International
Labour
Organization

REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT FINAL EVALUATION

Trafficking and other Worst Forms of Child Labour in Central and Eastern Europe, Phase II (PROTECT-CEE)

Stéphane Jeannet
Human Solutions Consulting – Geneva

International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)

This document has not been professionally edited

Table of contents

List of acronyms iv

Acknowledgements 1

Executive summary 2

1. Introduction 5

1.1 Scope and purpose of the evaluation 5

1.1.1. Scope 5

1.1.2. Purpose 5

2. Methodology 6

2.1. Desk review 6

2.2. Field visits 6

2.3. Stakeholders' workshops 6

3. Aspects examined by the evaluation 6

4. History of the project 6

5. Relevance of the Project 7

5.1. Design and Planning 8

5.1.1. Design 8

5.1.2. External factors 10

5.1.3. The project's sub-regional nature 10

5.2. Effectiveness 11

5.3. Partnerships 16

5.4. Efficiency of the projects 17

5.5. Sustainability 18

6. Conclusions 20

7. Recommendations 21

Annexes *22*

1. List of interviews and places visited *22*

2. Presentation of the evaluator *32*

3. Terms of reference of the evaluation *33*

List of acronyms

AP	*Action Programme*
CLMS	*Child Labour Monitoring System*
CSO	*Civil society organisation*
CTA	*Chief Technical Adviser*
DWCP	*Decent Work Country Programme*
ILO	*International Labour Organization*
IO	*Immediate Objective*
IPEC	*International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (ILO)*
LAC	*Local Action Committees*
M&E	*Monitoring and Evaluation*
MDT	*Multidisciplinary Teams*
MOLSAEO	*Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs*
MOU	*Memorandum of Understanding*
NGO	*Non-governmental Organisation*
NPM	*National Programme Manager*
NSC	*National Steering Committee*
PO	*Programme Officer*
SCREAM	*Supporting Children's Rights through Education, Arts and Media*
SIMPOC	*Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour*
SPIF	*Strategic Programme Impact Framework*
TBP	*Time Bound Programme*
UN	*United Nations*
UNFPA	*United Nations Population Fund*
UNICEF	*United Nations Children's Funds*
USD	*US Dollars*
USDOL	*United States Department of Labor*
WFCL	*Worst Forms of Child Labour*

Acknowledgements

The evaluator wishes to thank all the project staff for their assistance in organising the logistics for his missions, as well as for ensuring that he could meet a representative sample of the stakeholders involved in the project.

Executive summary

1. *The evaluator reached the conclusion that the project had been relatively well designed, although a proper baseline and/or needs-assessment should have been conducted. With regard to the validity of the project approach and strategies, and their potential to replicate, evidence shows positive indicators. There was however lack of clarity with regard to the magnitude of the trafficking phenomenon. During his missions, the consultant could only collect anecdotal direct evidence of actual cases of trafficking in the targeted locations. In contrast, the problem of child labour in all targeted countries was much more obvious to the observer. The relevance and effectiveness of the project would have benefitted from a clearer analysis of the specific challenges faced by national and ethnic minorities.*

2. *The time frame for project implementation and the sequencing of project activities was logical but in some cases not realistic. Indeed, changing mentalities and fostering institutional and legal change requires relatively long time spans, particularly in transition countries where frequent political crises are likely to stall reforms. The most successful projects occurred in countries which had had the chance to benefit from successive ILO- IPEC projects over a sufficient time-span, such as Romania. In such cases, change was allowed to occur in a gradual and organic manner, as opposed to be rushed over a short period (which lessens chances of ownership and appropriation). Obviously, delays in initiating projects and gaps between the implementation of the Action Programmes (AP) including direct services planned in the two phases of the project had a noticeable negative impact on progress. Some organisations and stakeholders in the interim did manage to continue certain activities by themselves, albeit at a much lower level.*

3. *Although political and institutional instability was taken into consideration in the design of the project, the magnitude of such instability in the course of implementation could not have realistically been foreseen. In fact, elections, changes of/within governments, blockages within parliaments, high turnover of key personnel within administrations, restructuring of government agencies, among other factors of disruption, clearly hampered the timely and efficient implementation of the projects in most targeted countries. The global financial crisis also had an impact on the situation of the targeted countries. The project nevertheless usually managed to deal with them in an appropriate manner.*

4. *The regional approach of the project presented, in balance, more advantages than disadvantages. The design of the project's sub-regional nature seemed to be logical, even if the contexts in the target countries were quite different. The major such difference is the membership of two countries in the European Union; it must be noted, however, that membership has so far not drastically had an impact on the phenomenon of WFCL in these countries; it has however provided access to a wider-ranging set of assistance packages. Contingent upon the availability of funds, the coordinators of the regional project could have created more opportunities for knowledge-sharing and coaching between countries. Although centralised coordination based in Bucharest made sense in terms of rationalisation of administrative and other procedures, it did also create an additional bureaucratic layer between the field and ILO headquarters, which in turn at times considerably slowed down processes such as approval of budgets. On the positive side, the centralisation of reporting had a positive impact on the standardisation and overall quality of the TPRs.*

5. *The project reached its quantitative targets in terms of direct beneficiaries – with the exception of Kosovo, which missed its target by 100, as well as the case of Romania, which exceeded its target. Use of ILO-IPEC tools by governmental agencies, trade unions, state service providers and NGOs in different projects and training programmes have been actively and successfully promoted by the project. The evaluator was generally impressed with the project's successes at the local level in raising awareness about child labour and in promoting social mobilization to address this issue. The majority of persons who had contact with the project declared having changed their vision of child labour as a result of activities such as training on CLMS.*

6. *The CLMS concept, as it is promoted in the region, is likely to prove relevant to the establishment of referral systems for children involved in WFCL or at risk of entering WFCL. Whereas pilots have proved that the model was feasible at the local level, a number of other factors (e.g. political will, funding, etc.) must obviously be taken into consideration. The evaluator noted a generally good level of ownership of the LACs, with some individual members showing commitment beyond expectations, but also with some exception.*

7. *In most instances, the LACs allowed stakeholders to build bridges between the different entities, for instance between local authorities (e.g. social services and the police) and civil society organisations. The same was true for closer relations between teachers and parents. The project contributed to overcome the frequent initial resistance to work together. The evaluator was positively impressed by the results obtained by peer educators.*

8. *The evaluator determined that the effectiveness of the project's strategies to raise awareness, including the Supporting Children's Rights through Education, Arts and Media (SCREAM) methodology was generally good, and in some cases excellent.*

9. *The evaluator was generally impressed by the degree of expertise and commitment of the implementing agencies. This appears to be attributable to two factors: the selected agencies were well-established organisations or institutions with a solid track-record of working for the protection children; and/or they had been involved in phase I of the project, during which they had been thoroughly trained and had proved their ability to work to the satisfaction of ILO-IPEC.*

10. *The expected outputs were in the majority of cases delivered in a timely manner, with the appropriate quantity and quality. In some cases where poverty was prevalent and social services were weak, it was made clear that educational services, in and by themselves, were not sufficient to achieve the project's objectives. As far as the evaluator could determine, the project made efficient use of resources and of the mechanisms in place for project monitoring. The Direct Beneficiary Monitoring and Reporting (DBMR) was perceived as process-oriented and its value-added was questioned, in particular because it did not build on information required in the TPR. The fact that it does not include software was also considered as a weak point. The capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners to develop effective action against child labour was generally enhanced as a result of project activities.*

11. *The project managed in some countries to mainstream CLMS in a number of national strategies, laws, institutions and action plans. A strategy for sustainability of achievements was defined clearly at the design stage of the project, but it did not sufficiently take into account the differences in contexts in the targeted countries. This fact was compounded by the fact that the formulation of an exit strategy was in most cases left for the very last period of the project. In countries which had started activities with a considerable delay, such an approach did make sense in view of the short time-span of the projects. More generally, interlocutors at*

country-level felt uneasy about mentioning an exit strategy while the implementation of action programmes was at its peak.

1. Introduction

1.1 Scope and purpose of the evaluation

1.1.1. Scope

12. *The final evaluation covers the ILO-IPEC PROTECT project components funded by USDOL and Germany. It focuses on the project's achievements and its contribution to the overall national efforts to achieve the elimination of WFCL.*

13. *The scope of the present ILO-IPEC evaluation includes all project activities to date including Action Programmes. The evaluation looks at the project as a whole, including issues of initial project design, implementation, lessons learnt, replicability and recommendations for future projects/programmes. While the primary focus of the evaluation is on Phase II of the programme, it is also important to link back to Phase I in providing an assessment of the overall legacy and contribution of ILO-IPEC so that a comprehensive view and assessment of the time frame required for effective support to countries can be provided.*

14. *The evaluation emphasizes the assessment of key aspects of the programme, such as strategy, implementation, and achievement of objectives. It assesses the effect and impact of the work carried out during the implementation phase, using data collected on the indicators of achievement. It also evaluates the effectiveness, relevance, and elements of sustainability of the programme activities carried out.*

1.1.2. Purpose

15. *The evaluation was conducted with the purpose of drawing lessons from the experiences gained during the period of implementation. It shows how these lessons can be applied in other planned ILO-IPEC interventions in the broader terms of action against child labour in the context of sector specific programmes and those on trafficking in particular.*

16. *In addition, the evaluation is intended to serve to document potential good practices, lessons learned, and models of interventions developed in this cycle of the project. It will serve as an important information base for key stakeholders and decision makers regarding any policy decisions for future subsequent activities in the country.*

17. *The results of the evaluation are intended to be used as part of strategic planning and possible orientation for further phases of the various projects, including models of interventions. The results should also be used by ILO-IPEC to design future programmes and allocate resources. Recommendations are intended to be specifically made for follow up action on areas/sectors where ILO-IPEC technical and financial assistance may still be needed (Albania, Kosovo, Moldova and Ukraine) and for future actions against child labour to be taken by the key stakeholders after the phase out of ILO/IPEC projects in Bulgaria and Romania.*

