendations relating to children not covered by the project: (4.2)

- The number of children who have dropped out of the project interventions before completion should be reported in the six-monthly reports
- Partners should accurately identify and monitor the child workers not covered by the project intervention, assisting them where possible
- On the basis of the numbers of child workers identified the project could design a follow up programme using selected partner agencies to completely remove child labourers from these sectors in these localities.

Recommendation concerning an area-based approach: (4.3)

- In areas where there has already been an intensive intervention and many children have been withdrawn from child labour, and especially where there is a supportive local political environment, there is potential to carry out an intervention to remove all forms of WFCL.

APPENDIX 1: Terms of reference

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMME ON THE ELIMINATION OF CHILD LABOUR
ILO/IPEC

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Final Version :
Basis for Contract

for

Mid-Term Project Evaluation

(Mid-term Independent Evaluation based on self-evaluation elements)

of

BGD/00/P50/USA:
Preventing and Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Selected Formal and Informal Sectors in Bangladesh

ILO Project Code: BGD/00/P50/USA

Financing Agency: US-DOL

Type of Evaluation: Independent

Geographical Coverage: Bangladesh

Date and duration of the evaluation: Eight weeks

Preparation Date: Jan. 2003

I. Background and Justification

The project *'Preventing and Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Selected Formal and Informal Sectors in Bangladesh'* is the largest project among many other projects launched in late 2000 by ILO/IPEC in Bangladesh. It focuses on children working in hazardous occupations under the most intolerable conditions ranging from exposure to chemicals and other harmful substances as well as being subject to long, difficult working hours. The project is operational in five prioritised informal and formal sectors, namely bidi industry, construction sector, leather tanneries, match factories and child domestic work sector. Building on the experience of the BGMEA[1] project as well as taking a big leap in the overall efforts of the ILO/IPEC-Bangladesh, this project originally aimed to remove about 30,000 children from hazardous occupations and to prevent another 15,000 younger siblings from replacing them in the labour market. The project intends to achieve these goals through various strategies varying from providing social protection to monitoring workplaces and communities.

To foster the broad based partnerships at the national level, the project has been implemented with the involvement of constituents and social partners under the purview of a Sub-committee appointed by the National Steering Committee of the ILO-IPEC. To ensure ownership at the field level, the Action Programmes (sub-projects or specific components of the project) are coordinated by the Sector Project Implementation Committees (SPIC) consisting of the representatives of district administration, key implementing agencies, stakeholders and other cooperating organizations (departments responsible for education, social welfare, health, trade; and employers' and workers' organizations; and other NGOs as appropriate).

The project also embraces the gender dimension in its key components, especially regarding child domestic workers who are predominantly young girls. The sectoral baseline surveys conducted by the project have contributed to collecting gender-sensitive data of target children and their families, so that adequate emphasis can be given to include children from female-headed households. Under the economic empowerment component of the project, families of target-children (about 90 percent of adult female family members of working children) will receive seed capital, training and support for income generating activities.

The broad objective of the project is to contribute to the systematic prevention and elimination of worst forms of child labour in Dhaka, Chittagong, Tangail, Rangpur, Kushtia, Narayanganj and Munshiganj. Specifically, the project is designed to achieve five immediate objectives as follows:

a) A strong foundation for the systematic prevention and elimination of worst forms of child labour in the selected sectors and regions will have been prepared through increased research and documentation;

b) The worst forms of child labour in the selected sectors and regions will have been substantially reduced through the direct action programs aimed at the withdrawal, social protection and rehabilitation of at least 30,000[2] children in a time-bound and systematic manner;

c) At least 15,000[3] younger siblings will have been prevented from entering

[1] Bangladeshi Garment Manufacturing Employers Association
[2] September 2002 Project revision requests number to be changed to 30,887
[3] September 2002 Project revision requests number to be changed to 6,021

the worst forms of child labour through economic empowerment of parents and the introduction of a continuous mechanism for workplace and community monitoring;

d) Instances of commitment made and action taken against the worst forms of child labour by the government, social partners, families, communities and the general public, jointly and separately, will have been increased through advocacy and awareness raising; and

e) The capacity of government, in particular the MOLE, in addressing the worst forms of child labour country-wide will have been increased through the strengthened institutional capacity and updated national statistics on the child labour situation.

The project was officially launched in September 2000. In order to provide sufficient time for 24 Action Programmes to deliver the outputs/services and eventually create sustainable impact, a one-year project extension until 30 September 2004 has been granted.

To date 25 Action Programmes are under implementation covering the bidi industry, construction sector, leather tanneries, match factories, child domestic workers, and National Child Labour Surveys. The program areas are scattered over Dhaka, Chittagong, Tangail, Kushtia, Narayanganj, Munshiganj and Rangpur districts**.**

In line with ILO/IPEC policies and procedures and as given in C*hapter 8: Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation* of the project document, the project is to undertake a mid-term evaluation to assess the soundness of the project approach and strategies, to review the effectiveness and efficiency in delivering outputs, to assess the extent project objectives have been met or will be met, and to examine potential impact on target groups. The current evaluation is the first evaluation for this project in its current project cycle.

The results of the mid-term evaluation will provide the basis for fine tuning, refocusing and reinforcing the approaches and strategies of the project, in particular for formulating the second half of the project which would take a much broader prospect in addressing the worst forms of child labour. It will also highlight potential good practices and lessons learned for further emulation by the TBP and other similar IPEC programs. The stakeholders will have the opportunity to reflect their views and concerns on the results of the present evaluation and comment on the future course of action to be taken by project management. Hence, the prospect for the project to embark on the second phase will hinge upon the overall performance and the promising achievement of the current phase.

As per IPEC evaluation procedures, a participatory consultation process on the nature and specific purpose of the evaluation was carried out. The present TOR is based on the outcome of this process.

II. Scope and Purpose

The mid-term evaluation should serve as a learning tool for the project management team. The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to review the ongoing progress and performance of the project (extent to which project activities have met the immediate objectives and outputs), to examine the likelihood of the project achieving its objectives and to examine the delivery of the project inputs/activities and an investigation on nature and magnitude of constraints, the factors affecting project implementation and an analysis of factors contributing to the project's success. The mid-term evaluation should provide all stakeholders with the

information needed to assess and possibly revise work plans, strategies, objectives, partnership arrangements and resources. It should identify the potential impact on policy and strategies and suggest a possible way forward for the future. Finally, it should identify lessons learned and potential good practices.

The scope of the evaluation includes all project activities to date, including the Action Programmes but will also look at the project as a whole and address issues of project design, implementation and other special concerns. The evaluation will cover all components and all activities and APs:

1) SIMPOC component or National Child Labour Survey
2) Research and Documentation
3) Social Protection component
4) Workplace and Community Monitoring
5) Advocacy and awareness raising
6) Reinforcing Institutional Capacity

III. Suggested Specific Aspects to be Addressed

The evaluation should address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability as defined in the ILO Guidelines for the Preparation of Independent Evaluations of ILO Programmes and Projects and for gender concerns see: ILO Guidelines for the Integration of Gender Issues into the Design, Monitoring and Evaluation of ILO Programmes and Projects January, 1995. The following are the broad suggested aspects that can be identified at this point for the evaluation to address. Other aspects can be added as identified by the evaluation consultants in accordance with given purpose.

