

Final Version

Independent Mid-term Evaluation

Project title:

*Building the Foundations for Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour
in Anglophone Africa (CBP)*

Project Number: P 340 02 100 051 – RAF/02/P51/USA

Donor: US Department of Labour (USDOL)

Executing Agency: IPEC

Geographical Coverage: Zambia, Uganda, Kenya, Ghana and Nigeria

Preparation date: September 2004

Consultant report prepared by:

.Mr. David Nii Addy (Germany), International Consultant/Teamleader
Mr. Frederick Huxley (USA), International Consultant

with inputs from:

Ms. Namwiinga Iinga (Zambia), National Consultant
Mr. Mathias Mosha (Uganda), National Consultant
Ms. Jane Munene (Kenya), National Consultant
Mr. Mawutor Kwaku Ablo (Ghana), National Consultant
Mr. Ibrahim Kolo (Nigeria), National Consultant

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms	3
Executive Summary	4
1. Introduction	8
Background	8
The purpose of the evaluation	9
Evaluation methodology	9
Constraints.....	10
The report structure	11
2. Child labour in the regional context.....	11
3. Main Findings on Project Design.....	13
Adequacy of problem analysis and design process.....	13
Relevance of objectives and strategy	14
Overall validity of design.....	16
4. Main findings on project implementation:	16
Management issues	18
Stakeholder involvement and implementation capacity.....	19
Usefulness of the planning workshops.....	20
Synergies through successful coordination with ongoing IPEC projects	21
5. Main findings on project performance	22
Progress towards achieving national objectives.....	23
Issues of sustainability	35
6. Lessons learned and emerging good practices	36
Lessons learned	36
Emerging good practices.....	37
7. Conclusions and recommendations.....	38
8. Annexes:.....	41
A. Schedule of team leader's meetings and tasks	42
B. Note on evaluation methodology.....	44
C. Question guide for partner consultation	47
D. Terms of Reference	51

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

AP	Action Programme
APSO	Action Programme Summary Outline
CBP	Capacity Building Programme
CLU	Child Labour Unit
CLC	Child Labour Committees
CLMS	Child Labour Monitoring System
COMMAGRI	Commercial Agriculture Programme
CPC	Country Programme Coordinator
CRC	Child Rights Club
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
DA	District Assembly
IA	Implementing Agency
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPEC	International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour
MoL	Ministry of Labour
MTR	Mid-term Review
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPC	National Programme Coordinator
NSC	National Steering Committee
SPIF	Strategic Programme Impact Framework
TBP	Time-bound Programme
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
USDOL	U.S. Department of Labour
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labour

Executive Summary

1. The **International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)** has been executing a sub-regional capacity-building project since September 2003. Before entering the last phase of implementation, a mandatory mid-term evaluation had to be carried out. This report, which incorporates elements of the individual country assessments produced by national consultants, is the result of the evaluation process that was conducted during September and early October 2004.
2. The **Capacity Building Programme (CBP)** covers five countries: Zambia, Kenya, Uganda, Ghana and Nigeria. It has two immediate objectives to be attained by the end of the project:
 - a) that governments, workers' and employers' organisations, NGOs and other partners will have the technical skills and organisational capacity to formulate and implement policies, programmes and other initiatives to facilitate prevention of the worst forms of child labour.
 - b) that knowledge and experience on child labour and good practice interventions will have been identified and shared among the five core countries and four non-core ones of Ethiopia, Malawi, South Africa and Tanzania.
3. The project **design** displayed sound internal logic based on a participatory process that included an adequate problem analysis, a needs assessment and development of a Strategic Programme Impact Framework (SPIF). These tools helped to provide important baseline data and to map out strategic goals for capacity-building. The nature of the design process also increased ownership and consensus among stakeholders. Experiences from previous IPEC initiatives, notably the Country Programmes, fed into the design but did not systematically inform the process. For example, final evaluations of the preceding Country Programmes came after the CBP had begun.
4. The project strategy is relevant and fits fully into national development policies of the five project countries. The overall objectives and the different activities, outputs and indicators were logically linked. While the quality of the indicators varied, all national project activities involved the preparation of comprehensive monitoring plans. However, there was no inception period and the project design proved unrealistic in terms of the inter-regional project scope and the proposed linkages between countries. Likewise, the project strategy was much less elaborate regarding the character and follow-up for the sub-regional activities.
5. With regard to project **implementation**, the project experienced significant delays during the start-up phase. These resulted in a number of inefficiencies that are currently compounded by the long approval process for Action Programmes. Institutional set up and management structures were adequate. However, Country Programme Coordinators tended to have too many obligations, especially in connection with the closure of the country programmes. Given the amount and pace of work, all national IPEC offices seemed understaffed.

6. The institutional structure at national level, however, was not always fully supportive of project implementation. CLU and NSC were mostly found to be rather weak and had limited capacity to effectively coordinate child labour related activities or to efficiently endorse Action Programme Proposals. Even though IPEC experienced a high staff turnover during the project, the international and national project personnel were found to be highly committed and professional..
7. The number and implementation status of Action Programmes varied by country. In both Zambia and Kenya withdrawal of children has started and five Action Programmes have begun implementation in each of the countries. No Action Programmes had been implemented in Uganda or Ghana at the time of the evaluation. However, six APs in Uganda and two in Ghana, have meanwhile received technical approval and financial clearance. Two more APs in Ghana have been technically approved. In Nigeria, five APs have been approved, and implementation of four of them had commenced by the time of the evaluation.
8. The selection of both old and new implementing partners was informed by the experience under the previous Country Programmes. ILO's traditional social partners seemed comparatively rather weak and contributed in many cases less effectively to the implementation of the project. In contrast and despite some initial difficulties with the formulation of APSOs, non-governmental implementing agencies generally contributed to the project as planned and pursued the objectives effectively. Thus, their implementation capacity and mutual interaction seemed generally quite appropriate to make use of the menu of interventions. Implementing partners generally confirmed the usefulness of this menu.
9. The assessment of the project **performance** to date naturally remains modest. Given both the delays and limited implementation record, it proved difficult to collect data on all the indicators and little can be said to date about the outcomes or overall impact of project activities. Yet, through direct action at the community level, the project has already successfully withdrawn several hundred children. Important inroads have also been made regarding the mainstreaming of child labour concerns that are reflected in relevant national policy documents of all project countries.
10. The longterm effects of capacity-building on implementing agencies remain difficult to measure, as is the extent of successful mainstreaming and the outcome of enhanced advocacy. Organisational child labour policies need to be further developed in all five countries. Moreover, in none of the project countries had National Policies on Child Labour been adopted.
11. Despite growing awareness regarding the need for sustainable interventions, the project-related provisions for **sustainability** remained limited. While commitment of the governments is generally good, and all stakeholders attempt to increase the prospects for sustainability through the involvement of local communities, the mobilisation of external resources has remained minimal.
12. Several **conclusions** have emerged from the evaluation. For example, the approach of the CBP methodology encouraged participation and commitment of stakeholders. This, in turn, has fostered the creation of stronger networks as well as enhanced strategic partnerships. However, some apprehension remains with regard to the use of the methodology by partners and its merit as a monitoring tool. Generally, it is too

early to determine the extent to which the project has been able to affect the larger environment for implementation or whether it has significantly increased capacity among partners. Albeit, the operationalisation of the capacity-building goals, the indicators of achievement and the sub-regional level interventions remained at times unspecific.