2. Methodology

2.1. Desk review

18. *The evaluation started with a desk review of appropriate material, including the project documents, progress reports, outputs of the project and action programmes, results of internal planning processes, the draft report of the mid-term evaluation, as well as relevant materials from secondary sources.*

19. *During his first mission, the evaluator had a telephone interview with the USDOL Desk Officer in charge of the project.*

2.2. Field visits

20. *After the desk review, the evaluation consisted missions to Albania, Kosovo, Moldova, Ukraine, Bulgaria and Romania, which included field visits to project locations to interview the following types of actors:*

- *Project management and staff*
- *Partner/implementing agencies*
- *Social partners Employers' and Workers' groups*
- *Boys and girls*
- *Parents of boys and girls*
- *Teachers, educators/psychologists*
- *Local Action Committees*
- *Government representatives, both at the central and local levels*
- *National Steering Committee*
- *Representative of the US Government*

2.3. Stakeholders' workshops

21. *The evaluation methodology included a half day stakeholder workshop in each country. The workshop was attended by ILO-IPEC staff and key partners in order to gather further data and present the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations and obtain feedback. Representatives of US Embassies attended in Romania and Bulgaria. The workshop took place towards the end of each country fieldwork. The results of the workshop are taken into consideration for the preparation of the present draft report.*

3. Aspects examined by the evaluation

22. *The evaluator made a preliminary selection and adaptation of suggested questions annexed to the evaluation Terms of Reference. Some questions were considered redundant and duplicates were therefore dropped. It must be stressed that the methodology and proposed programme of the evaluation focused mainly on partners and beneficiaries, whereas other stakeholders (e.g. other organisations working in the same or similar fields) were only marginally included. This obviously had an influence on the questions that could be addressed by the evaluation.*

4. History of the project

23. *Albania, the Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine participated in the first phase of an ILO/IPEC project,* ***Combating Trafficking in Children for Labour and Sexual Exploitation in the Balkans and Ukraine (PROTECT Phase I)****. The first phase project, funded by USDOL and Germany ended in January 2007. Since 2004, the*

activities of the project have been implemented together with other projects, under a common programming framework, Project of Technical assistance for the Elimination of Child labour, including Trafficking, in countries of Central and Eastern Europe (PROTECT CEE) – with the same management structure, and complementary upstream work / direct services. These projects have included Country Programmes for Albania and Ukraine, and a sub-regional programme on the WFCL funded by Germany which closed in June 2008. The Bulgarian and Kosovo components included as part of the Phase II present project are managed under the same programming framework, and implementing similar activities. Resource mobilisation efforts were included in the project design to generate additional resources to complement the project activities.

Objectives of phase II of the project

DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE

To contribute to the reduction and elimination of trafficking and other WFCL in Albania, Bulgaria, Kosovo, Moldova, Romania and Ukraine.

IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVES

Immediate Objective One: At the end of the project, country wide up-scaling of IPEC models of prevention/identification/referral and rehabilitation/tracking, through capacity building of institutions and greater involvement of employers will have increased the outreach of institutions for the elimination of child labour.

Immediate Objective Two: At the end of the project, 4500 children will have been either prevented or withdrawn from the Worst Forms of Child Labour in sectors/areas previously not addressed by IPEC interventions.

Immediate Objective Three: At the end of the project, mainstreaming of WFCL into national policies and legislation, and awareness raising/mobilisation activities will have supported an increase of resources allocated to the elimination of the worst forms of child labour.

5. Relevance of the Project

24. *With regard to the validity of the project approach and strategies, and their potential to replicate, evidence shows positive indicators as will be shown in the present report. There was however lack of clarity with regard to the magnitude of the trafficking phenomenon. This is partly due to the fact that data on the number of victims tend to be unreliable, subject to interpretation and vary according to the source used. During his missions, the consultant could only collect anecdotal evidence of actual cases of trafficking in the targeted locations. In contrast, the problem of child labour in all targeted countries was much more obvious to the observer.*

25. *The strategies addressed the root causes of trafficking and other worst forms of child labour – e.g. gender inequality and poverty as well as lack of education and skills training. It must be pointed out, however, that the time-span of the project and the budget at their disposal was sufficient only to scratch the surface of the immense and complex root-causes of the phenomena.*

26. *The evaluator is asked in the Terms of Reference to assess the appropriateness of the sectors/target groups and locations chosen to develop the project based on the finding of baseline surveys. As outlined below in the section on design (in particular paragraph 34), it must be pointed out that proper baseline surveys were not carried out prior to initiating the project. Sectors/target groups and locations were rather chosen further to less*

in-depth (yet useful) examination of the different situations – see textbox below. This is not to say that the priorities of the project were irrelevant, but rather that more in-depth analysis may have resulted in different choices. In some countries, for example, more emphasis may have been placed on rural forms of child labour as opposed to urban one – the latter being more visible and easily accessible for projects.

Examples of consultations and research having guided the project design

The sectors/target groups, priorities and pilot areas for Phase II were decided upon based on consultations with stakeholders in the six project countries during National Stakeholders' Workshops held before the start of the project. The outcome trees designed in the initial SPIF workshops held in Phase I (2004) were further used by the stakeholders to review the achievements and shortcomings since the first SPIF workshops. More specifically they served as a basis to define national outputs, activities, indicators, the sectors and geographical areas of intervention, target groups and types of interventions for Phase II. These workshops a/ reviewed the status of the country specific objectives defined during the SPIF workshops held in 2004, b/ provided feedback to the findings of the PROTECT CEE Evaluation Report for Phase I, and c/ proposed further actions, the sectors and areas of interventions to combat the WFCL, including child trafficking, in every country.

ILO-IPEC implemented activities in the six project countries based on research findings carried out in the beginning of Phase II: Surveys on Child Labour in Agriculture and a Study on Juvenile Justice System in Bulgaria, a Research on Hazards to which Child Workers Are Exposed in the Agricultural Sector in Moldova, a Baseline Survey on Hazardous Child Labour in Agriculture and a Mapping of Services for Street Children in Romania, and OSH Survey on Risks and Hazards of Child Labour in Ukraine. Moreover, during the period 1999-2004, national household surveys and rapid assessments/rapid assessment surveys/baseline surveys/studies on trafficking in children, street children, rural child labour, Roma children, national legislation were conducted in Albania, Bulgaria, Moldova, Romania and Ukraine.

5.1. Design and Planning

5.1.1. Design

27. *The internal logic (link between objectives achieved through implementation of activities) of the project and the external logic of the project (degree to which the project fits into existing activities that would impact on child labour) made perfect sense both to stakeholders interviewed and to the evaluator.*

28. *The project design adequately took into account the institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders. Evidence of this will be provided in later sections dealing with partnerships, including with regard to ownership and appropriation of projects by stakeholders.*

29. *A substantial effort was apparently made to learn lessons from the first phase of the project and incorporate them into the project design – see for instance textbox in paragraph 27 above.*

30. *The time frame for project implementation and the sequencing of project activities was logical but in some cases not realistic. Indeed, changing mentalities and fostering institutional and legal change requires relatively long time spans, particularly in transition countries where frequent political crises are likely to stall reforms. The most successful projects occurred in countries which had had the chance to benefit from successive ILO- IPEC projects over a sufficient time-span, such as Romania. In such cases, change was allowed to occur in a gradual and organic manner, as opposed to be rushed over a short period as shown here below (which lessens chances of ownership and appropriation).*

31. *Obviously, delays in initiating projects and gaps between the implementation of the Action Programmes (AP) including direct services planned in the two phases of the project had a noticeable negative impact on progress. For instance, Bulgaria started late and APs lasted only 13 months, which was considered insufficient by stakeholders. In Albania, a gap of 20 months occurred between the APs of the two phases – a mere 9 months for phase two. Some organisations and stakeholders in the interim did manage to continue certain activities by themselves, albeit at a much lower level.*

32. *The targeted countries all face problems related to national and/or ethnic minorities. Among those, the Roma are the most disenfranchised and vulnerable. This factor, however, was not sufficiently included in the design of the project and the specific problems of such groups were not duly taken into consideration in the approach. Having done so may have made the APs more relevant. Furthermore, an explicit strategy may have created opportunities to link the project to existing regional initiatives such as the Decade for Roma Education or EU programmes, as well as to national strategies.*

33. *Given that there were no real baseline surveys or in-depth needs assessments to speak of prior to the designing of the project, quantitative targets by country seem to have been established in a rather arbitrary manner (see also paragraph 27 above). In other words, the numbers of beneficiaries were assigned without properly matching them to the reality on the ground. For the second phase of the project, a decision was taken at the design phase to increase the number of target beneficiaries to be reached but the budget was not proportionally increased accordingly. This change was not always understood by project staff and stakeholders at country level.*

34. *The strategy used in this project fits in with the DWCPs (see textbox below) and national education and anti-poverty efforts. The evaluator's assessment with regard to the degree to which the project fit in with interventions carried out by other organizations varied widely from country to country. Indeed, coordination both with national and international organisations depended on a number of internal and external factors, such as the readiness of other organisations to cooperate and the degree to which national project staff attempted to coordinate with them – see also below the section on partnerships.*

Prevention and elimination of WFCL was mainstreamed into:

- *Decent Work Country Programme Albania 2008-2010*
- *Decent Work Agenda Bulgaria 2008-2009*
- *Decent Work Country Programme Moldova 2008-2011*
- *Decent Work Agenda Romania 2008-2009*
- *Priorities for the Decent Work Country Programme Ukraine 2008-2011 (to be signed)*