Design:

- Assess whether the beneficiaries were clearly identified (i.e. sub-groups, age, socio-economic status, etc. 'poor' or 'women' is not a homogenous group,) determine if more details are needed to better target interventions.
- Assess whether the problems and needs were adequately analysed. Determine whether the needs, constraints, resources and access to project services of the different beneficiaries were clearly identified taking gender issues into concern.
- Examine the appropriateness of the indicators and whether they are 'measurable'
- Address the factors leading to delay for gathering the necessary baseline surveys required to implement the project, highlight any recommendations that could be made to avoid similar problems in the future.
- Examine if collected data was gender-sensitive
- Assess whether the original timeline is realistic. If not, what could be done to make the timeline more realistic.
- Analyse whether adequate information on the socio-economic, cultural, and political situation of Bangladesh was available at the time of design and whether these were taken into consideration at design stage.
- Assess whether the design took into account the validity and practicality of institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders

Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness)

- Examine the preparatory outputs of the delivery process in terms of timeliness and identifying the appropriate resources/persons to implement the process.
- Assess whether a delivery mode for different beneficiary sub-groups were identified (different times in the day for project activities for 'poor men versus men' or 'women versus men' and location of activity, what method was used etc.)
- Address whether there was sufficient involvement by 'vulnerable groups/hidden groups' in the preparatory phase of the delivery process.
- Examine delivery of project outputs in terms of quality and quantity
- Assess the SIMPOC process thus far, looking specifically at the impact that start-up delays might have had on the project.
- Assess extent of achievement of immediate objectives (listed in background section)
- Assess the different impact on the different target groups
- Review effectiveness of project performance and implementation (both negative and positive ones)
- Assess the impact of the tracking and child labour monitoring components of the project.
- Review whether technical and administrative guidance and support provided by project staff, partner organisations and relevant ILO units were adequate.
- Determine the extent to which internal/external factors affected project implementation and whether the project's response to such factors was appropriate and timely.
- Analyse how appropriate the training that the program has provided to the Action Programme Implementing Organizations were and assess how the training has helped the organizations to carry out their responsibilities in a more efficient and effective manner.
- Identify whether the training has been uniform across all AP's and if not describe how they were different and whether certain training methods were more effective than others.
- Project's efficiency in terms of using resources in producing the project results
- Explore whether the phased, sectoral approach used in the present project is appropriate and consider whether any other approach, such as a regional approach, could be equally or more effective
- Evaluate whether the major strategies of the project sufficiently reflects the budget in terms of staffing, outputs and activities.
- Examine any budget revisions the project has requested and determine whether there is sufficient justification in terms of contributing to an improved and more effective implementation of the project i.e. a more justified allocation of budget in relation to strategies and outputs as formulated in the project document.

Relevance of the project.

- To assess whether the project still makes sense
- Examine whether the project responds to the real needs of the beneficiary group.
- Validity of project approach and strategies and their potentiality to replicate;

- Assess whether the problems and needs that gave rise to the project still exists or have changed
- Examine whether the external factors affecting project implementation have been adequately identified and whether the assumptions remain valid.

Sustainability

- Assess to what extent a phase-out strategy and an emphasis on the sustainability of project impact, defined at the project design phase, and what steps have been taken since then to ensure project sustainability.
- Assess what contributions the project has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders, and to encourage ownership of project to partners.
- Examine the likelihood of the partner organizations, local community including stakeholders, community leaders, local administration, local elites etc. involved in project to continue to work to eliminate and to monitor child labour after the project closes.
- Identify whether actions have been taken to ensure the access of women/other vulnerable groups to services and resources
- Examine whether social-cultural and gender aspects endanger the sustainability of the project and assess whether actions have been taken to sensitise local institutions and target groups on these issues.

Special Concerns to be addressed

In addition to the general concerns, the evaluation should critically explore the following issues:

- Feasibility for progressing from sector-wise approach to an area-based approach. Whether it is feasible to gradually introduce area-based interventions for eliminating and preventing worst forms of child labour, in other words, the project extension to second phase;
- Whether the strategies and approaches used by the project continues to be relevant and replicable for TBP;
- To what extent grassroots institutions (not including NGOs) can be developed to take part in long- term child labour monitoring; and
- Whether the economic empowerment of the family helps in eliminating the worst forms of child labour in a short time and is sustainable.
- Examine whether the project accurately reports on child labour in the five identified sectors based on the indicators and targets.
- Contribution of the project in piloting and determining the most suitable implementation modalities for future programmes (such as Time Bound Programme)

IV. Expected Outputs of the evaluation

The mid-term evaluation will produce the following outputs:

1. Self-evaluation reports prepared by the Action Programme partner organizations (Separate TORs for the self-evaluation exercise are attached);
2. Evaluation instrument (set of questions and brief annotated outline of evaluation report)

3. A preliminary draft report based on consultants desk review and the self-evaluation reports of the partner organizations, a background report for the stakeholders' meeting
4. Programme and process for stakeholder meeting
5. Facilitation of stakeholders' evaluation meeting; and
6. Final evaluation report reflecting
   - The views of the stakeholders,
   - Findings,
   - Conclusions,
   - Recommendations for second half of the current phase
   - Lessons learned,
   - Possible good practices,
   - Recommendations to be made for subsequent phases.
   -

All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports, and raw data, should be provided both in paper copy and in electronic version compatible with either WORD for Windows or WordPefect. Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with ILO/IPEC and the ILO consultant(s). Use of the data for publication and other presentation can only be made with the agreement of ILO/IPEC.

The final report will be distributed to key stakeholders in Bangladesh as per ILO/IPEC established procedures (see under schedule) by project management and in ILO HQ by IPEC-DED.

V. Evaluation Methodology

The following is the proposed methodology. While the evaluator(s) can propose changes in the methodology, any such changes should be discussed with and approved by DED.

The evaluation consultant might be asked to use the standard evaluation instruments that ILO/IPEC has developed for documenting and analysing achievements of the projects and contributions of the Action Programmes to the project.

The evaluation will be carried out using a desk review, an evaluation mission to relevant project sites, consultations with stakeholders and beneficiaries, and a stakeholder workshop to discuss findings and encourage ownership of evaluation findings. Precisely the evaluation will be carried out in four phases in the following manner:

Phase I:

- Conducting a self-evaluation by each individual Action Programme partner (on-going not responsibility of consultant)

Phase II:

- Reviewing documents and materials (project document, technical and financial reports, self-evaluation reports of individual action programs, etc);
- Visiting some selected program areas to randomly assess the quality and quantity of outputs and services delivered by the programs;
- Interviewing program staff, key stakeholders and beneficiaries including PFC members, parents, target children, workers and employers;
- Meeting with the members of NSC-subcommittee;
- Preparing background report;
- Prepare programme and process for stakeholder

Phase III:

- Stakeholder meeting with key stakeholders[4]

Phase IV:

- Finalizing the evaluation report, including comments by key stakeholders

To date Phase I of the evaluation process have been initiated by project management. The Action Programme implementing partners have been asked to conduct a self-evaluation of their activities. A Terms of Reference for the self-evaluation is annexed below. This step in the wider evaluation, in most cases, will also fulfil the requirement for a self mid-term evaluation of individual AP's. The self-evaluation reports of the Action Programmes will also serve as an in important source of information for the consultant evaluating the bigger project.

Composition of the evaluation team

An international external consultant will be recruited as evaluator to conduct the evaluation exercise with the logistical support of project management and the methodological support of IPEC Design, Evaluation and Documentation Unit (DED). The consultant will have the responsibilities for phases 2, 3, 4 of the evaluation, which includes:

- Undertaking desk review of relevant documents and materials;
- Conducting evaluation process including data collection;
- Preparing background report for the stakeholder meeting and basis for final report
- Facilitating the stakeholders meeting;
- Finalizing the final report incorporating comments and views made during the stakeholder meeting.

The ideal candidate for the post will have:

- Proven extensive evaluation experience
- Broad knowledge of and insight in development issues in Bangladesh
- Technical knowledge of Child Labour and WFCL
- Excellent report writing skills
- Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings
- Knowledge of and experience evaluating gender issues

Donor participation was foreseen in the evaluation mission/stakeholder workshop but was cancelled due to the political situation.