13. The CBP is contributing to enhanced awareness, social mobilisation, mainstreaming and direct support in tackling the worst forms of child labour. Targets for direct action seem to have been realistic and may even be surpassed. Greater community participation, local ownership and child participation has increased the prospects for sustainability. The need for more thematic linkages, better sustainability provisions and innovative strategies for additional resource mobilisation is increasingly recognised, but stakeholders need to integrate these elements much more in their forthcoming activities.

14. As far as lessons learned are concerned, it seems evident that:

- the SPIF methodology and the menu of intervention of the project can both function as effective tools for participatory planning and the development of targeted interventions, but it is far too early in the project cycle to judge their merit for monitoring project implementation.
- the flexible strategy did not sufficiently specify the steps necessary for pursuit of the sub-regional objective, which resulted in relatively low awareness levels among project stakeholders regarding the sub-regional project objectives.
- the over-ambitious, inter-regional nature of the CBP made it difficult to effectively link activities in East and West Africa.
- the need for a more pro-active role of the Child Labour Units and greater efficiency of National Steering Committees make a review of their roles and mandate mandatory.
- the elaboration of comprehensive Child Labour Monitoring Systems will be beyond the scope of the Capacity Building Programme and would justify a separate project approach.
- the careful documentation of experiences cannot be taken for granted; rather it requires great effort and possibly specialised training for implementing agencies.

15. Project members generally felt it was to be too early to identify **good practices**. However, the report emphasizes that the participatory approach to design and planning was definitely effective in facilitating organisational networking, institutional linkages and strategic partnerships. Other project elements that could be replicated relate to the quest for sustainability of income-generating activities and educational alternatives, the presence of trained social workers in counselling, the participation of former child labourers in rehabilitation efforts, the development of a broad-based advocacy strategy and the promising potential of involving religious bodies in sensitisation and resource mobilisation.

16. The evaluation produced the following main **recommendations** with regard to project design, implementation and achievement:

- to consider extending the duration of similar regional capacity-building projects in future and to provide for a reasonable inception period;

- to limit the geographical scope of similar projects in the future or to increase the project staffs commensurate with the current scope;
- to significantly shorten the approval process for Action Programmes and to continue simplifying the reporting formats;
- to tackle the institutional prerequisites for effective policy coordination by reviewing the roles of the Child Labour Units and the National Steering Committees;
- to expedite project activities directed at assisting partner governments toward the rapid finalisation of national child labour policies and the development of the required lists of hazardous forms of child labour;
- to put additional emphasis on the attainment of the second immediate objective by using resources earmarked for the participation of non-core countries in sub-regional activities for concrete follow-up activities in core countries;
- to better operationalise the goals of capacity building and mainstreaming by developing more qualitative indicators;
- to include training for fund-raising and resource mobilisation in the activities of the project;
- to highlight opportunities for programmatic linkages with the forthcoming Time-bound Programmes in Kenya and Ghana;
- to strengthen efforts aimed at mainstreaming child labour into HIV/AIDS prevention programmes, programmes addressing poverty and other country-specific causes of child labour.
- to step up activities for the documentation of lessons learned and the identification of good practices.

1. Introduction

This report is the result of an independent mid-term evaluation of a sub-regional child labour project implemented by the International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) of the International Labour Organization (ILO). The project covers five Anglophone countries in East and West Africa: Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Uganda and Zambia. The evaluation was carried out during September and early October 2004 according to the Terms of Reference of August 5, and it included presentations of preliminary findings at five national planning-cum-evaluation workshops in Lusaka, Nairobi, Kampala, Accra and Abuja. As such, the evaluation was to enhance organisational learning, accountability and performance. This report summarises the main findings and conclusions and incorporates elements of the five national assessments that were conducted previously as an integral part of the evaluation.

Background

In 2002, IPEC developed a technical cooperation programme entitled “Building the Foundations for Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Anglophone Africa” [the “Capacity Building Programme (CBP)”]. The project is focussing on **five core countries** and was developed against the backdrop of experiences with national programmes in **Kenya, Zambia, Uganda, Ghana and Nigeria**, which included a combination of awareness-raising, training and capacity-building and direct-action elements. Whereas Kenya has benefitted from IPEC activities since 1992, the other four countries have had programmes implemented only during the period of 1999-2002.

The programme’s official start was in September 2002. However, the project teams became operational much later, with the CTA starting only in February 2003 and national teams starting at different times -- e.g., in Uganda only in May 2003. As a result, the planned end date has been extended to February 2006. The total budget of the CBP was set at USD 5.3 million, and project interventions were designed to be implemented at two levels:

At the **national level**, the immediate objective was that “governments, workers’ and employers’ organisations, NGOs and other partners will have the technical skills and organisational capacity to formulate and implement policies, programmes and other initiatives to facilitate prevention of the worst forms of child labour, and protection, withdrawal, rehabilitation and reintegration of children participating in the WFCL” (Immediate Objective 1).

At the **sub-regional level**, it was expected that at the end of the project “knowledge and experience on child labour and good practice interventions will be identified and shared” (Immediate Objective 2). At this level, in addition to the core countries, activities were to benefit also non-core countries such as Ethiopia, Malawi, South Africa and Tanzania.

A series of national needs assessments provided baseline data for the project. Based on the project’s participatory planning process, the CBP anticipated that partner countries would first identify necessary project outcomes through sub-regional and national SPIF exercises and then select activities from a menu of interventions, including a limited set of pre-determined model interventions for adaptation to the national context. Interventions to be supported at national level would thus fall within the broad range of the following elements:

- Building the knowledge base on child labour;
- Dissemination of information;
- Raising awareness;
- Networking, integration and mainstreaming;
- Policy and legislative support;
- Direct action activities.

Reflecting the project's flexible and demand-driven approach to planning and monitoring, national activities were to be implemented in four stages with national self-evaluation-cum planning workshops to be held at each stage. It was hoped that these workshops would allow for a systematic involvement of all partners, an effective information exchange, the documentation of experiences and - through a close monitoring of implementation - for possible corrections. This mid-term evaluation corresponded to the second self-evaluation-cum planning exercise in each of the project countries. It therefore forms an integral part of the project methodology and its strategic approach.