35. *The project objectives and strategy were largely in line with the national policies, plans and strategies, and also with the priorities / outcomes identified by the tripartite national stakeholders for the Decent Work Country Programmes in Albania, Moldova and Ukraine, Decent Work Agendas in Bulgaria and Romania and the Sub-Regional and Kosovo Implementation Planning 2008-2009.*

36. *It is likely that the project in Bulgaria may have achieved better results if it had been allocated two staff members (as opposed to one), as in the other targeted countries.*

5.1.2. External factors

37. *Although political and institutional instability was taken into consideration in the design of the project, the magnitude of such instability in the course of implementation could not have realistically been foreseen. In fact, elections, changes of/within governments, blockages within parliaments, high turnover of key personnel within administrations, restructuring of government agencies, among other factors of disruption, clearly hampered the timely and efficient implementation of the projects in most targeted countries. For instance, the project in Albania had to deal with three successive Ministers of Labour in one year. In Romania, the Secretary of State in charge of labour resigned and, due to the political situation, the vast majority of project activities were frozen for several months; in total, the project had to deal with three secretaries of state in charge of child labour during the project's implementation.*

38. *The EU pre-accession process put a lot of pressure in Romania and Bulgaria to take action on the protection of children, in particular with regard to deinstitutionalisation. Pressure was also put with regard to combating child labour, albeit to a lesser extent.*

39. *The global financial crisis obviously had an impact on the situation of the targeted countries. Bankruptcy and budget cuts affected both the ability of governments to fulfil promises concerning the elimination of CL, as well as the vulnerability of the population. In this context, it is not out of the question that numbers of cases of CL increase.*

5.1.3. The project's sub-regional nature

40. *The design of the project's sub-regional nature seemed to be logical, even if the contexts in the target countries were quite different. The major such difference is the membership of two countries in the European Union; it must be noted, however, that membership has so far not drastically had an impact on the phenomenon of WFCL in these countries; it has however provided access to a wider-ranging set of assistance packages.*

41. *In terms of exchange of experience between target countries, the following examples can be noted:*

    - *Mission to Kosovo of the Project Coordinator of the ILO ACT/EMP Project in Moldova, representative of the National Employers Federation in Agriculture and Food Processing Industry of Moldova to share the experience in the formulation and promotion of a Code of Conduct against the WFCL for Employers in Agriculture and Food Processing Industry. This was financed by the RBSA project in Kosovo.*
    - *A study visit on the Child Labour Monitoring System[1] (CLMS) to Romania for a delegation from Kosovo.*

42. *Although these steps were positive, the evaluator is of the opinion that, contingent upon the availability of funds, the coordinators of the regional project could have created more opportunities for knowledge-sharing and coaching between countries. Likewise staff meeting (of national coordinators), which obviously contribute to peer-to-peer exchange, should have been more frequent (none took place in 2009); obviously, the absence of a specific budget dedicated to such meetings was an impediment.*

43. *Although centralised coordination based in Bucharest made sense in terms of rationalisation of administrative and other procedures, it did also create an additional bureaucratic layer between the field and ILO headquarters, which in turn at times considerably slowed down processes such as approval of budgets. On the*

[1] *IPEC model of identification, referral and tracking of children.*

positive side, the centralisation of reporting had a positive impact on the standardisation and overall quality of the TPRs.

5.2. Effectiveness

44. *The project reached (and often exceeded) its quantitative targets in terms of direct beneficiaries – with the exception of Kosovo, which missed its target by 100 and whose case is explained in section 5.4 below. A breakdown of the results is reproduced here below.*

CHILDREN DIRECT BENEFICIARIES, AS OF 16 OCTOBER 2009

4,585 children (2,039 girls and 2,546 boys) of which:

- *1,412 withdrawn from WFCL (559 girls and 853 boys)*
- *3,173 prevented to enter WFCL (1,480 girls and 1,693 boys)*

Breakdown per country

- *Albania – 685 children (271 withdrawn & 414 prevented)*
- *Bulgaria – 471 (88 withdrawn & 383 prevented)*
- *Kosovo – 555 children (192 withdrawn & 363 prevented)*
- *Moldova – 582 children (96 withdrawn & 486 prevented)*
- *Romania – 1,114 children (422 withdrawn & 692 prevented)*
- *Ukraine – 1,178 children (343 withdrawn & 835 prevented)*

Additional children direct beneficiaries (non-educational services only)

295 children (152 girls and 143 boys) of which:

- *12 withdrawn from WFCL (3 girls and 9 boys)*
- *283 prevented to enter WFCL (149 girls and 134 boys)*

45. *With regard to children indirect beneficiaries, the results, which the consultant finds appropriate (although the manner in which they were ascertained could be subject to discussion), are illustrated in the textbox below.*

CHILDREN INDIRECT BENEFICIARIES

***2,417,215 children** benefited from:*

- *Increased awareness at the community level*
- *Increased awareness after national-level campaigns*
- *Strengthening of education providers*
- *CLMS implementation*
- *Policy or legislation development and reform*
- *Other services provided by trained specialists*

46. *Use of ILO-IPEC tools by governmental agencies, trade unions, state service providers and NGOs in different projects and training programmes have been actively and successfully promoted by the project, as illustrated in the textbox below.*

ILO-IPEC TOOLS AND MODELS UP-SCALED

Albania

- ***CLMS Manual*** *used by the Ministry of Interior to mainstream CLMS multi-disciplinary approach into the National Anti-trafficking Strategy 2008-2014 for the cooperation between different institutions at local level with a focus on the modus operandi of LACs and MDTs.*

Bulgaria

- ***Manual for Professionals on CLMS*** *integrated in the agenda of the State Agency for Child Protection and used to establish a collaboration mechanism at local level to eliminate the WFCL.*

Kosovo

- ***Case Management Manual*** *used by the Centres for Social Work in the three areas to follow-up cases of WFCL and provide appropriate services.*

Moldova

- ***The Guidelines for Child Labour Monitoring in Moldova*** *used by the Ministry of Social Protection, Family and Child for training the members of the MDTs responsible for the National Referral System in two areas.*

Romania

- ***CLMS Practical Guide*** *approved by the National Authority for Protection of Children's Rights and used in its training programmes for the General Directorates for Social Assistance and Child Protection.*
- ***SCREAM package*** *recommended by Ministry of Education for use by the School Inspectorates and Children's Clubs network for non-formal education classes and extra-curricular activities.*

Ukraine

- ***SCREAM package*** *recommended by the Ministry of Education and Science and used for teachers' training in three regions.*
- ***Life Skills Manual*** *recommended by the Ministry of Education and Science and used by the practical psychologists working with children in orphanages and used by the Donetsk Teachers' Training Institute for Professional Development.*
- ***Manual on Psycho-Social Rehabilitation of Children Withdrawn from Trafficking and Other WFCL*** *recommended by the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine and used by Centers of Applied Psychology and Social Work in 27 regions of Ukraine.*

47. *The evaluator was generally impressed with the project's successes at the local level in raising awareness about child labour and in promoting social mobilization to address this issue. Awareness-raising about the hazards of child labour in agriculture proved more challenging than urban CL, primarily because of deep-seated traditions with regard to participation of children in chores around the farm and in the fields. APs nevertheless did manage to ensure, at least in the short-term, that most of these children attend school. This was achieved though a number of steps, including for instance: awareness raising (including with parents), incentives to join, additional support by teachers outside the classroom, coaching by peers, monitoring of school attendance followed by interventions with parents were necessary.*

DIRECT RECIPIENTS

Almost 3,000 persons trained:

- *members of LACs/MDTs/ICTs/CCTs*
- *teachers and school headmasters/ school psychologists/counsellors*
- *youth centres coordinators / peer educators / volunteers*
- *members of trade unions and employers' organizations*
- *officials from municipalities*
- *key staff from NGOs*
- *other stakeholders – probation officers, judges*

48. *The majority of persons who had contact with the project declared having changed their vision of child labour as a result of activities such as awareness raising activities (including working with media), peer education, advocacy and lobbying and training on CLMS.*

49. *The CLMS concept, as it is promoted in the region, is likely to prove relevant to the establishment of referral systems for children involved in WFCL or at risk of entering WFCL. One could say that the seed has been planted for this to happen, albeit with varying levels of potential for success in different countries. Whereas pilots have proved that the model was feasible at the local level, a number of other factors (e.g. political will, funding, etc.) must obviously be taken into consideration.*

50. *The evaluator noted a generally good level of ownership of the LACs, with some individual members showing commitment beyond expectations, but also with some exception – for instance, in Kosovo, members of the committees requested financial compensation for their participation in the LAC and for attending training courses.*

51. *In most instances, the LACs allowed stakeholders to build bridges between the different entities, for instance between local authorities (e.g. social services and the police) and civil society organisations. The same was true for closer relations between teachers and parents. The project contributed to overcome the frequent initial resistance to work together – this also had unintended spin-offs on other issues, e.g. in Romania with regard to violence against children.*

52. *The evaluator was positively impressed by the results obtained by peer educators. In this regard, a special mention should be made of the contribution of Roma peer educators in assisting their community.*

Progresses in scaling up the CLMS at national level after the piloting in the selected areas and capacity building efforts

ALBANIA

- *CLMS reinforced in three areas and established in two new areas, and piloted and institutionalized in the five areas based on Partnership Agreements concluded between the CLU/MOLSAEO and the Municipalities in five areas.*
- *CLMS mainstreamed into the Integrated Law on Child Protection (draft) and the Manual on the operation of the Child Protection Units (draft).*

BULGARIA

- *CLMS established, piloted and institutionalized in three areas based on agreements concluded at local level. A Core Team of Trainers on CLMS established.*
- *CLMS mainstreamed into the Child Protection Act (amended in 2009).*