Timetable and Work Plan

The evaluation is to be completed within two months for phases 2-4. As mentioned above, the partner organizations were instructed to conduct a self-evaluation of their own

[4] Project management to provide list of stakeholders

organizations as per ILO/IPEC policies and procedures. For phases 2-4 an external consultant will be engaged from early March to conduct the evaluation assignments. A stakeholder meeting will be conducted in the third week of March. The total duration of the evaluation process including submission of the final report should be within two months. The tentative timetable is as follows:

Phase I: (to be completed by end of January)

- Self-evaluation by implementing organizations of Action Programmes (November-January 2003)

Phase II: (3 weeks in country, proposed dates 8-26 March 2003)

- Briefing in Geneva (1 day)
- Desk review to prepare background evaluation report including field visits and organizing stakeholder workshop. (2 weeks)
- Draft background evaluation report (1 week)

Phase III: (2 days in the week of 23-28 March 2003)

- Stakeholder workshop (2 days) (March 23-24)
- Debriefing in Geneva (tentative March 31/April 1)

Phase IV: (2 weeks work)

- First draft from consultant April 7
- Comments from stakeholders May 12
- Consolidated comments prepared by DED and sent to consultant by May 19
- Final evaluation report due latest May 2 2003

Sources of Information and Consultations/Meetings

For Desk Review:

- Project document;
- Quarterly Progress reports to donor;
- Technical and financial reports of partner organizations;
- Studies and other reports, including Rapid Assessments and Baseline Surveys;
- Mission reports;
- Action Programme Summary Outlines (APSO);
- Project files (relevant correspondence); and
- Other project outputs, according to the needs and wishes of the Consultant;
- Self-evaluation reports of the Action Programmes.

For Individual Consultations/Meetings:

- Members of NSC sub-committee;
- Area Office's Programme Officer and CTAs of other IPEC projects;
- Project Management (CTA, Program Officer, Sector Coordinators, Social Monitors, technical unit ILO HQ);
- Partner organizations (Executive Directors, Action Program Coordinator, and other staff members);
- Parents, children, members of PFCs, local government administrators, teachers, etc);

- Relevant government officials; and
- Others, according to the needs and wishes of the Consultant Evaluator.

VI. Resources and Management

Resources

The following resources are required:

An international external consultant:

- Lump sum fee for the consultant (equivalent to 5 work week assignment)
- Travel cost Europe-Bangladesh-Europe,
- 4 days DSA in Geneva, up to 21 days DSA in Bangladesh
- Local travel cost.

Stakeholders' evaluation meeting and other team members:

- Estimated cost for holding the stakeholders' meeting;
- Cost of other team members for self-evaluation workshops covered by separate allocation

Management

IPEC project officials in Bangladesh will provide administrative support during the evaluation mission, including responsibility for contractual arrangements as the project is decentralised. IPEC/DED in HQ will organize the briefing and debriefing sessions of the international consultant. The consultant should work closely with and report to IPEC/DED in headquarters.

****

APPENDIX 2: Summary of Progress of Action Programmes as of 28 February 2003

S. No	AP Partner	Sector	Location	Total Budget (US$)	Budget cost per child with-drawn (US$)	Achievement/target								Self-evaluation dissagrettated by gender?
						Children withdrawn from hazardous work	CL supplied with NFE or basic education	Children main-streamed to formal Education	School going CL subjected to project interventions	Young siblings prevented from WFCL	Children supplied with counseling/health/ referral services	Families benefiing from medical check-ups & healthcare	Families benefiting from IGAs and/or credit schemes	
1	CB	Bidi	Rangpur	417,343	113	**654**	**1,884**	**1,343**	**1,441**	**509**	**3,820**	**2,404**	**1,205**	Yes
						3,709	1,884	1,215	1,441	913	4,622	2,589	2,589	
						18%	100%	111%	100%	56%	83%	93%	47%	
2	SSS	Bidi	Rangpur	423,490	107	**1,346**	**2,452**	**1,712**	**40**	**839**	**4,871**	**2,131**	**1,010**	Yes
						3,957	2,452	1,926	1,155	914	4,871	2,131	2,131	
						34%	100%	89%	3%	92%	100%	100%	47%	
3	ESDO	Bidi	Rangpur	305,935	121	**1,130**	**1,496**	**832**	**191**	**407**	**2,522**	**1,460**	**635**	Yes
						2,530	1,496	1,173	694	597	3,127	1,460	1,460	
						45%	100%	71%	28%	68%	81%	100%	43%	
4	LH	Bidi	Rangpur	183,669	82	**621**	**1,211**	**792**	**712**	**141**	**1,266**	**490**	**428**	Yes
						2,228	1,254	1,022	712	243	2,471	861	861	
						28%	97%	77%	100%	58%	51%	57%	50%	
5	SEPOC	Bidi	Rangpur	72,191	119	**128**	**510**	**224**	**0**	**145**	**754**	**325**	**325**	Yes
						609	510	387	0	145	754	325	325	
						21%	100%	58%	#DIV/0!	100%	100%	100%	100%	
6	BDSC	Bidi	Rangpur	134,519	109	**692**	**874**	**485**	**240**	**306**	**742**	**615**	**234**	Yes
						1,232	874	606	240	306	1,538	680	680	
						56%	100%	80%	100%	100%	48%	90%	34%	
7	BRAC	Bidi	Rangpur	347,104	103	**1,326**	**1,476**	**393**	**1,047**	**589**	**3,206**	**2,104**	**961**	Yes
						3,357	1,724	1,060	1,047	684	4,041	2,104	2,104	
						39%	86%	37%	100%	86%	79%	100%	46%	
8	SETU	Bidi	Kushtia	154,053	88	**209**	**851**	**93**	**0**	**336**	**1,564**	**1,097**	**256**	Yes
						1,752	1,131	652	26	428	2,180	1,551	1,551	
						12%	75%	14%	0%	79%	72%	71%	17%	
9	PIPASA	Bidi	Kushtia	142,661	139	**408**	**733**	**310**	**0**	**464**	**1,635**	**608**	**62**	Yes
						1,024	784	346	0	611	1,635	747	747	
						40%	93%	90%	#DIV/0!	76%	100%	81%	8%	
10	SATU	Bidi	Tangail	199,077	106	**1,051**	**506**	**324**	**1,074**	**196**	**2,109**	**1,192**	**381**	Yes
						1,884	506	324	1,074	300	2,184	1,289	1,289	
						56%	100%	100%	100%	65%	97%	92%	30%	

Sub total	Bidi		2,380,042	107	**7,565**	**11,993**	**6,508**	**4,745**	**3,932**	**22,489**	**12,426**	**5,497**	
					22,282	12,615	8,711	6,389	5,141	27,423	13,737	13,737	
					34%	95%	75%	74%	76%	82%	90%	40%	