The purpose of the evaluation

According to the Terms of Reference, this evaluation has the following overall purposes:

- To review the implementation of the project so far and consider any changes in strategy on the basis of emerging experiences, recommending adjustments where necessary;
- To examine current proposed activities and make an assessment of their potential contribution to the implementation of the strategy;
- To review the existing institutional set up and implementation capacity;
- To assess the existing as well as potential linkages between the project and other child labour initiatives being developed in the sub-region, including other planned IPEC programmes, and suggest strategies for cooperation.

A mid-term exercise, the nature of the evaluation was to be formative to effectively inform and enhance the last phase of the project. Key evaluation criteria to be applied included effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability. The detailed TORs are attached to this report.

Evaluation methodology

The evaluation adopted a consultative and partly participatory approach for data collection by employing a combination of semi-structured interviews (with key informants, implementing agencies and IPEC project staff), group discussions with beneficiaries and preparatory desk reviews. Such reviews included the analysis of relevant project documents, technical progress reports, status reports and final evaluation reports of earlier national child labour programmes. The guide for individual interviews consisted of a set of general questions based on the Terms of Reference and adjusted according to the specific group of respondents. In general, both the national and international evaluation teams subscribed to participatory principles in their conceptual approach to the evaluation.

In each of the project countries, the consultants visited government institutions (in particular, the Child Labour Units within the Ministries of Labour), and selected implementing agencies. In addition, some focus group discussions were held with representatives of child labour committees at community level, members of child rights clubs and child beneficiaries in their working or learning environment. As far as the interviews with government officials, social partner representatives and other stakeholders were concerned, these were conducted to obtain opinions of a wide range of project partners and IPEC constituents regarding the project's progress so far. Of special interest was the perspective of stakeholders on the innovative planning process adopted during project design and implementation.

The presentation of preliminary findings and the participation in the national planning workshops presented additional opportunities for testing and refining of preliminary findings. Workshops were seen to form part both of the external evaluation and the internal planning process and included a review of the SPIF, group work and an exchange of experiences among stakeholders.

The entire evaluation was carried out over 38 days, slightly extending beyond the month of September 2004. All five core countries were visited by the teamleader, who was selected by ILO and responsible for the overall coordination and consistency of the evaluation. A detailed list of the itinerary, including an overview of the meetings held, is included in the annex. A second international consultant, selected by USDOL, participated in the work in Uganda, Ghana and Nigeria. At the country level, the two international consultants were assisted by local consultants, who had prepared national assessments to inform the presentation of preliminary findings at the stakeholder workshops and the overall evaluation report. This collaboration proved highly beneficial and constructive. By the end of the mission, all national consultants had submitted draft assessments, and this report incorporates key findings from them.

Constraints

During the evaluation, the international consultants had to deal with a number of challenges related to assessing the progress of the project in five different countries spread over a wide area in a short time. The itinerary was extremely tight and left little opportunity for detailed analysis or extensive partner consultation. The arrangements of the national workshops often allowed for only a day of preparation and brief field visits. This meant that the international team had to rely inordinately on the national consultants, whose draft reports differed markedly in quality. Presentations of the evaluation's preliminary findings, stakeholder discussions at the workshops, and also this report would have benefited from longer, deeper, and more considered field visits by the international consultants.

Constraints existed also with regard to email communication and logistical arrangements. Due to the tight work schedule, the preparation of the main evaluation instrument (question guide) had to be done by the team leader without prior consultation among the team. Likewise, a proposal for the suggested structure of national reports could only be shared with the entire team during the first half of the evaluation process. And the programming that brought the second international consultant into the field half-way through the evaluation complicated the task of developing a coordinated approach to the partner consultation and data analysis. However, it is important to stress that the support, openness and professionalism displayed by

all of the national IPEC officials and the CTA helped a great deal in completing the work despite these difficulties.

The report structure

In compiling this report, the evaluators took note of the *ILO Guidelines for the Preparation of Independent Evaluations of ILO Programmes and Projects*, which also informed the organisation of the present report. The structure of the report reflects the framework detailed in their TORs. It uses general evaluation criteria, such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability in determining the appropriateness of the design, implementation and achievements of the project. The report begins with a brief description of the sub-regional context and then assesses the quality of the project design, the process of implementation and the performance so far. On the basis of these findings, some remarks on the prospects for sustainability and resource mobilisation are made. To the extent possible, lessons learned as well as potential good practices are identified in the subsequent chapter. Finally, the report draws some important conclusions and makes a number of concrete recommendations for project improvement.

2. Child labour in the regional context

Based on current ILO estimates, there are more than 350 million children economically active throughout the world. In terms of absolute numbers, some 61% of working children are found in Asia and 32% in Africa. Around 246 million are engaged in child labour, with the highest incidence to be found in sub-Saharan Africa, where it is thought that some 80 million children (or 41% of the 5-14 year- olds) are involved.

Work or employment by children under the age of 18 becomes child labour when it does not conform with the provisions of ILO Convention No.138 on the Minimum Age for Employment. In addition to the age of the child, it is the type of economic activity and the conditions of work that determine the definition. Globally, some 179 million child labourers are in hazardous work, prostitution, debt bondage or slavery-like conditions, and other illicit activities, which together constitute the *worst forms of child labour*. Children engaged in armed conflict or victims of trafficking also fall within these unconditional forms of worst child labour.

Recent research findings indicate the complex nature and difficult causal relationships of the child labour problem in sub-Saharan Africa.¹ General weaknesses in the enforcement of existing legislation and the development of child labour policies, certain entrenched socio-cultural norms or societal attitudes, a patchy knowledge base and insufficient institutional capacities for resource mobilisation and sustainable direct action exacerbate the problem. Throughout the region, most child labour is found in the agricultural and informal sectors of economy. High poverty rates coupled with slow economic growth, insufficient employment generation, rapid urbanisation and the persistent growth of the informal sector present similar challenges in all five project countries. In Zambia, Kenya and Uganda informed opinion saw child labour as occurring mainly in commercial export agriculture. By contrast, contending

¹ Sonia Bhalotra: Child Labour in Africa, OECD Social Employment and Migration Working Papers No.4, Paris 2003.

views existed with regard to the extent of child labour in small-scale agriculture in West Africa.