KOSOVO

- *CLMS reinforced in three areas and established in three new areas, and piloted and institutionalized in the six areas based on partnership agreements.*
- *CLMS mainstreamed into the Administrative Instruction on Prevention and Elimination of Hazardous Child Labour in Kosovo Replication of the CLMS Kosovo-wide mainstreamed into the European Partnership Action Plan for 2009.*

MOLDOVA

- *CLMS established, reinforced and piloted in five areas.*
- *CLMS mainstreamed into the National Plan on Creation of an Integrated Social Services System 2008-2012. CLMS elements included in the training curriculum for MDTs in charge with the implementation of the National Referral System. CLMS to be mainstreamed into the National Plan of Action on Prevention and Elimination of WFCL in Moldova.*

ROMANIA

- *CLMS piloted/reinforced in 8 counties and support provided for nationwide up-scaling (training and information sessions). CLMS is currently operational in 31 counties and 4 sectors of Bucharest (out of 41 counties and 6 sectors of Bucharest).*
- *Training on CLMS mainstreamed into the National Strategy for Professional Training in the Field of Child Rights Protection 2009-2013 (draft). CLMS Practical Guide approved by the NAPCR and a draft Government Decision on the use of CLMS model nationwide currently prepared.*

UKRAINE

- *CLMS reinforced and piloted in two regions. Methodological support provided for CLMS up-scaling (trained practitioners)*
- *CLMS mainstreamed into the Law on National Action Plan to Implement CRC till 2016 that contains separate chapter on combating child labour and sets as an objective CLMS implementation in Ukraine.*

53. *The evaluator determined that the effectiveness of the project's strategies to raise awareness, including the Supporting Children's Rights through Education, Arts and Media (SCREAM) methodology was generally good, and in some cases excellent. In terms of promoting appropriation of IPEC tools, the following commendable achievement should be highlighted:*

Romania

- ***CLMS Practical Guide*** *approved by the National Authority for Protection of Children's Rights and used in its training programmes for the General Directorates for Social Assistance and Child Protection.*

- ***SCREAM package*** *recommended by Ministry of Education for use by the School Inspectorates and Children's Clubs network for non-formal education classes and extra-curricular activities.*

Ukraine

- ***SCREAM package*** *recommended by the Ministry of Education and Science and used for teachers' training in three regions.*

- ***Life Skills Manual*** *recommended by the Ministry of Education and Science and used by the practical psychologists working with children in orphanages and used by the Donetsk Teachers' Training Institute for Professional Development.*

- ***Manual on Psycho-Social Rehabilitation of Children Withdrawn from Trafficking and Other WFCL*** *recommended by the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine and used by Centers of Applied Psychology and Social Work in 27 regions of Ukraine.*

54. *The consultant, further to interviews with teachers and educators, determined that, in the countries where the SCREAM package had been translated[2] (and in some cases adapted to the national context) and properly disseminated, it was overwhelmingly appreciated. Furthermore, SCREAM has visible effects on the attitude of children, e.g. with regard to self-confidence, openness, ability to express oneself. This fact was very apparent in the discussion held with children who had participated in the project. SCREAM was described by a boy in the following words: "I can compare it to a vaccine, to prevent our silly behaviours, for instance rejecting opportunities to learn".*

55. *Unexpected and multiplier effects of the project included:*

    - *Some partner NGOs in Romania passed on ILO knowledge and tools to their own partner NGOs, including across the border with Moldova.*

    - *In Romania, the Steering Committee was looking at the possibility of using the CLMS model to include violence against children.*

    - *In Moldova, the DBMR showed that victims of CL also suffer from domestic violence. The project therefore managed to include WFCL in the law against domestic violence.*

    - *UNFPA Moldova will use the ILO model in its projects on combating domestic violence and trafficking.*

56. *The project made considerable efforts, and achieved commendable results in mainstreaming the WFCL into legislation and policies, as illustrated in the table below:*

WFCL MAINSTREAMED INTO LEGISLATION AND POLICIES	
Albania	- *draft Integrated Law on Child Protection* - *Action Plan 2007-2013 for the Strategy on Social Inclusion 2007-2013*
Bulgaria	- *amendments to Child Protection Act* - *amendments to the Coordination Mechanism for Referral and Rehabilitation of Children Victims of Trafficking*
Kosovo	- *Administrative Instruction on Prevention and Elimination of HCL* - *Strategy and Action Plan for Protection of Children's Rights 2009-2013*

[2] *The SCREAM package was translated into four languages (Albanian, Bulgarian, Romanian and Ukrainian) and adapted to the national contexts. Given a shared use of languages, Kosovo used the Albanian version, while Moldova used the Romanian one.*

WFCL MAINSTREAMED INTO LEGISLATION AND POLICIES	
Moldova	- *Strategy on the National Referral System for Protection and Assistance of Victims and Potential Victims of Trafficking 2009-2011 and its Plan of Action* - *National Plan on Creation of an Integrated Social Services System 2008-2012*
Romania	- *draft National Plan of Action against Violence on Children 2009–2013* - *Government Decision (GD) regarding the Prohibition of HCL*
Ukraine	- *Law on Social Work with Children and Youth* - *Law on State Programme "National Action Plan (NAP) to Implement CRC till 2016"*

5.3. Partnerships

57. *The evaluator was generally impressed by the degree of expertise and commitment of the implementing agencies. This appears to be attributable to two factors: the selected agencies were well-established organisations or institutions with a solid track-record of working for the protection children; and/or they had been involved in phase I of the project, during which they had been thoroughly trained and had proved their ability to work to the satisfaction of ILO-IPEC.*

58. *The capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners to develop effective action against child labour was generally enhanced as a result of project activities. That being said, most of these partners had already acquired expertise and know-how previously to phase II of the project. Where shortcomings were identified in the course of implementation, they were generally related to the various reporting requirements of the project. These problems were handled in two ways, namely by coaching the partners in improving their reporting skills or, and this is a less desirable approach, by writing reports on their behalf.*

59. *Implementing agencies (both at the central and communal levels) generally praised project staff for their ability and availability to provide support, in particular with regard to the technical aspects of project management.*

60. *The participation of the different relevant actors in the National Steering Committees NSC was on average of an acceptable level. Unsurprisingly, the involvement of the different representatives of the state administration was uneven, as was the hierarchical level of their representation in the sessions. One notable positive example is Moldova, where the Deputy Minister of Labour had from the onset been personally involved on the work of the Committee. In the case of Kosovo, the National Steering Committee (called Technical Working Group) was said to still be IPEC-driven. The representatives of the different ministries complained that their participation in Committee sessions was problematic given that it was not specifically mentioned in their job description – and therefore that they had trouble justifying to their superiors the time they spent in these sessions.*[3]

61. *Generally, the NSCs did not specifically deal with operational aspects of the action programmes' implementation; rather their sessions were more a forum to exchange information. One positive aspect of the*

[3] *A comment to the draft version of the present report stated: "Active involvement of members of the TWG in the CLMS, in particular in the process of training, coaching and monitoring of LACs was not at satisfactory level due to their workload with other assignments within their institutions. In this regard, KCPECL took the decision to institutionalize the TWG on CLMS through a decision of the Permanent Secretary of the Government (ongoing)."*

Committees was the fact that they provided opportunities for tripartite exchange of views and for bridge-building between NGOs and government agencies. Other activities, such as joint training, seminars and conferences organised by the project provided networking opportunities for organizations and government agencies working to address child labour on the national, provincial and local levels.

62. *It must be stressed that the methodology and proposed programme of the present evaluation focused mainly on partners and beneficiaries, whereas other stakeholders (e.g. other national or international organisations working in the same or similar fields) were only marginally included. This obviously has an influence on the questions that could be addressed by the evaluation, for instance with regard to coordination between the different stakeholders – for example the level of cooperation/coordination between the project and organisations such as UNICEF or OSCE differed within countries. One case of such cooperation is to be found in Ukraine, where joint activities with OSCE are frequent, to the point that the Organisation earmarked EUR 20'000 in 2008 to support IPEC activities to combat trafficking.*

5.4. Efficiency of the projects

63. *The expected outputs were in the majority of cases delivered in a timely manner, with the appropriate quantity and quality. In some cases, where poverty was prevalent and the offer of social services was weak, it was made clear that educational services, in and by themselves, were not sufficient to achieve the project's objectives; this was illustrated for instance in Kosovo by the initial reluctance of representatives of the local social services to help identify children victims of CL in the framework of the project. Head teachers had to be involved to identify them. This is one of the reasons why the Kosovo project fell short of its target by 100 cases.*

64. *As far as the evaluator could determine, the project made efficient use of resources and of the mechanisms in place for project monitoring. The Direct Beneficiary Monitoring and Reporting (DBMR) was perceived as process-oriented and its value-added was questioned, in particular because it did not build on information required in the TPR by IPs. The fact that it does not include software was also considered as a weak point.*

65. *The July 2008 mid-term review was relatively irrelevant with regard to a potential impact on the second part of the project. Indeed, the process was almost entirely based on Romania. It did not include either field visits, or self-assessment at country-level. Its findings, conclusions and recommendations were of a general nature and overly focused on the issue of the extension of the CTA's contract. Furthermore, the report was never finalised and remained in draft form, which was not likely to encourage the project to fully take it into account.*

    The overall coordination of the project was the responsibility of two Chief Technical Advisers for two years (one CTA during the period October 2006 - June 2007 and the second CTA for the period June 2007 – September 2008). For the period October 2008 – December 2009, the management of the project was shared between an Acting CTA (the Senior Desk Officer for Europe, Central Asia and Arab States at ILO-IPEC HQ) and the two Sub-Regional Project Coordinators.