S. No.	AP Partner	Sector	Location	Total Budget (US$)	Budget cost per child with-drawn (US$)	Achievement/Target								
						Children withdrawn from hazardous work	CL supplied with NFE or basic education	Children main-streamed to formal Educa-tion	School going CL subjected to project interventions	Young siblings prevented from WFCL	Children supplied with counseling/heal th/ referral services	Families benefiing from medical check-ups & healthcare	Families benefiing from IGAs and/or credit schemes	Self-evaluation dissagrettated by gender?
11	SUF	CDW	Dhaka	85,477	71	**92**	**1,200**	**10**	**0**	-	**1,200**	-	-	
						1,200	1,200	575	0	-	1,200	-	-	
						8%	100%	2%			100%			
12	NM	CDW	Dhaka	76,624	77	**75**	**1,000**	**0**	**0**	-	**989**	-	-	Yes
						1,000	1,000	557	0	-	1,000	-	-	
						8%	100%	0%			99%			
13	Shoishab	CDW	Dhaka	100,605	84	**115**	**1,200**	**13**	**0**	-	**898**	-	-	Yes
						1,200	1,200	645	0	-	1,200	-	-	
						10%	100%	2%			75%			
14	CDS	CDW	Dhaka	63,062	79	**0**	**800**	**28**	**0**	-	**761**	-	-	Yes
						800	800	459	0	-	800	-	-	
						0%	100%	6%			95%			
15	PMK	CDW	Dhaka	63,066	79	**71**	**800**	**0**	**0**	-	**752**	-	-	Yes
						800	800	460	0	-	800	-	-	
						9%	100%	0%			94%			
16	UPAKAR	CDW	Chittagong	16,751	67	**0**	**-**	**0**	**0**	-	**0**	-	-	No report
						250	250	30	0	-	250	-	-	
						0%	0%	0%			0%			
Sub-total		CDW		405,585	77	**353**	**5,000**	**51**	**-**	**-**	**4,600**	**-**	**-**	
						5,250	5,250	2,726	-	-	5,250	-	-	
						7%	95%	2%			88%			
17	OSDER	Construction	Naranganj	70,650	130	**351**	**442**	**189**	**23**	**68**	**702**	**342**	**238**	Yes
						543	486	421	23	159	702	390	390	
						65%	91%	45%	100%	43%	100%	88%	61%	
18	BMS	Construction	Naranganj	67,489	132	**215**	**365**	**220**	**10**	**139**	**419**	**302**	**120**	Yes
						513	451	395	10	139	652	332	332	
						42%	81%	56%	100%	100%	64%	91%	36%	
19	SMSKS	Construction	Naranganj	65,745	136	**81**	**367**	**87**	**35**	**106**	**526**	**294**	**92**	Yes
						482	414	372	35	167	649	385	385	
						17%	89%	23%	100%	63%	81%	76%	24%	
20	BVDP	Construction	Naranganj	26,165	136	**52**	**136**	**44**	**0**	**31**	**191**	**137**	**125**	Yes
						193	180	164	0	81	274	149	149	
						27%	76%	27%		38%	70%	92%	84%	
Sub-total		Construction		230,049	133	**699**	**1,310**	**540**	**68**	**344**	**1,838**	**1,075**	**575**	
						1,731	1,531	1,352	68	546	2,277	1,256	1,256	
						40%	86%	40%	100%	63%	81%	86%	46%	

S. No	AP Partner	Sector	Location	Total Budget (US$)	Budget cost per child with-drawn (US$)	Achievement/target								Self-evaluation dissagrettated by gender?
						Children withdrawn from hazardous work	CL supplied with NFE or basic education	Children main-streamed to formal Education	School going CL subjected to project interventions	Young siblings prevented from WFCL	Children supplied with counseling/health/ referral services	Families benefiing from medical check-ups & healthcare	Families benefiting from IGAs and/or credit schemes	
	UDDIPAN	Match	Chittaggong	48,115	207	**0**	**210**	**29**	**0**	**99**	**316**	**140**	**97**	Yes
						232	460	281	0	128	360	224	224	
						0%	46%	10%		77%	88%	63%	43%	
22	SEEP	Match	Dhaka	87,330	148	**135**	**406**	**127**	**0**	**62**	**682**	**272**	**306**	Yes
						589	455	318	0	118	707	364	364	
						23%	89%	40%		53%	96%	75%	84%	
23	DCI	Match	Dhaka	40,901	115	**74**	**170**	**50**	**0**	**50**	**250**	**200**	**75**	Yes
						356	228	105	128	88	444	279	279	
						21%	75%	48%	0%	57%	56%	72%	27%	
Sub-total		Match		176,346	150	**209**	**786**	**206**	**-**	**211**	**1,248**	**612**	**478**	
						1,177	1,143	704	128	334	1,511	867	867	
						18%	69%	29%	0%	63%	83%	71%	55%	
24	BEES	Leather	Dhaka	58,930	132	**0**	**102**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	Yes
						447	159	43	0	0	447	0	0	
						0%	64%	0%			0%			
Grand Total				**3,250,952**	**105**	**8,826**	**19,191**	**7,305**	**4,813**	**4,487**	**30,175**	**14,113**	**6,550**	
						30,887	20,698	13,536	6,585	6,021	36,908	15,860	15,860	
						29%	**93%**	**54%**	**73%**	**75%**	**82%**	**89%**	**41%**	

APPENDIX 3: People, groups and organisations consulted

Ministry of Labour and Employment
SC Khan, Joint Secretary
Dr Dil Afroz Haque, Deputy Secretary, MOLE and Project Director, Eradication of Hazardous Child Labour in Bangladesh
Shafiqur Rahman Bhuiya, Senior Assistant Chief, Planning Cell, MOLE

Ministry of Primary and Mass Education
Kazi Golam Mostafa, Deputy Secretary

Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics
Md. Zobdul Hoque, Joint Director

Child Domestic Worker Sector, Dhaka
Md. Zamal Uddin, Executive Director, Society for Underprivileged Families (SUF)
Tipu Sultan, Action Programme Coordinator, (SUF)
Labone, Child Domestic Worker, (SUF)
Mrs Shilpi, Guardian, (SUF)
Community Watch Group (7, all female), (SUF)
Community Mobilisers (6, all female), (SUF)
Action Programme Coordinator, Nari Maitree
Nasima, Peer Educator, Nari Maitree working area
Sayeda Mahfuza Begum, Thana Education Officer, Nari Maitree working area

Construction and match sector in Narayanganj
13 girls, 8 boys aged 7 – 13. Some engaged in labour, some enrolled in NFE (both working and non-working) and some mainstreamed in a government primary school
APCs from OSDER, BMS, BVDP, SMSKS
Aliaganj Primary School Headmaster
Farida Akter, BMS Executive Director

Leather industry related
Md. Harun Chowdhury, Chairman, Bangladesh Tanners Association and Ward Commissioner
Abul Kalam Azad, President, Bangladesh Leather and Leather Goods Industry Workers' Federation
Shaikh Khajauddin, Director, East Asia Tanneries Ltd
Md. Abdus Salam, Deputy Director, Bangladesh Extension Education Services
Leo Palma, Action Programme Coordinator, Bangladesh Extension Education Services

Bidi sector, Rangpur
Bidi (ex)child workers in Rangpur (13 girls, eight boys)
Employers (group discussion with 9 men, 1 women)
Bangladesh Bidi Workers representatives (group discussion with 14 men belonging to Bidi Shramik Union and Bidi Majdur Union)
Individual female bidi child worker near BDSC office
35 women who have received credit from the 7 partners

Chairman and 5 members of Haragach Porashava PFC
Chairman and 7 members of Haragach Union PFC
Md. Emdadul Hoque Vorsha, owner of Aziz Bidi Factory (and factory tour)
Workshop with the Action Programme Coordinators and Executive Directors of the seven partners

Other ILO Projects
Ronald E Berghuys, CTA, Prevention and elimination of child labour in the urban informal sector, ILO

Other Projects
Ruby Q Noble, Team Leader, BEHTRUC Project, UNICEF

Donor representatives
Michelle LaBonte, First Secretary, Embassy of the United States of America
Sarah White, DFID Advisor working in Time Bound Programme Process (by 'phone)

Employers representatives
Kazi Saifuddin Ahmed, Labour Advisor, Bangladesh Employers' Federation
Pradip Kumar Kundu, Additional Secretary, Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers & Exporters Association