Child labour, defined as work performed by children aged 5-17 that is hazardous or harmful to their health, safety, or morals and that interferes with their formal education, is an acknowledged problem in the five countries examined by this evaluation. Children engaged in the worst forms of child labour in the region are found in exploitative domestic work, the fishing industry, small-scale mining, commercial sexual exploitation and the urban informal sector. The often dangerous nature of such work exposes children to serious occupational health risks. In several countries of the region, notably in West Africa, children are also trafficked within and between countries for exploitative work in urban households, commercial agriculture or the sex industry. While reliable empirical data on the extent of the problem are not readily available, findings from recent rapid assessments confirm that the commercial sexual exploitation of children is of grave concern to many countries of the entire region.

Despite the goal of universal primary education and the attempt to maintain free basic education, the accessibility and quality of schools as well as implicit education costs remain other serious problems. Weak education systems, widespread need to combine school with work and the perception of low educational returns often act as disincentives or encourage high drop-out rates. In many instances, low enrolment rates persist with girls often having less opportunities for schooling and being more vulnerable to exploitative work. Sizeable proportions of children are estimated to be out of school. In addition, traditional African notions about the importance of children's participation in family work, abuse in informal practices of kinship fostering, the growth of materialism and the breakdown of traditional systems of social security have all helped to increase pressure on many children to engage in work.

Moreover, the horrific impact of HIV/AIDS and the growing frequency of orphanhood in the region significantly contribute to the growth and persistence of the high incidence of child labour.² Present to varying degrees in all the project countries, this factor is most powerful in Eastern/Southern Africa, and especially in Zambia, where a recent survey found the prevalence rate to exceed 15 percent among citizens aged 15-49.³ By contrast, rates in the West African states of Ghana and Nigeria are said to range around 5 percent for that cohort. In both Uganda and Zambia, some 15% of all children under 15 years of age are believed to have lost at least one parent. Another important regional factor underlying child labour is the involvement of children in armed conflict. In Uganda, bitter fighting between government forces and the Lord's Resistance Army has continued in the north for several years. The conflict has had serious implications for children and pushed far too many toward the worst forms of child labour.

Since 1999 a growing number of African states have implemented Country Programmes with a view to directly assisting children in need and to bringing national legislation in line with international standards. States that have ratified the ILO Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention (No.182) commit themselves to developing immediate and effective measures for the prohibition and elimination of these forms of child labour. This is the case in all five project countries. Central to these activities is the development of a National Plan of Action and the statutory definition of a list of hazardous work.

² Rau, B.: Combating child labour and HIV/Aids in sub-Saharan Africa, IPEC Paper No.1, July 2002.

³ Nkonkomalimba, M.: "Integrating Child-Labour Issues into the HIV/AIDS Agenda – The Way Forward in Zambia," Child Labour in Focus (vol. 2, 2004, pp. 8-9).

The governments of Kenya and Ghana, in particular, have expressed strong commitment for the integration of child labour issues into their national development strategies. As a result, they are currently preparing the implementation of Time-bound Programmes that will include a comprehensive set of direct interventions, clear targets and policies to create an enabling environment for the effective elimination of child labour.

3. Main Findings on Project Design

Responding to some of the specific regional causes of child labour has been an overall objective of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (ILO-IPEC) in anglophone Africa. IPEC support to national efforts against child labour in sub-Saharan Africa began in 1992 with assistance to Kenya. National programmes followed in Ghana, Nigeria, Uganda, and Zambia via direct actions to withdraw children from child labour or to prevent them from entering it during 1999-2002. In addition, those programmes raised consciousness of the practice and strengthened capacities of governments and other organizations in combating it. However, these national programmes also were generally perceived as exhibiting a “top/down” approach – with IPEC mostly as the top and national partners as the bottom - that insufficiently fostered participation by national stakeholders. In part to address these concerns, and also to implement effectively Convention 182, ILO-IPEC instituted the Capacity-Building Programme (CBP) in Anglophone Africa in 2002 with funding from the U.S. Department of Labour.

As outlined in Section 1 above, the CBP aimed to operate on two levels. At the national level, it was expected to consolidate initiatives started under the country programmes, to build upon important direct-action projects, to develop capacities of national stakeholders for carrying out research into the worst forms of child labour, to raise consciousness of those practices, to foster networking and other organizational links among stakeholders to combat the practices, and to build an enabling policy/legal environment for eliminating the worst forms of child labour. At the sub-regional level, the knowledge and good-practice interventions developed across all five national programmes were to be shared also with four other Anglophone countries on the continent – namely Ethiopia, Malawi, South Africa, and Tanzania.

Adequacy of problem analysis and design process

IPEC staff and national stakeholders in the sub-region generally concur that analysis of the worst forms of child labour and how to eliminate them have been adequate under the CBP. Previous initiatives, and especially lessons learned from the country programmes undertaken earlier, were used in framing parts of the “Menu of Interventions.” Also, the persistent challenge of sustainability was acknowledged, albeit perhaps not sufficiently addressed, as part of the project design. The need for monitoring plans was recognised and more attention seems to have been placed on the selection of partners and the *process* of capacity-building rather than on the mere realisation of outputs.

At the national level, several of the successful direct-action initiatives to withdraw children from child labour – such as interventions by the Undugu Society in Kenya, the KIN programme to rehabilitate street children in Uganda or the HDI programme on child domestic workers in Nigeria – have been expanded in the CBP. Thus, rather than focussing exclusively

on institutional capacity-building, the CBP combines this with the consolidation of direct-action interventions.

More broadly, the design process sought to address a key lesson learned about participation by involving a wide range of individuals and organizations in each country in an ongoing series of planning/evaluation workshops. Foremost among these were the Strategic Programme Impact Framework (SPIF) exercises carried out in all five countries during 2003. SPIF workshops took the CBP's Menu of Interventions – five mutually enabling sectors of activity concerned with child labour – and related every one of them to the child-labor needs, responses, actors, and priorities in each country. As a result, the national SPIFs formed the basis for development of the Action Programmes.

However, this building on lessons learned, local capacities, and national efforts already underway was also limited by an overlap – specifically, the CBP was undertaken before (and sometimes well before) the country programmes were completed. An example is Ghana, where the country programme began in July 2000 and continued until January 2004. This overlap meant that the CBP there (and, to lesser extents, in the other four countries as well) did not address lessons learned from the whole country programme because it began before those activities were completed and the final report written.

In addition the time, attention, and labour required to end the country programme delayed the initial steps for implementing the CBP.⁴ Both of these limitations, of course, resulted not so much from flaws in the CBP design as from the timing and manner of its implementation. Yet the limitations are important also for an exceedingly practical reason: if steps are not taken very shortly, a similar overlap will likely recur with the CBP and whatever IPEC programme (if any) that follows it in these countries. For example, action programmes currently underway or about to begin in several are scheduled to end in January 2006, leaving precious little time -- one month -- for the myriad tasks of closing out a project.