66. *There was a slight problem with the dual-funding of the project. The USDOL funded project had the CTA budgeted for two years out of three and national staff (country teams and sub-regional project coordinators) for 30 months out of 36 months – the initial duration of the project; it was extended by three months. The CTA post was phased out on 30 September 2008, while the national staff salaries were funded from the German-funded project 'Upstream Activities for Prevention and Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Central and Eastern Europe'. It was originally planned, to complement the USDOL-funded project with a budget allocation from the German Government, but the earmarked co-funding was postponed. Therefore, the*

German-funded project contributed to fulfil the commitment to cost-share the activities planned under Phase II of the USDOL funded project and ensure the sustainability of the upstream interventions.

5.5. Sustainability

67. *A strategy for sustainability of achievements was defined clearly at the design stage of the project, but it did not sufficiently take into account the differences in contexts in the targeted countries. This was compounded by the fact that the formulation of an exit strategy was in most cases left for the very last period of the project. In countries which had started activities with a considerable delay, such an approach did make sense in view of the short time-span of the projects. More generally, interlocutors at country-level felt uneasy about mentioning an exit strategy while the implementation of action programmes was at its peak.*[4]

68. *The project managed to mainstream (i.e. include) CLMS in a number of national strategies, laws, institutions and action plans, as the examples below illustrate:*

- ***ALBANIA:*** *CLMS mainstreamed into the Integrated Law on Child Protection (draft) and the Manual on the operation of the Child Protection Units (draft).*
- ***BULGARIA:*** *CLMS mainstreamed into the Child Protection Act (amended in 2009).*
- ***KOSOVO:*** *CLMS mainstreamed into the Administrative Instruction on Prevention and Elimination of Hazardous Child Labour in Kosovo Replication of the CLMS Kosovo-wide mainstreamed into the European Partnership Action Plan for 2009.*
- ***MOLDOVA:*** *CLMS mainstreamed into the National Plan on Creation of an Integrated Social Services System 2008-2012. CLMS elements included in the training curriculum for MDTs in charge with the implementation of the National Referral System. CLMS to be mainstreamed into the National Plan of Action on Prevention and Elimination of WFCL in Moldova.*
- ***ROMANIA:*** *Training on CLMS mainstreamed into the National Strategy for Professional Training in the Field of Child Rights Protection 2009-2013 (draft). CLMS Practical Guide approved by the NAPCR and a draft Government Decision on the use of CLMS model nationwide currently prepared.*

---

[4] *Comments to the draft version of the present report brought the following additional information: "The Exit strategy in Romania was approved by the NSC on 23 October 2009. Only Romania and Bulgaria phased out by the end of the project, while the other four project countries continue to work in the framework of a sub-regional project to be completed by 31 December 2010 (funded by the German Government). This project is also funding finalization and approval of the exit strategy for Bulgaria. Moldova and Kosovo implement other country based projects focusing on drafting National Plans of Action (NPAs) for Prevention and Elimination of WFCL based on consultations with key stakeholders. This made inappropriate to go for in-depth consultations and approval processes of the exit strategies by the end of the project, because these NPAs would support an exit strategy in the respective countries."*

- ***UKRAINE:*** *CLMS mainstreamed into the Law on National Action Plan to Implement CRC till 2016 that contains separate chapter on combating child labour and sets as an objective CLMS implementation in Ukraine.*

69. *The examples listed above do necessarily prove that the results they achieved will be sustainable in the long-term. Indeed, a number of factors may jeopardise these undertakings, such as decreasing political will to fully implement them (which cannot be excluded given the recurring political instability), as well as budgetary constraints (which are likely to increase in light of the economic crisis).*

70. *The authorities in Kosovo have decided to replicate the CLMS in all municipalities by the end of 2010. Although this decision can be seen as a success of the project, it is difficult to see how it will be feasible to achieve this ambitious undertaking in such a short time, given the current situation of Kosovo.*

71. *The activities contained in the textbox below, in particular the collective agreements, will certainly contribute to the sustainability of the achievements of phase II of the project with regard to the involvement of social partners in combating the WFCL.*

WFCL MAINSTREAMED INTO SOCIAL PARTNERS' ACTIVITIES

Albania

- ***Joint Agreement on prevention and elimination of child labour*** *among trade unions, employers' organizations, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities and Labour Inspection (2008)*
- ***Round Table "Enhancing the capacities of trade unions to implement the Joint Agreement on prevention and elimination of child labour in Albania"*** *(2009)*
- ***Trainings on prevention and elimination of child labour for teachers and other professionals*** *(2007-2009)*

Bulgaria

- ***Revised Collaboration Agreement against Child Labour*** *signed by the General Labour Inspectorate, State Agency for Child Protection and Agency for Social Assistance (2008)*
- ***National Round Table*** *on the business sector's responsibility on CL elimination (2008)*
- ***Round Table to mark the WDACL 2009*** *(Teachers' Trade Union affiliated to the Labour Confederation Podkrepa, 2009)*

Kosovo

- ***Debates on the role of teachers trade unionists in strengthening the response of schools against child labour*** *(2008)*
- ***End of Year Event dedicated to child labour issues*** *(American Chamber of Kosovo, 2008)*

Moldova

- ***Round table "Education: The Right Response to Child Labour"*** *(2008)*
- ***Parliamentary hearings on corporate social responsibility*** *(Global Compact Network Moldova, 2008)*
- ***Code of Conduct on the elimination of WFCL for employers in all sectors*** *(Moldovan Global Compact Network, 2008)*
- ***Collective Agreement in Constructions Sector*** *(2009)*
- ***Permanent Tripartite Council on Child Labour*** *established within the National Commission for Consultations and Collective Bargaining (2009)*

Romania

- ***Code of Conduct against Child Labour in Constructions Sector*** *and the* ***Declaration of Adherence (2009)***
- ***Leaflet for promoting the Code of Conduct***
- ***Monitoring mechanism for the implementation of the Code of Conduct approved by National Authority for the Protection of Children's Rights***
- ***Fundraising campaign "Open Your Heart Campaign"*** *(since 2005)*

Ukraine

- ***Training on CLMS for trade unionists (2008-2009)***
- ***Child Labour Inter-Regional Conference (2008)***
- ***Tripartite round-table dedicated to WDACL 2009***
- ***National Essay Competition "My Future Career"*** *for students in 100 schools from the 27 regions of Ukraine (2009)*

6. Conclusions

72. *The evaluator reached the conclusion that the project had been relatively well designed, although a proper baseline and/or needs assessment should have been conducted.*

73. *The relevance and effectiveness of the project would have benefitted from a clearer analysis of the specific challenges faced by national and ethnic minorities.*

74. *Choosing implementing partners involved in phase I of the project contributed to efficiency and effectiveness of phase II.*

75. *The project was faced with a number of external challenges due to political and economic crises, but generally managed to deal with them in an appropriate manner.*

76. *The time frame for project implementation and the sequencing of project activities was logical but in some cases not realistic. Indeed, changing mentalities and fostering institutional and legal change requires relatively long time spans, particularly in transition countries where frequent political crises are likely to stall reforms.*

77. *The most successful projects occurred in countries which had had the chance to benefit from successive ILO-IPEC projects over a sufficient time-span, e.g. in Romania. In such cases, change was allowed to occur in a gradual and organic manner, as opposed to be rushed over a short period (which decreased the chances of appropriation and ownership)*

78. *The regional approach of the project presented, in balance, more advantages than disadvantages. However, more resources should have been allocated to exchange of information and experiences between the different country teams.*

79. *The project, with the exception of missed target in Kosovo, managed to fulfil its objectives and this in an efficient manner.*

80. *The evaluator was generally impressed with the project's successes at the local level in raising awareness about child labour and in promoting social mobilization to address this issue.*

81. *The usefulness and feasibility of ILO-IPEC tools and models were demonstrated. Signs of national and/or local appropriation and ownership of these tools and models could be observed.*

82. *More specifically, the CLMS concept, as it is promoted in the region, is likely to prove relevant to the establishment of referral systems for children involved in WFCL or at risk of entering WFCL. Whereas pilots have proved that the model was feasible at the local level, a number of other factors (e.g. political will, funding, etc.) must obviously be taken into consideration. The evaluator noted a generally good level of ownership of the LACs, with some individual members showing commitment beyond expectations, but also with some exception. LACs allowed stakeholders to build bridges between the different entities, for instance between local authorities (e.g. social services and the police) and civil society organisations.*

83. *A number of important policy and legal breakthroughs were achieved by the project, but continued efforts will be necessary to ensure their sustainability – see recommendations below.*

7. Recommendations

84. *Despite membership of their country in the EU, Bulgarian and Romania partners still need assistance in terms of technical capacity building. ILO should therefore identify ways and means to ensure that such support is provided, either directly by itself, or through EU programmes building on the achievements of the project so far.*

85. *Potential future projects should be based on clearer analysis of the specific challenges faced by national and ethnic minorities. This would not only increase relevance and effectiveness of projects for these particularly vulnerable groups, but also facilitate: a) synergies with other international and national actors already active in this field; building bridges with national or regional strategies (e.g. the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005–2015); c) access to sources of funding earmarked for such minorities.*

86. *Further assistance should be provided to non-EU countries to continue up-scaling of ILO-IPEC tools and models, including effective implementation of new policies and legal instruments – see also further recommendation below on the CLMS.*

87. *Additional attention should be paid to ensure coordination and synergies with assistance provided by other international stakeholders, notably the EU in the context of its pre-accession programmes.*

88. *ILO should examine the possibility of enrolling Albania and Moldova in a TBP programme, given the apparent readiness of these countries to do so.*

89. *The CLMS concept, thanks to the pilots established by the project, largely proved its relevance to the establishment of referral systems for children involved in WFCL or at risk of entering WFCL. Nevertheless, additional action (for instance lobbying to muster sufficient political will and the allocation of the necessary budgetary resources) will be necessary to ensure that the model is effectively replicated beyond the local level.*