Trade Union representatives
Nazrul Islam Khan, General Secretary, Bangladesh Jatiyabadi Sramik Dal
Abdul Kader Howlader, President, Jatio Shromik Jote-Bangladesh
Dr Wajedul Islam Khan, General Secretary, Bangladesh Trade Union Centre
Shah Md. Abu Zafor, President, Jatiyo Sramik Party

ILO, IPEC Headquarters, Geneva
Peter Wichmand, Senior Evaluation Officer, Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section
Naomi Asukai. Evaluation Officer, Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section
Caspar Merkle, Evaluation Officer, Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section
Hakki Ozel, SIMPOC
Sherin Khan, Programme Support, Asia

ILO Country Office
Gopal Bhattacharya, Director

Preventing and eliminating the worst forms of child labour in selected formal and informal sectors project, ILO
Sujeewa Fonseka, CTA
Pracha Vasuprasat, Programme Officer
2 Sector Coordinators and MIS coordinator
5 Social Monitors in group discussion in Rangpur

Stakeholders Workshops
CDW stakeholders in Dhaka - see list
Presentation and discussion on findings of Mid-Term Evaluation – see list

Mid-term Evaluation
Stakeholders' Meeting – CDW Sector, Dhaka
On 12 March 2003 at Nari Maitree Office, Malibagh, Dhaka

List of Stakeholders

Partner Organization	Stakeholders/Role	Name	Sex	Remarks
1. SUF	CDW Employer NFE Teacher Formal School Teacher Local leader	Bakul Dr.A.F.M. Alamgir Ms. Israt Ara Sultana Mr.Mir Bodruj Zaman Ms. Shamima Motin	Girl Male Female Male Female	
2. Nari Maitree	Employer NFE Teacher CWG Member Peer Educator Local Govt. Authority Formal School Teacher Thana Education Officer	Ms. Nazneen Akter Ms. Shopna Ms. Mahmuda Khatun Nasima Akter Ms. Bina Alam Md. Atique Ullah Sayeda Mahfuza Begum	Female Female Female Girl Female Male Female	 Ward Commissioner (# 23) Headmaster, Badda Govt. Primary School TEO, Gulshan
3. Shoishab Bangladesh	CDW NFE Teacher Formal School Teacher CWG Member Employer	Shella Ms. Shokria Hussain Ms. Asma Akhter Mr. Syed Waliullah Mr. Fazle Haq	Girl Female Female Male Male	 Rtd. Govt. Official Rtd. Govt. Official
4. CDS	CDW Local Leader	Asadul Mr. Shahed Zaman	Boy Male	
5. PMK	CDW Employer	Ruma Ms. Samsad	Girl Female	

Stakeholders' workshop on Mid-term Evaluation
USDOL/WFCL Project – BGD/00/P50/USA
(24-25 March 2003, BRAC Center, Mohakhali, Dhaka)

Name of Participant	*Position*	*Institution*	*Linked AP*	*Attendance*
Dr. Dil Afroz Haque	Deputy Secretary	Ministry of Labour and Employment, GOB	NSC	2 days
Mr. Kamal Hossain	Senior Assistant Secretary	Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, GOB	NSC	,,
Mr. Anwarul Alam	Senior Assistant Chief	Ministry of Women and Children Affairs, GOB	NSC	1 day
Mr. Gopal Bhattacharya	Director	ILO-Dhaka		1 day
Mr. Md. Zobdul Hoque	Joint Director	Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics	National Child Labour Survey	2 days
Mr. Kazi Saifuddin Ahmed	Labour Advisor	Bangladesh Employers' Federation	NSC	2days
Dr. Wazedul Islam Khan	General Secretary	Bangladesh Trade Union Centre	NSC	,,
Mr. Shah Md. Abu Zafar	President	Jatiyo Sramik Party	NSC	,,
Mr. Aworangajeb Selim Khan	PFC Member	-	PIPASA	,,
Mr. S. M. Shafiqul Alam	Action Program Coordinator	Organization for Social Development and Research	OSDER	,,
Mr. Hemayet Hossain	Employer	-	OSDER	,,
Mr. Abu Zafar	PFC Member	-	BMS	,,
Mr. Sayed Waliullah	Retd. Govt. Officer	Community Watch Group (CWG)	SB	,,
Ms. Sayeda Mahfuza Begum	Thana Education Officer-Gulshan	Community Watch Group (CWG)	NM	,,
Ms. Hosne Ara Begum	Program coordinator	United Development Initiatives for Programmed Action	UDDIPAN	,,
Mr. Leo Palma	Action Program Coordinator	Bangladesh Extension Education Services	BEES	,,
Mr. Ronald E. Berghuys	Chief Technical Adviser	BGD/00/P01/NET, ILO	-	1day
Ms. Nasmeen Ahmed	Coordinator, SP	BGD/00/P01/NET, ILO		2 days
Mr. H.S.S. Fonseka	Chief Technical Adviser	USDOL-WFCL Project	-	,,
Mr. Pracha Vasuprasat	Programme Officer	USDOL-WFCL Project	-	,,
Mr. A.T. Siddiquee	Sector Coordinator	USDOL-WFCL Project	-	,,
Ms. Regan Manjita Biswas	Sector Coordinator	USDOL-WFCL Project	-	,,
Mr. Borhan Uddin	MIS Coordinator	USDOL-WFCL Project	-	,,
Ms. Tanzen Ara Rahman	Secretary	USDOL-WFCL Project	-	,,
Mr. Khandoker Nazrul Islam	Social Monitor	USDOL-WFCL Project	-	,,
Mr. Hossain Ahmed	Social Monitor	USDOL-WFCL Project	-	,,
Mr. Debashish K. Saha		UNICEF		1 day

APPENDIX 4: References and documents consulted

Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, 2002/2003, Meeting of the Technical committee on National Child Labour Survey, minutes of all meetings

International Labour Organisation, 2000, Project Document: Preventing and eliminating the worst forms of child labour in selected formal and informal sectors, ILO

International Labour Organisation, 2002, Eliminating the worst forms of child labour: A practical guide to ILO Convention 182, ILO and Inter Parliamentary Union

Joint Child Labour Working Group, Bangladesh, 2000 – 2003, Position Statement and minutes of meetings

MOLE, 2002, Coordination Meeting of Child Labour Projects in Bangladesh, minutes of 3 meetings

USDOL/WFCL, 2000 - 2003, Status Reports and Technical Progress Reports 1 to 9

USDOL/WFCL, 2000, Criteria for short-listing the potential partners

USDOL/WFCL, 2000, Eligibility criteria for considering the action programme proposals

USDOL/WFCL, 2003, ToR and guide to preparation of Mid-Term Self –Evaluation (for Action Programme partner organisations), USDOL/WFCL

USDOL/WFCL, 2002, Overview of Child Labour Databases; ILO/IPEC Workshop on Database Management and Tracking of Child Labour

Various, 2000, Baseline studies (8 number)

Various, 2000/2001, Action Programme Proposals from partner organisations (sample only)

Various, 2003, Mid-Term Evaluation Reports by Action Programme partner organisations (24 number)