Relevance of objectives and strategy

The CBP has the overall development objective of contributing to the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in Anglophone Africa. As discussed above, it seeks this objective through pursuing two interrelated immediate objectives: at the national level, the CBP aims to withdraw or protect 10,000 children from child labour and to develop the technical and organizational capacities of stakeholders opposing such labour in five countries of Anglophone Africa; at the sub-regional level, the CBP promotes the sharing of experiences and information opposing child labour among those five core countries and four peripheral ones.⁵

The strategy for pursuing these objectives involves many tracks and seems both realistic and sound – though there are concerns about timing (as outlined above). On the national level in each of the five countries, direct-action programs aim to prevent children from entering the worst forms of child labour or to withdraw and rehabilitate those who do. In support of these

⁴ In Ghana, it also blurred perceptions about which activities belonged to the country programme and which to the CBP: at the Midterm Evaluation workshop in September 2004, none of the implementing partners could recognize the SPIF or remembered helping to make it. Only after repeated questions and prompts did a few recall their participation; however, most thought the SPIF looked useful and requested copies of the documentation for it.

⁵ “Building the Foundations for Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Anglophone Africa,” ILAB Technical Cooperation Project Summary, p. 1.

programs are the capacity-building activities. First are those to increase knowledge about the worst forms of child labour and how to eliminate them. Next are efforts to raise awareness among government officials, employers, workers' associations, NGOs, and others about these practices and how to deal with them. Third are activities to promote networks and other forms of organization among the officials, employers, etc., so they can better share information and coordinate actions to address them. And fourth are moves to create policies and laws enabling and reinforcing direct actions and the research, media activity, and mobilization efforts that support them. All of these interrelated activities are codified in the SPIF for each country.

In addition to direct actions and supporting activities, a third element in the strategy is preselected activities. There are four of these and they apply to all countries of the CBP: (1) building curricula about the worst forms of child labor, especially for faculties training social workers; (2) establishing community child-labor committees to implement and monitor the progress of activities locally; (3) promoting child participation in CBP activities (e.g., through essay-writing contests or other forms of healthy competition); and (4) establishing national advocacy strategies about child labor. Based on an analysis of the country programmes and progress reports across the sub-region, these actions were intended to supplement the SPIF activities and to provide a basis for common actions and comparisons across the five countries. Although they were not tailored by stakeholders to fit each national situation (as with the SPIF), the preselected activities nonetheless have been found useful and seem mostly to have been adopted eagerly by both IPEC staff and implementing partners.

For example, the SPIF workshop in Nigeria related direct-action activities for children at risk of entering, or already in, the worst forms of child labour to the following: specific needs (absence of temporary shelter for children, low awareness and commitment by government officials about their mandates on child labor, etc.); specific responses to those needs (providing temporary shelters, sensitizing government officials, etc.); specific role assignments (Federal Ministry of Labour and Productivity, Federal Ministry of Information, etc.); and to the next steps for specific action (developing a child-labor policy, generating new research about child labor, etc.). By going through the SPIF workshops, then, a number of Nigerians have engaged in (or deepened their engagement with) adapting general concepts to fit their national situation and committing themselves to apply the results. In this way, participants have become stakeholders dealing with child labor, persons and organizations with vested interests in implementing the decisions they helped to make. Over time, as these joint decisions become implemented, achieved, and built upon, a constituency for child labour can be established, consolidated, and made more effective while the CBP is carried out.

The design of the CBP links the direct-action efforts, capacity-building activities, and preselected activities to the first immediate objective in a logically sequenced, nuanced manner. One can argue that pursuing similar activities on the sub-regional level will lead to similar outputs with reference to the second immediate objective as well, though the design is less explicit in showing how that will be the case. The indicators and means of verification in the Project Monitoring Plan look generally useful for keeping the CBP on track, though several of the indicators feed into more than one output, requiring careful accounting and cross-referencing for accurate monitoring. A few of the indicators also are stated so broadly – e.g., “child labour addressed in Poverty Eradication Action Plans and other government policies” – that their utility as a measurement for mainstreaming or capacity building is questionable.

Nonetheless, the project is relevant to the child-labor situation in the five core countries. It is consistent with poverty-reduction plans, universal primary education programs, and other

government efforts, though discussion of the project-related assumptions remains limited.⁶ The CBP targets specific groups – children whose parents have HIV/AIDS, children from poor families placed in foster care as domestic servants, female children in general, and children living on the streets – as being specially at risk. This approach seems well founded, as it prioritizes efforts to where they are needed most. While it is understandable that some implementing partners could also use more general help to develop their capacities as organizations – e.g., training to develop financial-monitoring and budgeting skills or to make governance structures more accountable and transparent to members – the CBP prudently supports those activities only when they are directly relevant to child labor.

Overall validity of design

Because of the problem analysis, design process, objectives, and strategy discussed above, the CBP has a valid design. Monitoring plans and rather ambitious performance indicators cover all project countries and the activities of the sub-regional CTA office. While not gender specific as such, the project design appears gender-sensitive, both in how it recognizes girls as an especially at-risk population (all other factors equal) and in how it guides activities, IPEC staff, and implementing partners toward dealing effectively with that population. In part due to this gender sensitivity, as well as to its overall relevance to the child-labour situations in the five countries, the CBP appropriately addresses the sectors, geographic areas, and numbers of children and families that it can reasonably be expected to cover.

Conversely, several factors challenge the ambitions of the CBP on the sub-regional level and beyond. As mentioned above, the design is much more explicit about activities on the national level, so it is difficult to speak precisely about its appropriateness elsewhere. However, brief consideration of the economic, social, and cultural differences between countries in Eastern/Southern Africa (Kenya, Uganda, Zambia) and West Africa (Ghana, Nigeria) highlight the challenges of working across two such areas. The distance between those areas, and the transport networks among them, do not soften the challenges, and the requirements of reaching out to the four “peripheral” countries (Ethiopia, Malawi, South Africa, and Tanzania) adds to them. Finally, ILO’s own bureaucracy further complicates work across the project areas, as will be discussed in the section below.

4. Main findings on project implementation:

With regard to overall project implementation, the project has experienced significant delays associated with both the recruitment of project staff during the start-up phase and the retention of staff during the project cycle. Instead of September 2002, the effective time of installment of the Chief Technical Adviser and the actual project start occurred only in the month of February 2003. This resulted in some inefficiencies regarding output delivery and made the evaluation of project implementation against planned activities not fully feasible. The proposed project end date has now been extended until February 2006.

⁶ For example, a key assumption underlying the CBP’s interrelated activities seems to be that coordinated actions by NGOs, ILO’s traditional social partners, and the government officials directly concerned with child labour will generate sufficient political will to achieve necessary policy changes. Such assumptions should be highlighted so that managers and implementing partners are clearly aware of both opportunities and difficulties so they can work to maximize the former.