International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
ILO/IPEC

Final Version for stakeholder circulation: October 9th 2009 Basis for contract

Terms of Reference
For
Independent Final Evaluation

Trafficking and other Worst Forms of Child Labour in Central and Eastern Europe Phase II (PROTECT-CEE)

ILO Project Code	RER/06/P50/USA & RER/09/51/FRG
ILO Project Number	P.340.06.400.050 P.240.09.400.051
ILO Iris Code	100608 101625
Countries	Albania, Bulgaria, Kosovo, Moldova, Romania and Ukraine
Duration	39 months (USDOL) 9 months (FRG)
Starting Date	September 2006 (USDOL) April 2009 (FRG)
Ending Date	December 2009 (USDOL and FRG)
Project Locations	National level and selected districts
Project Language	English
Executing Agency	ILO-IPEC
Financing Agency	USDOL and FRG
Donor contribution	USDOL: US $3,500,000 FRG: US$ 534,850

The aim of ILO-IPEC is the progressive elimination of child labour, especially its worst forms. The political will and commitment of individual governments to address child labour - in cooperation with employers' and workers' organizations, non-governmental organizations and other relevant parties in society - is the basis for IPEC action. IPEC support at the country level is based on a phased, multi-sector strategy. This strategy includes strengthening national capacities to deal with this issue, legislation harmonization, improvement of the knowledge base, raising awareness on the negative consequences of child labour, promoting social mobilization against it, and implementing demonstrative direct action programmes (AP) to prevent children from child labour and remove child workers from hazardous work and provide them and their families with appropriate alternatives.

Trafficking in human beings is closely linked to the political and economic transition that countries in South Eastern Europe have gone through in the last decade. It has its roots in the lack of job opportunities, the cost of living that exceeds average incomes, the increasing social stratification and the weakening of the social safety net. Parents who are hard-pressed to feed large families do not dissuade children from leaving and some even take the initiative to arrange for one of their children to migrate in the hope of increasing family income. Certain communities such as the Roma (in particular Roma women) who are marginalized on the labour market are particularly vulnerable to trafficking.

Trafficking in human beings takes place both across borders and internally. Trafficking of women and girls for sexual exploitation has dominated media reporting of the issue but trafficking in children, both boys and girls, for labour exploitation is also growing. Children are trafficked for begging, petty crime, street vending, and domestic work or to work in agriculture, construction, or manufacturing. They are trafficked across borders but also within countries, generally from rural to urban areas, or from small towns to towns where demand for malleable labour is higher. Some are abducted or threatened into compliance; others are lured by the promise of 'easy money', of escaping poverty and violence at home, of discovering new places. They end up in situations of debt bondage, in exploitative working conditions and are exposed to violence and abuse.

Albania, Bulgaria, Kosovo, Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine are among the countries in Central and South East Europe most seriously affected by the Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL), including sexual and labour exploitation of children, either through a trafficking process or at the child's place of origin. The prevalence in these countries of WFCL has disastrous consequences on the safety, health and well being of children. Urgent action on trafficking and other WFCL was – and is - required in order to eliminate these practices. Since 2000 in Albania, Bulgaria, Kosovo, the Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine, ILO/IPEC has been working to provide technical and financial assistance in the implementation of child labour conventions; ILO Minimum Age Convention (1973) No.138 and ILO Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention (1999) No.182.

Phase I

Albania, the Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine participated in the first phase of an ILO/IPEC project, ***Combating Trafficking in Children for Labour and Sexual Exploitation in the Balkans and Ukraine (PROTECT Phase I)***. The first phase project, funded by USDOL and Germany ended in January 2007. Since 2004, the activities of the project have been implemented together with other projects, under a common programming framework, Project of Technical assistance for the Elimination of Child labour, including Trafficking, in countries of Central and Eastern Europe (PROTECT CEE) – with the same management structure, and complementary upstream work / direct services. These projects have included Country Programmes for Albania and Ukraine, and a sub-regional programme on the WFCL funded by Germany which closed in June 2008. The Bulgarian and Kosovo components included as part of the Phase

II present project are managed under the same programming framework, and implementing similar activities. Resource mobilisation efforts were included in the project design to generate additional resources to complement the project activities.

Since work began in the region in 2000, ILO/IPEC has:

- Increased the knowledge base on the WFCL used for capacity building with governments and social partners;
- Provided direct services to children at risk and victims of child labour;
- Reinforced the legal and policy frameworks in line with Conventions No. 138 and No. 182;
- Tested intervention models that have included components of employment promotion, peer education, life skills, Child Labour Monitoring System (CLMS), and psycho-social rehabilitation of victims of trafficking.

Project approach and strategy

The first phase of PROTECT built an effective delivery capacity and had much success. The scope and complexity of WFCL in the region demanded further follow-up work. Based on the groundwork of Phase I, the present project was designed to:

- Scale-up the models already developed in the region with an increased number of direct beneficiaries and additional resources from governments, employers and donors;
- Strengthen and widen knowledge and experience sharing among participating countries.

The strategies and the general directions were designed based on the recommendations of the independent mid-term evaluation of Phase I. Phase II of the project has three immediate objectives which continue the dual emphasis on simultaneous upstream and downstream work, and the multi-disciplinary approach to direct services.

Immediate Objective One: *At the end of the project, country wide upscaling of IPEC models of prevention/identification/referral and rehabilitation/tracking, through capacity building of institutions and greater involvement of employers will have increased the outreach of institutions for the elimination of child labour.*

Immediate Objective Two: *At the end of the project, 4500 children will have been either prevented or withdrawn from the Worst Forms of Child Labour in sectors/areas previously not addressed by IPEC interventions.*

Immediate Objective Three: *At the end of the project, mainstreaming of WFCL into national policies and legislation, and awareness raising/mobilisation activities will have supported an increase of resources allocated to the elimination of the worst forms of child labour.*

Phase II has been built around ILO/IPEC principles of sustainability (which includes attention to sustainability from project inception onwards) and embeds ongoing monitoring and evaluation processes. The co-funding mechanism was continued from Phase I. Specific exit strategies were to be designed to operate within specific country contexts while reflecting the principles of ILO/IPEC.

Mid-Term Evaluation/Review

In line with ILO-IPEC policies and procedures and as outlined in the project document, a mid-term review was undertaken in June 2008. The mid-term review found that the strategies employed to meet the project objectives were appropriate and the project could expect to achieve the target results.

Based on the findings, the mid-term review notably recommended that:

- The overall approach of the project should be maintained in the future. However, there are delays in the project's implementation and the decision concerning the phasing out of the management team may endanger the achievement of the objectives. The ILO – IPEC should identify possible solutions to make sure that the CTA and the NPMs will continue their activity at least up to the approval of the final reports and disbursement of the final payments.

- There is no coherent phasing-out strategy for the moment. The strategy should be the main priority in this stage of the project and should be the responsibility of the CTA and the NPMs. The process should involve the National ILO-IPEC Team in working together with CLU, especially because there will be no other phase of the project.

- The project should develop a knowledge management system, based on the methodological, thematic, geographic and other relevant aspects that have strategic importance for efficient and effective work and make it available to the persons or organizations interested in developing projects in the field of WFCL.

Recent Activities and Outcomes

In 2009, the originally planned budget allocation from the German Government for this project was received and began implementation in April 2009 to December 2009. This contributes to cost-share activities planned under Phase II of the USDOL funded component and was designed to ensure the sustainability of the upstream interventions. The USDOL component was also extended so that both components have a current end date of December 2009.

Decent Work Country Programme

From the perspective of the ILO, the elimination of child labour is part of its work on standards and fundamental principles and rights at work. The fulfilment of these standards should guarantee **decent work** for all adults. In this sense the ILO provides technical assistance to its three constituents: government, workers and employers. This tripartite structure is the key characteristic of ILO cooperation and it is within this framework that the activities developed by the project should be analyzed.

ILO Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) are being introduced in ILO to provide a mechanism through with to outline agreed upon priorities between the ILO and the national constituents partners within a broader UN and International development context. For further information please see http://www.ilo.org/public/english/decent.htm

The DWCP defines a corporate focus on priorities, operational strategies as well as a resource and implementation plan that complements and supports partner plans for national decent work priorities. As such DWCP are broader frameworks to which the individual ILO project is linked and contributes to. DWCP are beginning to gradually be introduced in various countries. In four of the project countries the DWCP has been drafted and implemented:

Albania: http://www.ilo.org/intranet/english/bureau/program/dwcp/download/dwcp_albania_old.pdf
Bulgaria: http://www.ilo.org/intranet/english/bureau/program/dwcp/download/dwcp_bulgaria.pdf
Moldova: http://www.ilo.org/intranet/english/bureau/program/dwcp/download/dwcp_moldova_old.pdf
Ukraine: http://www.ilo.org/intranet/english/bureau/program/dwcp/download/dwcp_ukraine.pdf

Background to the Final Evaluation

ILO-IPEC projects are subject to end of project evaluations as per ILO technical cooperation policies and procedures and in agreement with the donor. In ILO-IPEC evaluations of its projects are carried out to enhance organisational learning and demonstrate achievement. As per ILO-IPEC procedures, a participatory consultation process on the nature and specific purposes of this evaluation was carried out three months prior to the scheduled date of the evaluation. Inputs were received from key stakeholders. The present Terms of Reference are based on the outcome of this process and inputs received in the course of the consultative process.

II. Scope and Purpose

Scope

The final evaluation will cover the ILO-IPEC PROTECT project components funded by USDOL and Germany. It will focus on the project's achievements and its contribution to the overall national efforts to achieve the elimination of WFCL. The evaluation should focus on all the activities that have been implemented since the start of the project to the moment of the field visits.