APPENDIX 5: Diary of Evaluation Consultant

6th March	Geneva	Travel to Geneva, briefing with ILO/IPEC
7th March		Travel to Bangladesh
8th March	Dhaka	Arrive Dhaka, Briefing by ILO/USDOL/WRCLP
9th March	Dhaka	Meetings with MOLE, USAID project, UNICEF, ILO/NET
10th March	Dhaka	Reading project documents (general strike)
11th March	Dhaka	Meetings with US embassy, Employers representatives, Trade Union representatives, SUF field visit
12th March	Dhaka	BEES and leather tannery owner and trade union field visit, ILO Director, CDW stakeholder workshop at NM
13th March	Dhaka	BMS field visit for construction workers, OSDER for match manufacturers, focus group meeting with child workers
14th March	Rangpur	½ day rest and travel to Rangpur
15th March	Rangpur	Workshop with target children, discussion with WFCL Social Monitors, Meetings with bidi employers and labour unions
16th March	Rangpur	Visit NFE centres and IGAs, meeting with Haragach Pourashava PFC, observe Haragach Union PFC, tour of Aziz Bidi Factory, workshop with women involved in IGAs and observe street drama
17th March	Dhaka	Workshop with EDs and APC of 7 partners and travel to Dhaka
18th March	Dhaka	Analysis and meeting with BBS
19th March	Dhaka	Analysis of findings, telephone discussions
20th March	Dhaka	Reading office files, meeting with Sector Co-ordinators and other office staff
21st March	Dhaka	½ day rest, workshop preparation
22nd March	Dhaka	Workshop preparation
23rd March	Dhaka	Meeting with MPME, discussions with project staff, preparation of workshop materials
24th March	Dhaka	Stakeholder Workshop
25th March	Dhaka	Stakeholder Workshop
26th March	Dhaka	Report writing
27th March	Geneva	Travel to Geneva
28th March	Oxford	Debriefing with IPEC and travel to London
29/30th March	Oxford	Rest
31st March 7th April	Oxford	Report writing (5th and 6th April weekend off)
21st/22nd May	Oxford	Final revisions to report in response to comments

APPENDIX 6: Terms of Reference for Self-Evaluation component

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMME ON THE ELIMINATION OF CHILD LABOUR
ILO/IPEC

TERMS OF REFERENCE

AND

GUIDE TO PREPARATION

of

Mid-Term Self-Evaluation

Self-evaluation conducted by Action Program partner organization

For

Independent Evaluation

of

BGD/00/P50/USA:

Preventing and Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Selected Formal and Informal Sectors in Bangladesh

I. Background and Justification

The Preventing and Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Selected Formal and Informal Sectors in Bangladesh Project is the largest among many other projects launched in late 2000 by the ILO/IPEC in Bangladesh. It focuses on children working in hazardous occupations under the most intolerable conditions ranging from expose to chemicals and other harmful substances to subject to long, tedious working hours. The project is operational in five prioritized informal and formal sectors, namely bidi industry, construction sector, leather tanneries, match factories and child domestic work sector. Building on the experience of the Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers and Exporters Association (BGMEA) project as well as taking a big leap in the overall efforts of the ILO/IPEC-Bangladesh, this hard-core project originally aims to remove about 30,000 children from hazardous occupations and to prevent another 15,000 younger siblings from taking their position in the labour market. Though it is quite ambitious, the project intends to achieve these goals through various strategies varying from providing social protection to monitoring workplaces and communities.

The broad objective of the project is to contribute to the systematic prevention and elimination of worst forms of child labour in Dhaka, Chittagong, Tangail, Rangpur, Kushtia, Narayanganj and Munshiganj. Specifically, the project is designed to achieve five immediate objectives as follows:

a) A strong foundation for the systematic prevention and elimination of worst forms of child labour in the selected sectors and regions will have been prepared through increased research and documentation;
b) The worst forms of child labour in the selected sectors and regions will have been substantially reduced through the direct action programs aimed at withdrawal, social protection and rehabilitation of at least 30,887 children in a time-bound and systematic manner;
c) At least (6,021) younger siblings will have been prevented from entering the worst forms of child labour through economic empowerment of parents and the introduction of a continuous mechanism for workplace and community monitoring;
d) Instances of commitment made and action taken against the worst forms of child labour by the government, social partners, families, communities and the general public, jointly and separately, will have been increased through advocacy and awareness raising; and
e) The capacity of government, in particular the Ministry of Labour and Employment (MOLE), in addressing the worst forms of child labour country-wide will have been increased through the strengthened institutional capability and updated national statistics on the child labour situation.

According to Chapter 8: Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting of the Action Program Summary Outline (APSO), the program is to undertake mid-term evaluation to assess the soundness of intervention approach and strategies, effectiveness and efficiency in delivering outputs, extent of the achievement of program objectives, and potential impact on target groups. The results of mid-term self-evaluation will provide the basis for fine tuning, refocusing and reinforcing of approach and strategies of the Project, in particular when

formulating the second phase with much broader scope in addressing the worst forms of child labour. It will also highlight instances of good practices and lessons learned for further emulation by the Time Bound Program (TBP) and other similar IPEC programs. The stakeholders will have opportunity to reflect their views and concerns on the results of evaluation and future course of actions to be taken by the Project management. Hence, the prospect for the Project to embark on the second phase will hinge upon the overall performance and the promising achivement of the current phase.

To date 25 Action Programs have been implementing various program components in bidi industry, construction sector, leather tanneries, match factories, child domestic workers, and National Child Labour Survey. The program areas are scattered over Dhaka, Chittagong, Tangail, Kushtia, Narayanganj, Munshiganj and Rangpur districts.

II. Scope and Purpose

The aim of the mid-term self-evaluation report is to improve our knowledge on programs towards the elimination of child labour and the protection of working children. Therefore, it is important to learn about your experience in the field of combating child labour and cooperating with ILO/IPEC. The evaluation will review the ongoing progress and performance of the program with the emphasis on:

- Validity of program approach and strategies and their potentiality to replicate;
- Extent of achievement of immediate objectives;
- Extent of major impacts made or likely to make on the target groups;
- Factors affecting program performance (negative and positive ones);
- Whether the program is still relevant or make sense;
- Effectiveness of the program in terms of using resources in producing the program results;
- Efficiency of program management against the delivery of program outputs in terms of quality and quantity;
- Contribution of the program in strengthening capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders;
- Contribution of the program in piloting and determining the most suitable implementation modalities for future programs (such as TBP); and
- Feasibility for progressing from sector-wise approach to an area-based approach.

In effect, the evaluation should examine the extent to which program activities have been geared to production the outputs and attainment of the immediate objectives as indicated in the program document. It will consider the implementation approach, and actual use of inputs compared with initial estimates. It also includes an investigation on nature and magnitude of constraints, and an analysis of factors contributed to the program's successes. Finally, it should identify the lessons learned, good practice, established mechanisms and their potential impact on policies and strategies to combat the worst form of child labour. The mid-term evaluation will cover the period from the inception of the program to December 2002.

III. Special Aspects to be addressed

In addition to the general concerns of program design, relevance, delivery, performance, cost effectiveness, feasibility and sustainability, the evaluation should critically explore the following issues:

- Whether it is feasible to gradually introduce area-based interventions for eliminating and preventing worst forms of child labour, in other words, the project extension to second phase;
- To what extent the grassroots institutions (not NGO) can be developed to take part in long- term child labour monitoring; and
- Whether the economic empowerment of the family and contribution of women help eliminating the worst forms of child labour in a short time and on sustainable basis.

IV. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation will be carried out in the following manner:

- Reviewing of documents (action program document, technical and financial reports, Income Generating Activity (IGA) training reports, etc);
- Reviewing and assessing feedback from the program areas the quality and quantity of outputs and services delivered by the programs;
- Interviewing and meeting with key stakeholders including Program Facilitating Committee (PFC) members, parents, target children, workers and employers;
- Organizing local stakeholders' meeting; and
- Preparing the self-evaluation report.
-

V. Composition of evaluation team

The evaluation exercise will be undertaken by the program staff heading by Action Program Coordinator (APC) or Program Monitor (PM), where the former is not available, with the involvement and support from program monitor, community mobilizers and social monitor.

VI. Timetable

The mid-term self evaluation process is expected to complete within one month starting from 16 November 2002. The report of the self-evaluation has to be submitted to the Program Office by 31December 2002 the latest.