National level activities are at different stages of implementation. Nonetheless, implementation efficiency has generally picked up, as Action Programmes have gotten underway in Zambia, Kenya and Nigeria. In Ghana the new CPC appeared to be significantly increasing the preparation of programmes and succeeded in having three APSOs quickly approved technically and three others under review. In Uganda, where a very experienced and highly respected CPC has had to make do without a Programme Assistant, seven APs are technically cleared, but still await financial clearance from Procurement. In Zambia, a new CPC has joined the local IPEC office in September, after the previous Coordinator resigned in June. The local IPEC office in Zambia will also receive further support through a Programme Assistant, who joined the team in September 2004, and a likely Junior Professional Officer who is expected to join at a later stage. The latter will have special responsibility for the realisation of the sub-regional project outputs.

The project is moving only slowly towards realisation of the second immediate objective concerning the exchange of information and experience in the sub-region. Sub-regional trainings on child labour research and on mainstreaming were held in Kampala and Lusaka with participation of non-core countries. However, those workshops did not include a systematic follow-up and mostly did not allow for wide representation of tripartite stakeholders. Equally, the Internetbased discussion forum that was launched with some delay, due to technical problems, clearly was not yet well known, as a result of only limited awareness to date about the site.

Work on the compilation of inventories of donor resources is ongoing, but at different stages in all the project countries. A format has been developed and data inputs were being finalised in Zambia and Uganda. Whereas the professional assistance of an intern has only just been secured in Ghana, work is already well underway in Kenya, and it seems to have been completed in Nigeria. Yet, in none of the project countries did stakeholders seem fully aware of the process. Preparations are on-going for the sub-regional technical consultations for MoLs on child-labor monitoring systems that will be held in Dar es Salaam during the month of November 2004.

The lack of reliable and fast email communication has hampered implementation efficiency and negatively affected the mechanisms for information exchange between IPEC offices. In all five project countries, these problems were compounded by the long approval process for Action Programmes. In addition to the steps involved in granting technical approval, complex administrative processes associated with clearance by ILO's own Procurement section, obtaining the final payment authorisation, and preparation and signature of the legal agreement between the Implementing Agency and the Area Office are required. Additional administrative bottlenecks are often due to email problems that can also affect the time it takes to effect signature on waivers or service agreements, requiring the signature of the Area Office Directors in Dar es Salaam, Abuja, or Lusaka.

Further delays have occurred with regard to the transfer of funds, when the timing of Action Programme approval and expenditure forecasts did not fully match. In some cases, Area Offices did then not have sufficient funds at their disposal to meet all commitments. All in all, the time it takes to receive actual clearance or signed service agreements from IPEC headquarters, Procurement and responsible Area Offices appears far too long *after* the APSOs have been approved by the CPCs and the CTA office.

In general, the budgeted amounts for the APs and their effective monitoring seem a bit on the low side, especially as they do not seem to easily allow for regular project visits by the CPCs.

Also, so far, no complementary funding has been recorded, and resources for investments in partner buildings or school infrastructure are not supplied under the CBP.

Management issues

As far as management issues and the institutional set-up were concerned, the overall coordination through the interplay among Chief Technical Adviser and Country Programme Coordinators in each of the project countries seemed to be working well. Backstopping from ILO headquarters was perceived as generally adequate and all workplans appeared to be generally on track. All CPCs commended the CTA for the good technical guidance and support given to them. Admittedly, however, it would appear that the two West African project countries seemed to have received a little less attention from the CTA office, due to the distance involved and the subsequent lack of frequent monitoring visits.

The national coordinators, who mostly had substantial additional responsibilities regarding the management of one or two other IPEC projects, were supported by Financial Officers (or Programme Assistants, in Zambia and Nigeria). The support from these additional project team members seemed to greatly facilitate the work and inter-face with implementing partners. All national project staff interviewed displayed full commitment and seemed to be working in an efficient and very professional manner. Their remuneration levels and number of support staff, however, did not seem adequate, as indicated by individual comments and high turn-over levels in the past.

The national assessments found the management set-ups to be adequate, although in both Zambia and Ghana new CPCs had only just come on board and all local IPEC offices were clearly understaffed. In the past, according to the assessment of some national consultants, this had led to a problem with regard to implementation capacity of the programme secretariats and poor networking. However, thanks to the presence of highly committed CPCs in all project countries and a very competent CTA in Lusaka, the project management during the period was maintained effectively. Despite the relatively high staff turnover, the submission of progress reports so far seems to have been timely. The support rendered by the local ILO Area Offices in Zambia, Tanzania and Nigeria seemed satisfactory in most cases, albeit at times also responsible for some delays.

The CTA office attempted to make up for any delays by processing APSOs rapidly and by offering additional support services through the training and proactive involvement of all the Financial Assistants. With regard to the training of the latter, the project seemed to have been quite successful in transferring the necessary skills to these officials with a view to increasing the implementation efficiency of the project. As a result, reporting obligations have been closely monitored. Those implementing agencies who had already begun implementation of their Action Programmes have had to develop detailed work plans and implementation schedules. Consequently, the quality of progress reporting to USDOL by means of Status Reports and Technical Progress Reports was found to be adequate and to the satisfaction of IPEC headquarters.

Direct communication between the stakeholders and all IPEC staff appeared to be good and inspired by mutual trust. Project partners expressed great satisfaction and gratitude for the quality support rendered by all national project offices. Due to the participation of the majority of partners in the former country programmes, the CBP start-up was generally smooth. However, Country Programme Coordinators tended to have too many other

obligations, especially during the closure of the country programmes and as a result of the absence of ILO country offices. The latter situation particularly affected the work programmes of IPEC offices in Uganda and Ghana, where NPCs always faced the danger of having to take on other non-project related functions. Also in Kenya and Nigeria, where the assessments of national consultants confirmed the good organization of local offices, highly committed CPCs had to share their time among different project activities. Without doubt, the necessary increase in the delivery rate of the project will require the full staff time of all coordinators during the final project phase.

As far as progress toward the two immediate objectives is concerned, the project's Action Programmes seem to be effectively geared towards achieving their targets. All in all, they appeared to be of good quality and the organisations fully capable of implementation and independent reporting. However, it seemed obvious that weaknesses in terms of the project-related "hardware", notably the capacity of the existing educational infrastructure to present viable alternatives to child labour, might actually negatively affect the implementation capacity. The extent to which the CBP had taken these bottlenecks into consideration remained questionable, as the initial needs assessments did not seem to have systematically assessed the constraints of the educational sectors.