The scope of the present ILO-IPEC evaluation includes all project activities to date including Action Programmes. The evaluation should look at the project as a whole, including issues of initial project design, implementation, lessons learnt, replicability and recommendations for future projects/programmes. While the primary focus of the evaluation is on Phase II of the programme, it would also be important to link back to Phase I in providing an assessment of the overall legacy and contribution of ILO-IPEC so that a comprehensive view and assessment of the time frame required for effective support to countries can be provided.

The evaluation is expected to emphasize the assessment of key aspects of the programme, such as strategy, implementation, and achievement of objectives. It will assess the effect and impact of the work carried out during the implementation phase, using data collected on the indicators of achievement. It will also evaluate the effectiveness, relevance, and elements of sustainability of the programme activities carried out.

Purpose

The evaluation is to be conducted with the purpose of drawing lessons from the experiences gained during the period of implementation. It will show how these lessons can be applied in other planned ILO-IPEC interventions in the broader terms of action against child labour in the context of sector specific programmes and those on trafficking in particular.

In addition, the evaluation will serve to document **potential good practices**, **lessons learned**, and **models of interventions** developed in this cycle of the project. It will serve as an important information base for key stakeholders and decision makers regarding any policy decisions for future subsequent activities in the country.

The results of the evaluation will be used as part of strategic planning and possible orientation for further phases of the various projects, including models of interventions. The results should also be used by ILO-IPEC to design future programmes and allocate resources. Recommendations should be specifically made for follow up action on areas/sectors where ILO-IPEC technical and financial assistance is still needed (Albania, Kosovo, Moldova and Ukraine) and for future actions against child labour to be taken by the key stakeholders after the phase out of ILO/IPEC projects in Bulgaria and Romania.

III. Suggested 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 on "Planning and Managing Project Evaluations" 2006. This is further elaborated in the ILO document "Preparation of Independent Evaluations of ILO Programmes and Projects" 1997. For gender concerns see: “ILO Evaluation Guidance: Considering Gender in Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects”, September 2007.

The evaluation should be carried out in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy, the ILO Guideline, the specific ILO-IPEC Guidelines and Notes, the UN System Evaluation Standards and Norms, and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

In line with results-based framework approach used by ILO-IPEC for identifying results at global, strategic and project level, the evaluation will focus on identifying and analysing results through addressing key questions related to the evaluation concerns and the achievement of the Immediate Objectives of the project using data from the logical framework indicators.

The suggested aspects to address (detailed in Annex 1) were identified during the process of formulating the current terms of reference. Other aspects can be added as identified by the evaluation team in accordance with the given purpose and in consultation with ILO-IPEC Geneva's Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section (DED). It is not expected that the evaluation address all of the questions detailed in the Annex; however the evaluation must address the general areas of focus. The evaluation instrument should identify the general areas of focus listed here as well as other priority aspects to be addressed in the evaluation.

The following are the main categories that need to be addressed:

- Design and planning
- Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness) of Objectives
- Relevance of the project
- Sustainability
- Special Aspects to be Addressed

IV. Expected Outputs of the Evaluation

The expected outputs to be delivered by the **International Evaluator** are as follows:

- Desk review
- Evaluation field visits including interviews and consultations with key stakeholders in all six project countries (duration of visits per country to be determined between team leader and project staff in consultation with DED)
- Preparation and facilitation of national stakeholder evaluation workshop in each country, including workshop programme and background note
- Debriefing with project staff and key national partners
- Draft report
- Second and final version of report, including any response to consolidated comments

The final evaluation report should include:

- Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions and recommendations
- Clearly identified findings

- Clearly identified conclusions and recommendations clearly addressed to type of stakeholder
- Lessons learned
- Potential good practices and effective models of intervention.
- Appropriate Annexes including present TORs
- Standard evaluation instrument matrix

The total length of the report should be a maximum of 30 pages for the main report, excluding annexes; additional annexes can provide background and details on specific components of the project evaluated. The report should be sent as one complete document and the file size should not exceed 3 megabytes. Photos, if appropriate to be included, should be inserted using lower resolution to keep overall file size low.

All drafts and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided both in paper copy and in electronic version compatible with Word for Windows. Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with ILO-IPEC and the consultants. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of ILO-IPEC. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

The final report will be circulated to key stakeholders (project management, ILO-IPEC, ILO Regional, all participants present at the stakeholder evaluation workshop, donor and others as identified by DED) for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated by the Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section (DED) of ILO-IPEC Geneva and provided to the evaluator. In preparing the final report the evaluator should consider these comments, incorporate as appropriate and provide a brief note explaining why any comments might not have been incorporated.

V. Evaluation Methodology

The following is the proposed methodology for the final evaluation. While the evaluation team can propose changes in the methodology, any such changes should be discussed with and approved by DED provided that the research and analysis suggests changes and provided that the indicated range of questions is addressed, the purpose maintained and the expected outputs produced at the required quality.

Desk Review

The evaluation will be carried out using a desk review of appropriate materials, including the project documents, progress reports, outputs of the programme and the projects (action programmes), results of any internal planning process and relevant materials from secondary sources. At the end of the desk review period, it is expected that the evaluation consultant will prepare a document indicating the methodological approach to the evaluation in the form of the inception report and evaluation instrument, to be discussed and approved by DED.

Field visits by international evaluator:

The international evaluator will conduct an evaluation mission in-country that will consist of the following:

- Interviews with ILO-IPEC officials and project staff, key national stakeholders and informants as identified by key stakeholders and the evaluator
- Field visit to selected project sites
- A half-day stakeholder evaluation workshop

The international evaluator will interview the donor representatives, ILO-IPEC HQ, and ILO-IPEC regional staff either in person or by conference calls early in the evaluation process, preferably during the desk review phase.

The evaluator will be asked to include as part of the specific evaluation instrument to be developed, the standard evaluation instruments that ILO-IPEC has developed for documenting and analyzing achievements of the projects and contributions of the Action Programmes to the project.

The evaluation methodology includes a half day stakeholder workshop in each country. The workshop will be attended by ILO-IPEC staff and key partners, including the donor as appropriate, in order to gather further data, as appropriate present the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations and obtain feedback. The workshop will take place towards the end of each country fieldwork. The results of the workshop should be taken into consideration for the preparation of the draft report. The evaluator will be responsible for organizing the methodology of the workshop. The identification of the number of participants of the workshop and logistics will be under the responsibility of the project team in consultation with the evaluator. Key project partners should be invited to the stakeholder workshop. The project will propose a list of participants.

Composition of the evaluation team

The evaluation will be carried out by an international evaluator who previously have not been involved in the project. The evaluator is responsible for drafting and finalizing the evaluation report. The evaluator will have the final responsibility during the evaluation process and the outcomes of the evaluation, including the quality of the report and compliance with deadlines.

The background, responsibilities and profile of the international evaluator should include:

International Team Leader	
Responsibility	**Profile**
• Briefing with IPEC DED • Telephone Interviews with donor and IPEC HQ • Desk review • Prepare evaluation instrument • Conduct field visits in selected project sites in all six project countries • Facilitate a stakeholder workshop with the logistic support of the national project teams • Draft the evaluation report • Finalize the evaluation report taking into consideration comments from key stakeholders.	• Relevant background in social and/or economic development. • Experience in the design, management and evaluation of development projects, in particular with policy level work, institution building and local development projects. • Experience in evaluations in the UN system or other international context as team leader • Relevant regional experience preferably prior working experience in Central and Eastern Europe. • Experience in the area of children's and child labour issues and rights-based approaches in a normative framework are highly appreciated. • Experience at policy level and in the area of education and legal issues would also be appreciated. • Experience in the UN system or similar international development experience including preferably international and national development frameworks in particular PRSP and UNDAF. • Knowledge of strategic planning approaches • Familiarity with and knowledge of specific thematic area of trafficking. • Fluency in English; • Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings.

The international evaluator will undertake a **desk review** of the project files and documents, undertake **field visits** to selected project locations in all six project countries, **and facilitate the stakeholder workshop.**

The international evaluator will be responsible for **drafting** the evaluation report. Upon feedback from stakeholders to the draft report, the international evaluator will further be responsible for **finalizing** the report **incorporating** any comments deemed appropriate.

The evaluation will be carried out with the technical support of the IPEC-DED section and with the logistical support of the project office in Bucharest with the administrative support of ILO Geneva and ILO sub-regional office in Budapest. DED will be responsible for consolidating the comments of stakeholders and submitting them to the international evaluator.

It is expected that the evaluator will work to the highest evaluation standards and codes of conduct and follow the UN evaluation standards and norms.

Timetable

The tentative timetable is as follows.