VII. Outline of Evaluation Report

- Summary of findings and recommendations (1-2 pages)
- Introduction (1/2 - 1 page)
- Program design (3 - 4 pages)

  - Local socio-economic and cultural context; (1 page)
  - Adequacy of problem analysis (1/2 - 1 page)
  - Development and Immediate objectives (1/2 page)
  - Overall validity of program design (1/2 – 1 page)

- Program implementation – **specific** (10 - 15 pages)

  - Local institutional arrangement
  - Target groups
  - Activities
  - Outputs
  - Management and coordination
  - External factors

- Performance - **overall** (10 – 15 pages)

  - Relevance
  - Effectiveness
  - Sustainability
  - Efficiency
  - Alternative strategies

- Special aspects (5 pages)

  - Feasibility for area-based elimination of the worst forms of child labour
  - Ownership of grassroot institution in child labour monitoring
  - Contribution of women in eliminating child labour

- Findings, conclusion and recommendations (5 pages)
- Lessons learned (1-2 pages)
- Good practices (2 pages)
- Annexes

VIII. Guide to Preparation of Mid-term Self-Evaluation

The report must cover the following elements: General Information on the Action Program and the Implementing agency; Information on Outputs and Inputs; Information on the Types of intervention; Information on the Target Groups; Information on the Objectives; Special Concerns; Corrective Action, Lesson Learned, and Good Practice.

General Information on the Action Program and the Implementing Agency

1. Provide the following information on the Action Program

Title of the Action Program:

Location of the Action Program:

Name of the implementing agency:

Local address of the implementing agency:

Street:
City:
Tel: Fax:
E-mail:

Budget of Action Program (in US$):

Period covered by this report:

From (actual starting date) to (day-month-year):

Name, signature of the accredited official of the Implementing Agency of the Action Program: and Date:

2. Describe the nature of the Implementing Agency (whether it is a national level, regional/provincial level, local/community level, other (please specify) NGO.

Information on the Types of Intervention Strategies and Activities

3. Give description on main types of intervention (outputs, activities) carried out under the Action Program. Structure the description of the outputs and activities by grouping them according to the types of interventions provided in the box below.

Broad type of intervention activities*	
Withdrawal of children from hazardous work	Networking/ Coordination activities (parent group meeting, Focus Group Discussion (FGD), etc)
Improvement of working conditions	Research
Non-formal education for working children	Formation of IGA/self-help groups
Pre-vocational training for working children Vocational training for working children	Support Services (healthcare, medicine, nutrition, shelter, counselling, hot line facility)
Establishing/Strengthening institutional/ organisational arrangements on child labour (e.g. setting up a child labour unit, PFC, Child brigade, etc.)	Awareness raising (newspaper, TV, radio, posters, leaflet, wall painting etc.)
Improvement of law enforcement	Others
IGA training parents Micro-credit for parents	.....

***** See XI: Key intervention components

Activities

Each activity listed in the APSO should be discussed, in the same order, noting whether it is or has been:

- completed
- on schedule
- not yet scheduled to begin
- delayed in start
- underway, but behind schedule
- underway, but below planned level
- cancelled

If the implementation is less than satisfactory, the reasons thereof, the corrective action taken and the degree of success of the corrective action should be indicated. Recommendations for the improvement or change in the activities may be incorporated in the discussion.

Information on Outputs and Inputs

4. Describe whether the Action Program produced the outputs as planned in the APSO. If there have been any major changes during the lifetime of the Action Program, explain the reasons for and the nature of these changes and how these have affected the outcome of the Action Program. Also describe about the qualities and quantity of outputs and their contribution (impact) to the objectives.

5. Describe whether the inputs of the organisations participating in the Action Program (IPEC, Implementing agency, possible other organisations) have been provided according to plan. (Explain problems, if any, and describe what was done to solve them)

6. Describe whether the budget allocation has been sufficient or whether a budget revision was undertaken. In case of a budget revision (increase or decrease in budget or major shifts between budget lines) specify the purpose.

Information on the Target Groups

7. Describe the group(s) of working children covered by the Action Program.

   Please fill in the attached tables on target, achievement, and progress (Annex I). In the main text, please give a brief qualitative description of other important characteristics about working children you have reached through the Action Program (such as type of work, relation with employer and working conditions; possible gender differences; location; ethnicity and social background as appropriate).

   Describe the main characteristics of the working children, who will ultimately benefit from the Action Program. Specify economic sectors, such as type of work, relation with employer and working conditions; and possible gender differences; location; ethnicity and social background as appropriate.

8. List the other stakeholders- intermediate partner groups- (persons who participate in any activity of the Action Programme and who are not working children e.g. parents, members of employers' organisations, trade union, local administrators, local politician, teachers, etc). Describe how they have participated in the Action Program. For each intermediate partner group indicate whether their contribution has been positive, negative, important or not important.

9. What are the views of the working children and/or the intermediate partner group(s) on the usefulness of the outputs of the Action Program in meeting their needs?

10. Describe the effects of the Action Program on the situation of the working children and/or the intermediate partner group(s).

Information on the Objectives

11. List the objectives of the Action Program as stated in the APSO. If the initial objectives had to be revised or modified during implementation specify the type of changes and the reasons.

12. Describe the progress made towards the achievements of the objectives and specify major accomplishments and/or drawbacks.

General implementation factors

13. To the extent that these factors are not specifically covered in response to sections mentioned above, the following should be addressed:

    (a) Program strategy – have there been any major changes in the strategy followed during the program life? If so, why?

    (b) Program management – what, if any, have been the primary management problems encountered in the course of the program?

    (c) Administrative support and backstopping – what, if any, have been the primary administrative support and backstopping (by parent organization and ILO-IPEC) problems encountered in the course of the program?

    (d) External factors – to what extent have external factors (uncontrollable) identified in program proved to the valid? Have unexpected events favoured or delayed achievement of objectives? Were these events unique or might they have been anticipated?

Special Concerns

14. <u>Priority groups in US-DOL IPEC project are children working under hazardous conditions, girls and children especially under 15 years old. Please specify whether and how the Action Program has specially addressed these groups.</u>

15. How has your Action Program contributed towards the elimination of child labour and protection of working children in the wider context of your working area? (For example: explain the impact of awareness raising

campaigns, possibilities for replication of the Action Programs approach, demonstration effects of your Action Program etc.)

16. How could the achievements of the Action Program be made sustainable, i.e. to what extent are the effects and impact of the action Program durable after withdrawal of IPEC funds? What are arrangements for the future of young siblings, and those who are studying at the Non Formal Education (NFE), who have completed pre-vocational and vocational trainings? (Please specify if institutional arrangements have been made and if personnel or other resources will be available to assure the continuation of the activities)

17. Describe whether the technical and administrative support received by IPEC was adequate or not. Describe whether it was positive, insufficient or negative and make suggestions for improvement, if any.

18. List the factors which you consider to have contributed most to the success of the Action Program (main success factors) or which have put the success of the Action Program most at risk (main risk factors).

Corrective Action

19. State the actions that are indicated by your assessment including any possible revision to (parts of) of the Action Program and the workplan.

Lessons Learned

20. Lessons learned can be defined as a generalization based on an experience of the program which was evaluated (the ultimate expression of evaluation results). It is the learning that is applicable to a generic situation rather than to a specific circumstances. It is the lesson to be produced (distilled or extracted) from the documented experience. Lessens learned point out what is very likely to happen and/or what should be done to make something happen, or prevent it from happening. The lessons drawn from evaluation should high light the strengths and weaknesses (both positive and negative aspects) in program implementation that affected performance and impact. (Kindly provide details in 1-2 pages).