Also, the lack of educational material and sufficient resources for local level child labour committees could hamper effective implementation in future. In Kenya, for instance, it appears that some of the services rendered to withdrawn children - by way of vocational skills training and apprenticeship schemes - would become more effective if they included access to text books and possibilities for income. Similarly, the lack of IT equipment and necessary skills appeared to limit the effective use of the electronic discussion forum at the time of the evaluation.

Stakeholder involvement and implementation capacity

In all project countries, the involvement of stakeholders, organisational implementation capacities and government commitments were generally perceived to be good. Yet, as a result of frequent reshuffling of relevant officials, the sense of project ownership was not consistently strong throughout the five project countries and the degree of involvement among the Social Partners differed. In all cases the selection of implementing partners during the implementation of the CBP extended beyond the traditional tripartite set-up and included primarily NGOs that already had participated under the national programmes. However, Kenya's national assessment claimed that the selection of implementing agencies could have included a more careful organisational assessment of existing strategic priorities.

In terms of their institutional capacity, ILO's traditional social partners seemed comparatively weak and thus contributed in many cases less effectively to the implementation of the project. Nonetheless, an effective collaboration between the Government, Workers' and Employers Organisations was underway in the development of a national advocacy strategy in Ghana. The national assessment for Uganda, on the other hand, felt that the advocacy potential associated with the national union structure was not effectively put to use and that major capacity needs persisted, for instance, in the area of proposal writing. Indeed, general institutional capacity needs seemed to persist with several IAs in the realm of general management skills, monitoring and methods for documentation.

Thus, taken together, institutional structures at national level were not always fully supportive of project implementation. The institutional implementation capacity of the Child Labour Units and the responsible Ministries was usually less pronounced than that of other implementing partners. Despite some success in training and in sensitizing relevant government officials or law enforcement officers, CLUs were mostly found to be rather weak and with limited capacity to effectively coordinate child labour activities. Given the project's focus on capacity-building, a more systematic way of addressing the weak institutional capacities of the CLUs and NSCs could have perhaps been expected. Unless effectively revitalized, National Steering Committees especially should have their prominent role in the endorsement of APs reconsidered.

Interestingly enough, in Zambia the Child Labour Unit benefitted from a recent increase in direct Government funding. In Uganda, the Child Labour Unit had a highly competent and experienced coordinator plus two part-time staff, while Kenya even boasted of a Child Labour Division of up to eight officers. Despite these strengths, in most cases staff and financial resources of Child Labour Units remained highly inadequate, and frequent turnover of personnel seemed to indicate low strategic priority as well as limited political clout. Country-wide labour inspection and full enforcement of legislation were other bottlenecks in all the project countries. For instance, in Uganda, the District Labour Officers, who are the focal points for child labour issues at their level, covered only 26 out of the 56 districts of the country.

Similarly, National Steering Committees seemed to have major difficulties in meeting regularly and efficiently endorsing Action Programme Proposals. In most cases this was attributed to the lack of resources and the institutional weaknesses of Child Labour Units in their capacity as secretariats. Not surprisingly then, in all countries the national assessments conducted in preparation of the mid-term review found the Steering Committees to be in need of reviewing their role, membership and commitment.

In contrast and despite some initial difficulties with the formulation of APSOs, non-governmental implementing agencies generally contributed to the project as planned and pursued the objectives effectively. The country report for Uganda, for instance, confirmed that all partner agencies had fully qualified and experienced staff, well-established governance structures, and experience with monitoring systems and audited accounts. Yet, the example of Children in Need in Zambia revealed that sudden changes in leadership can also affect the implementation capacity of otherwise strong civil society actors.

Usefulness of the planning workshops

Strategic Programming Impact Frameworks (SPIFs) were developed in all countries, followed by the first round of stakeholder self evaluations and the required mid-modular review workshops. These helped to foster participation and project ownership among stakeholders, as indicated during partner interviews and national planning workshops. The planning methodology also gave participants an opportunity to participate in the selection of partners and to optimize the division of labour. In turn, project partners in all five countries seemed fully committed and appeared to share common understandings of the key concepts of child labour, in particular its worst forms. Especially in Nigeria, Uganda and Kenya the outcomes of the planning workshops were well documented and effectively used for information exchange among stakeholders. Based on the national planning processes, the areas of focus

are the informal sector in Zambia, Kenya, Uganda and Ghana – with only Nigeria’s focus being on domestic work.

Generally, the partners consulted on the usefulness of the SPIF, the menu of interventions and the planning workshops saw these elements as important tools for consensus-building and demand-driven Action Programmes. As far as the national SPIFs were concerned, the assessment of stakeholders pointed to its added-value for participatory planning and maintaining a focus on the objectives. Partner comments at the national workshops confirmed this in Kenya, Zambia, Nigeria and Uganda. Although the majority of stakeholders participating in the national midterm review workshop in Ghana expressed a certain lack of previous exposure to the SPIF (as described in note 4 above), here also the planning workshops were described as extremely useful for those organisations who had been involved in the preparation of Action Programmes.

The first set of self-evaluation-cum-planning exercises were carried out between September and November 2003, while the mid-module reviews took place in the following March and April. The meetings were used to discuss common concerns and to brief stakeholders regarding the development and planning for Action Programmes. In addition, the meetings were seen as an important networking opportunity for partners. Therefore, stakeholders of other IPEC programmes were generally given the opportunity to participate in the mid-term review meetings conducted in each country.

Actually in all countries the implementation capacity and institutional interaction seemed quite appropriate and fully conducive to making good use of the participatory planning methodology. The pre-selected items included under the menu of interventions were generally found to be relevant, albeit slightly limiting the participatory nature and scope of the menu of interventions. In cases such as in Ghana, some national stakeholders found the selection of areas to be restricted by the mandatory nature of the pre-selected items. As a result, direct action and curriculum reform were perceived to be receiving too much attention, while other capacity-building priorities that the SPIF had identified were seen as in danger of being left out.

In general, however, the menu of interventions offered a flexible framework for implementation and regular planning workshops effectively functioned as planning tools. During all partner meetings in the five project countries, participants were asked to discuss a number of questions in group work. The issues to be discussed related to the implementation capacity of stakeholders, the prospects for sustainability of their interventions, any lessons learned or emerging good practices and, finally, whether the strategic direction of the project was still within the priorities that had originally been identified by the SPIF. These intense discussions nurtured institutional linkages and encouraged a systematic information exchange about the Action Programmes of partners and also helped to assess the progress of implementation. Yet, given the delays in implementation, the evaluation could not establish to what extent these tools were used for monitoring purposes.