Final Evaluation		
Responsible Person	**Tasks**	**Duration and Dates**
International evaluator	o Telephone briefing with IPEC DED o Desk Review of project related documents o Evaluation instrument based on desk review	Early October Estimated Duration: 5 days
Evaluator with logistical support by project	o In-country to Romania for briefing and consultations with project staff o Consultations with project staff /management o Field visits o Consultations with girls and boys, parents and other beneficiaries o Workshop with key stakeholders in each project country	October 19th to November 6th for first three countries November 16th to December 4th for second group of countries Six weeks work
International Evaluator	o Draft report based on consultations from field visits and desk review and workshops	December 7-13 Estimated duration 7 days
DED	o Circulate draft report to key stakeholders o Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to team leader	Mid-December 2009
Evaluation team leader	o Finalize the report including explanations on why comments were not included	End December 2009 Estimated 5 days
TOTAL number of days		**Evaluator: 47 days** **Time in field calculated at 5 day weeks**

Sources of Information and Consultations/Meetings

Available at HQ and to be supplied by DED	• **Project document (for USDOL and FRG components)** • **DED Guidelines and ILO guidelines** • **Midterm review report**
Available in project office and to be supplied by project management	• **Progress reports/Status reports** • **Technical and financial reports of partner agencies** • **Direct beneficiary record system** • **Good practices and Lessons learnt report (from TPR)** • **Other studies and research undertaken** • **Action Programme Summary Outlines Project files** • **National workshop proceedings or summaries** • **Any other documents**

Consultations with:

- Project management and staff
- ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials
- Partner agencies
- Social partners employers' and workers' groups
- Children, including boys and girls, who have received project services and those who have not and their parents
- Community members
- Teachers, government representatives, legal authorities etc as identified by evaluation team
- Relevant officials from the Ministry of Manpower, Youth, and Employment's Child Labour Unit; the Department of Social Welfare; the Ministry of Women's and Children's Affairs; the Ministry of Education and Sports etc.
- Members of the National Steering Committee
- International organizations, NGOs or multi- and bilateral donors
- Telephone discussion with USDOL and FRG as appropriate
- Telephone interviews with US Embassy Labour officers in each of the project countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Kosovo, Moldova, Romania, Ukraine (specific contact information to be provided to the evaluator).
- Consultations with Germany Embassy Labour officers

Final Report Submission Procedure

- For independent evaluations, the following procedure is used:
- The evaluator will submit a draft report to **IPEC DED in Geneva**
- IPEC DED will forward a copy to **key stakeholders** for comments on factual issues and for clarifications
- IPEC DED will consolidate the comments and send these to the **evaluator** by date agreed between DED and the evaluator or as soon as the comments are received from stakeholders.
- The final report is submitted to IPEC DED who will then officially forward it to stakeholders, including the donor.

VI. Resources and Management

Resources

The resources required for this evaluation are:

For the international evaluator:

- Fees for an international consultant for 47 work days
- Local DSA in project locations for maximum 27 nights in various locations in the project countries in line with ILO rules
- Travel from consultant's home residence to the six project countries in line with ILO regulations and rules

Other costs:

- Fees for local travel in-country
- Stakeholder workshop expenditures in the six countries

- Interpretation costs as appropriate
- Any other miscellaneous costs.

A detailed budget is available separately.

Management

The evaluation team will report to ILO-IPEC/DED in headquarters and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with DED should issues arise. ILO-IPEC project officials in Bucharest and in the project countries and the ILO Offices in Geneva and Budapest will provide administrative and logistical support during the evaluation mission.

Annex I: Suggested Aspects to be Addressed

Design and Planning (Validity of design)

- Assess whether the project design was logical and coherent and took into account the institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders. Were lessons learned from past ILO-IPEC interventions such as the first phase of the project successfully incorporated into the project design?
- Assess the internal logic (link between objectives achieved through implementation of activities) of the project and the external logic of the project (degree to which the project fits into existing activities that would impact on child labour).
- Analyze whether available information on the socio-economic, cultural and political situation, (this includes local efforts already underway to address CL and promote education opportunities for targeted children and existing capacity) in the project countries was taken into consideration at the time of the design and reflected in the design of the project. Did the project's original design fill an existing gap in services that other ongoing interventions were not addressing? Determine whether the needs, constraints, resources and access to project services of the different beneficiaries were clearly identified taking gender issues into concern.
- To what extent were external factors and assumptions identified at the time of design? Have there been any changes to these external factors and the related assumptions and, if so, how did this impact project implementation and the achievement of objectives?
- Was the time frame for project implementation and the sequencing of project activities logical and realistic? If not, what changes were made to improve them?
- Was the strategy for sustainability of achievements defined clearly at the design stage of the project?
- Were the objectives of the project clear, realistic and achieved within the established time schedule and with the allocated resources (including human resources)? Were the targets realistic? Were the linkages between inputs, activities, outputs and objectives clear and logical? Did the action programmes designed under the project provide clear linkages and complement each other regarding the project strategies and project components of intervention?
- Examine the appropriateness of the indicators and whether they are 'measurable'
- Did the design of the project take into consideration any collaboration efforts with non-project countries but ending or receiving countries?
- Assess any implications of the dual funding mechanism used in this project.
- Assess the design of the project's sub-regional nature. Are there advantages to the sub-regional grouping and was this reflected in implementation? For future programming, would there be any added value to including other countries (or removing any of the current project countries) from the sub-regional configuration?

Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness)

- Has the project achieved its immediate objectives? Has the entire target population been reached? Please distinguish between beneficiaries as reported to receive educational services and beneficiaries that have received non-educational services. Please also distinguish by sector or worst forms of child labour. Assess the effectiveness of the education and non-education services being provided to beneficiaries.
- How effective was the project in terms of leveraging resources? What process was undertaken by the project to identify and coordinate implementation with other child labour-focused initiatives and organizations in the country?
- Were the selected implementing agencies the most relevant and appropriate for carrying out the activities?
- Assess the key achievements of the project per country in terms of combating child trafficking for sexual and labour exploitation.
- Assess what effect the regional based approach of the project had on the project as whole versus implementing the components on an individual country by country approach.
- What was the quality and how effective were the APs, and how did they contribute to the project meeting its immediate objectives? Examine the capacity constraints of implementing agencies and the effect on the implementation of the designed APs.
- What lessons have been learned from the APs? What possibilities are there for effective replication of efforts?
- Are there sector specific lessons regarding the types and effectiveness of the services provided?
- How has the capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners to develop effective action against child labour been enhanced as a result of project activities? Has the capacity of community level agencies and organizations in the project countries been strengthened to plan, initiate, implement and evaluate actions to prevent and eliminate child labour?
- Were the expected outputs being delivered in a timely manner, with the appropriate quantity and quality?
- Assess the efficiency of the project i.e. compare the allocated resources with results obtained. In general, did the results obtained justify the costs incurred?
- Assess the participation of different relevant actors in the National Steering Committee (e.g. How are these structures participating in project implementation? Examine the relationship between the NSC and the implementing agencies, what is their collaboration? How did this contribute to progress toward project's objectives?) What was their capacity in implementing work on CLMS?
- Examine any networks that have been built between organizations and government agencies working to address child labour on the national, provincial and local levels. Assess the project's partner linking and networking strategy.
- Assess the level of government involvement in the project and how their involvement with the project has built their capacity to continue further work on future programmes
- Which are the mechanisms in place for project monitoring? Please assess the use of work plans and project monitoring plans (PMPs), Direct Beneficiary Monitoring and Reporting (DBMR) processes or systems.
- How were recommendations from the mid-term review acted upon by the project and to what effect?
- How did factors outside of the control of the project affect project implementation and project objectives and how did the project deal with these external factors?
- How were the strategies for monitoring of direct child beneficiaries implemented and coordinated? Assess how the project monitored both the work and education status of all direct

beneficiaries, discussing whether or not the system was appropriate and efficient in monitoring each child to ensure that he/she was no longer working and/or that work conditions were no longer hazardous, and were attending education programs regularly. Assess how project staff and implementing partners understand and use the DBMR forms and database.

- How effective was the project in raising awareness about child labour and in promoting social mobilization to address this issue? Has awareness-raising about the hazards of child labor in agriculture resulted in noticeable changes in behavior?
- Please assess the effectiveness of the project's strategies to raise awareness, including the Supporting Children's Rights through Education, Arts and Media (SCREAM) methodology.
- Identify unexpected and multiplier effects of the project.
- Does the CLMS concept, as it is promoted in the region, prove to be relevant to the establishment of referral systems for children involved in WFCL or at risk of entering WFCL?
- Analyse the effectiveness and outreach of the CLMS. How effective was the project in implementing and strengthening the CLMS and how effective were the systems themselves in identifying, referring to support services, tracking of child beneficiaries and providing the project with information on the situation of direct beneficiaries.
- What are the progresses in scaling up the CLMS at national level after the piloting in the selected areas and capacity building efforts?
- Assess the key achievements of the project per country in terms of CLMS and elimination of child labour.
- How successful was the project been in mainstreaming the issue of child labour into ongoing efforts in areas such as education, employment promotion, poverty reduction, and data collection? Assess the progress of the project's gender mainstreaming activities.
- Assess the process for documenting, disseminating and replicating/up-scaling pilot projects.

Relevance of the Project

- Assess the validity of the project approach and strategies and their potential to replicate. Did the strategies adequately address the root causes of trafficking such as gender inequality and poverty as well as lack of education and skills training?
- Assess the appropriateness of the sectors/target groups and locations chosen to develop the project based on the finding of baseline surveys.
- Were the Action Programs well-rooted within the communities in which they operated?
- How does the strategy used in this project fit in with the DWCPs and national education and anti-poverty efforts, and interventions carried out by other organizations?
- Did the strategy address the different needs and roles, constraints, access to resources of the target groups, with specific reference to the strategy of mainstreaming and thus the relevant partners, especially in government?
- Did the service package promoted by the project respond to the real needs of the beneficiaries? Do children/families/communities get the support they need to protect children from WFCL?

Sustainability

- Assess to what extent a phase out strategy was defined and planned and what steps were taken to ensure sustainability. Assess whether these strategies have been articulated/explained to stakeholders as well as the actual efforts to phase out activities or to transfer responsibilities to local partners as a means of promoting sustainability.

- Assess what contributions the project has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders and to encourage ownership of the project to partners.
- Assess the long-term potential for sustained action and involvement by local/national institutions (including governments) and the target groups as a result of the project.
- Examine whether socio-cultural and gender aspects endanger the sustainability of the programme and assess whether actions have been taken to sensitize local institutions and target groups on these issues.
- What lessons can be learned of the project's accomplishments and weaknesses in terms of sustainability of interventions?

Special Aspects to be Addressed

- Assess the extent the project took advantage and exploited opportunities of learning from each other, of sharing experiences across countries including processes.
- How well did the coordination of different components (by funding source) within PROTECTCEE function and any recommendations in improving overall coordination.