Some brief examples of lessons learned:

- Lack of precision in the identification and description of the intended beneficiaries at the program implementation may lead to uncertainty among program and counterpart staff as to the identity of the intended beneficiaries. This situation may result in benefits accruing to people other than those whom were originally intended.

- The provision of credit combined with training on small enterprise development and credit management is a successful strategy for increasing the income earning opportunities of target

*groups who are resource-poor and have had no, or limited, access to education or skill training. (**Warning**: do not try to copy this example as lessons learned of your AP).*

Good Practice

21. Good practice is a documented specific case, situation, strategies or tactics that work and contribute to the desirable outcomes. It is the continuous process of learning, feedback, reflection and analysis of what works (or does not work) and why. It encompasses key crucial factors, process, and condition leading to an achievement of ultimate objective (impact), which can be emulated in the same or similar environment. (Please provide at least 2 pages with details on background, intervention process and outcomes base on fact and figures).

An example of good practice: Slum Improvement Project in Dhaka Metropolitan City - Bangladesh

Dhaka is one of the fastest growing mega-cities in the world. Slums pose one of the biggest problems of the city. Around 12 per cent of the total population of the Dhaka city live in slum areas, which are very densely populated with a population density of 750 people per hectare. These areas have few or no basic utility services, including portable water, sanitation, drainage, etc. Slum Improvement Project (SIP) under the Local Government Engineering Department (LGED) was established in 1985 in five municipalities to address the social and environmental problems affecting slum dwellers.

Through Slum Improvement Project (SIP) participatory approach, the Local Authority has made a breakthrough in providing an integrated package of basic physical, social and economic infrastructure services to the urban poor. Of all SIP components, the micro-credit program has been found to be particularly successful and most attractive. Many poor households have increased their income using this facility. The SIP has significantly raised levels of awareness particularly in health and sanitation among slum dwellers, resulting in significant reductions in the incidence of numerous diseases. The SIP has empowered poor women through community involvement, particularly through the savings and credit program, thereby realizing the overall status of women in families and communities.

IX. Assessment of Program Performance

Please provide evidence of your assessment whenever possible. For example **a statement like the following should not stand on its own**: *"The non-formal education centre was very successful and the children were very pleased with the quality of the teaching."* You should indicate how and why you reached this conclusion. Possible indicators for the *success of a non-formal education centre* could be the *enrolment of a considerable number of previously working children*, the *increasing demand of parents of working children to enrol these children in the centre, a low drop-out rate, and the academic achievement of learned children(learning ability)*. The *positive feeling* of the children could be indicated by their *regular attendance, active participation in the classes, and their educational prospect.*

1. **General**

(a) Immediate objective achievement - effectiveness
To what extent has the program achieved, or is it likely to achieve, its immediate objective?

(b) Achievement of immediate objective indicators/success criteria (given in program document) as compared to plan.

(c) Actual or potential impact
To what extent has the program had, or is it likely to have, an impact on the target group/development objective? What are the potential changes in situation the program is going to create?

(d) Program relevance/significance
In the light of the conditions prevailing at the time of the evaluation, does the program continue to make as much sense as it did at the time it was conceived?

(e) Efficiency
Do the actual or anticipated program results continue to justify the cost?

(f) Are there now, or are there likely to be any important unanticipated effects, either positive or negative?

(g) To what extent are the assumptions/external factors which underlie the program still valid? If they are not, what effect is this likely to have on objective achievement?

(h) Are there any obvious alternative approaches?
Is there now, or would there have been, a more effective or more efficient way to approach the problem?

2. **Cultural and socio-economic factors**

To what extent is this program affecting cultural and/or socio-economic aspects (other than those directly intended and discussed elsewhere) on either the target group or others, in respect to:

- the status of women or other sub-groups
- shifts in patterns of work
- changes in kinship and family structures
- popular participation
- leisure and its enjoyment
- human rights

3. **Findings and Recommendations**

In this section, provide a recapitulation of the program achievements to date, including an analysis of how and to what extent the results to date have contributed or

are contributing to the accomplishment of the APSO's immediate and development objectives.

In addition, discuss the following aspects, as appropriate:

3.1 Program objectives

What, if any, changes are necessary or desirable in the program objectives? What changes of indicators of program achievement are called for? (interim evaluation only).

3.2 Program implementation

What, if any, actions or changes are necessary or desirable in connection with program implementation, i.e. inputs to be provided, activities to be undertaken or outputs to be produced?

3.3 Program performance

What, if any actions or changes are necessary or desirable to enhance the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the program?

3.4 Program strategy

Are there any recommendations of a general nature regarding the strategy to be followed in similar programs in the future?

3.5 Management

What recommendations can be made to improve management of this, or future, programs?

3.6 Administrative support and backstopping

What recommendations are made to ILO-IPEC or governments to improve support and backstopping of this or future programs?

3.7 External conditions

What particular conditions or events should be specifically considered in planning future programs of the same type or in the same area?

3.8 General comments

On the basis of the experience with the program, what factors not covered above should be kept in mind in planning future programs of this type or in the same area?

X. Suggested questions to be addressed in assessing the main evaluation concerns*

Validity of Design

- Are the objectives clearly stated, describing the solutions to the identified problems and needs?
- Are the indicators of achievement clearly defined, describing the changes to be brought about?
- Have the external factors affecting program implementation been identified and assumptions proven valid?
- Is the Action Program logical and coherent linking the inputs, activities and outputs to each immediate objective?
- Are the roles and commitment of the various partners clearly defined?
- Is there any reason to revise it?

Delivery Process

- Has the overall execution of the program focused on the achievement of the objectives?
- Have the various partners contributed to program implementation as planned;
- Have the main partners interacted and coordinated as planned?

Performance

Relevance

- Do the problems/needs that gave rise to the program still exist, have they changed or are there new needs that should be addressed?
- Was the program an appropriate response to the problems/needs that existed when it started?
- Is it still appropriate to the problems/needs?
- Have the priorities given to the basic components of the program, i.e. institutional development versus direct support, changed? If so, why?
- Are the objectives still valid or should they be reformulated?

Effectiveness

- To what extent has the program achieved its immediate objective(s)?
- Have data been collected by the program on the indicators of achievement? Do they provide adequate evidence regarding the effects and impact of the program? Is it necessary to collect additional data?
- Did the target group participate in the formulation and implementation of the program?
- Have the benefits of the program accrued to the target group?

XI. Key intervention components of AP

1. Advocacy and awareness raising:
    - Door to door visit
    - Monthly coordination meeting with parents

* These questions are illustrative and should be used as a "model" not as a "blue print". They should be adapted to the characteristics and features of each project. Evaluators are encouraged to address any questions that they consider relevant to the evaluation, even if they were not included in the terms of reference.

- Seminar and meeting on worst forms of child labour
- Organizing peer group (e.g. peer educator, child brigades)
- Focus group discussions
- Social mobilization (local administration, local elites, school teachers, religious leaders, local politician, workers and employers)
- Distribution of awareness raising material
- Putting up of billboard and wall painting
- Street drama performance
- VDO shows
- Rallies
- Day observance

2. Education and vocational training:
    - Non-formal education (including curriculum used)
    - Provision of moral and value counseling to children
    - Mainstreaming into formal education
    - After school coaching
    - Prevocational training
    - Vocational training
    - Job placement for adult children

3. Family economic empowerment:
    - Parent group formation
    - IGA trainings
    - Saving groups
    - Credit disbursement
    - Credit repayment
    - IGA performance and economic well-being

4. Health and environment (sickness, disease, vaccination/ inoculation, recreation)
    - Working children
    - Parents
    - Young sibling
    - Recreational/VDO shows activities

5. Workplace monitoring
    - PFC
    - Community (including public administrators, workers, employers, etc)
    - Database
    - Factory visits
    - Family visits
    - Signing of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)