Synergies through successful coordination with ongoing IPEC projects

A number of synergies were created by the collaboration of several IPEC projects in all countries and by the networking among partners. By its very nature, the Capacity Building Programme attempted to coordinate activities with other IPEC projects, expand technical skills and build upon existing initiatives. In this regard, work initiated under COMAGRI in

Zambia, Kenya and Uganda was to be followed through concerning the development of Child Labour Monitoring Systems. Also, a number of joint training activities or team-building exercises have been hosted and in several cases the evaluation observed a pooling of resources. In most of the country offices the CBP shared support staff and equipment with other IPEC activities.

Intense collaboration was observed with the COMAGRI project. Earlier in the year, an important training event for IPEC Finance and Administrative Assistants (FAAs) was jointly hosted by the two projects. Feedback from stakeholders seems to confirm that this is perceived as enabling local IPEC offices to better support partner agencies, prevent reporting delays and improve the quality of the financial reports.

Especially in Kenya, IPEC staff from different projects displayed an impressive team spirit, and coordinated work regularly at a monthly “ILO Managers Forum.”. However, consultation and information exchange seemed to occur in all project offices, and Project Coordinators of other IPEC or ILO projects participated in all five stakeholder workshops. Equally, all project offices made efforts at collaborating with other UN or international agencies. Synergies were also created among partners at the field level through joint activities and mutual participation in selected activities.

In general, resource utilisation of the CBP appeared to be efficient and targeted attempts were made to limit expenditure through the pooling of resources or the negotiation of other favourable arrangements. In Kenya, media houses have been successfully lobbied to provide free newspaper space and some trainers agreed to reduce their charges during the attachment period under direct action programmes. On the other hand, implementation was reportedly hampered when a new headquarter-driven advocacy product had to be conceptually integrated in the Action Programme Proposals at a rather late stage.

In Nigeria, three planned research projects were modified in order to be integrated into an UN inter-agency research programme on child protection. There, as in Uganda and Zambia, the local IPEC offices participate in a number of important fora. Nevertheless, the national assessment for Ghana rightly identified the challenge of coordination for the various IPEC projects in the country. This will be a major task for the forthcoming Time-bound project. In fact, judged on the basis of partner perceptions, a more coordinated approach by IPEC or the transition towards more coherent country programmes seems appropriate in all project countries as a way to maximize synergies.

The advent of the Time-bound projects in both Kenya and Ghana also meant that the two countries had to adjust their work programmes accordingly and begin preparations for an integration of various projects under a common management structure.

5. Main findings on project performance

Given the late start and limited implementation, it is not really possible to evaluate the performance i.e., the achievements of the CBP results against expected outputs at this point. The extent to which the objectives of the project have been achieved can only be assessed fairly and accurately once implementation has progressed further. This finding is basically confirmed by all the national assessments.

As indicated above, the implementation efficiency of the project was negatively affected by the large number of Action Programmes not yet approved. Nevertheless, as far as likely progress towards the first immediate objective is concerned, the sizeable allocation of the budget and the quality of the project's Action Programmes seem all geared towards achieving the targets. While prevention targets have generally not yet been reported as part of AP implementation, withdrawal and reintegration of children are underway in Zambia, Kenya and Nigeria. It is here where the impact of the project is already felt at the community level.

Given initial results to date, their good track records and promising implementation capacity, implementing partners of these countries are likely to exceed their targets of 2000 children by the end of the project. The effectiveness of the project is also expressed by the extent to which public opinion is being sensitized in all the countries, community structures take on new responsibilities, national alliances are built and preparations get underway for the development of comprehensive advocacy strategies. At the same time, the adoption of new legislation and comprehensive national policies seems to be proving more difficult than anticipated. It is important to stress that it is also the process of project implementation (associated with the mobilisation of local communities) that is contributing to the building of longterm capacity.

The extent to which the second immediate objective has been achieved is far less clear, as the outcomes of the sub-regional workshops are difficult to measure and no concrete national follow-up activities were programmed. Given the technical difficulties and delays in launching the web-based discussion forum as well as in compiling the inventories, it seems evident that less information sharing among countries has so far materialised than what was originally expected. Unless much more emphasis will be put on the concrete objectives and national follow-up mechanisms for the project's sub-regional activities, the intended promotion of greater capacity and better exchange of experience there will have only limited success.

Progress towards achieving national objectives

Zambia

In the context of implementation, project partners have effectively expanded their capacities, notably for project development and implementation. Institutional alliances and awareness raising efforts have been stepped up. Remarkably, project stakeholders even started planning independent activities without direct support from IPEC, as exemplified during the activities marking the World Day against Child Labour. Significant progress has also been made with regard to the establishment of child rights clubs and civil society consultations for the development of an advocacy strategy. While specific activities aimed at prevention have not yet started, direct action under the project has resulted in the withdrawal of 725 children (414 boys and 335 girls) who have been counselled and provided with non-formal education. Finally, the Child Labour Unit has received a sizeable budgetary allocation.

However, judged on the basis of the monitoring plan, the evaluation found several other goals only partially attained. For instance, the revised Employment Act as well as the Employment of Children & Young Persons Act were not yet available, as the bills had only recently been submitted to the parliament. Similarly, the national child labour policy has not yet been adopted and the human resource capacity of the Child Labour Unit was still comparatively weak. However, addressing these shortcomings formed part of the Action Programme that the MoL had submitted and that seemed to be fully backed by the relatively strong commitment

of the government. Even so, the revised curriculum for social work was not yet in place, and organisational policies on child labour needed still to be developed.

At the time of the evaluation, the following five Action Programmes had begun implementation in Zambia:

- Children in Crisis: Enhancing Children’s Participation in the Debate;
- M-Films: A Multi-Media Campaign to combat the WFCL;
- JCM: Programme for combating child labour through capacity building in rural communities;
- ACP: Mobilisation of Church Leaders to combat the WFCL;
- CHIN: National Advocacy Strategy.

Recently, an additional proposal for the involvement of artists in awareness-raising activities by the Child Labour Ambassadors got approval. At the time of the evaluation, proposals by the Ministry of Education for Curriculum Reform, by Kalushi District Council for Direct Action, by Hosano Mapolo for support to Child Labour Committees and by AOHD on Community Mobilisation were still awaiting financial clearance. In the meantime, the Action Programme Proposal from the Ministry of Labour & Social Security in Zambia has been approved after awaiting financial clearance for several months. This programme is intended to assist in the formulation of a list of hazardous labour and the development of a statutory instrument. Finally, a union proposal by ZCTU is still under review.

Summary chart of Action Programmes in Zambia

Action Programme	Status and Nature of Action Programme	Achievements	Challenges
Anglican Children’s Project	On-going/withdrawal, rehabilitation and reintegration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrew 1500 children out of the intended 1200 • Mobilised 15 churches to fight against CL • Established 15 CLC • Trained CLC in youth and child care • Rehabilitating children currently • Introduced IGAs to parents • Implementing pilot child trafficking project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial reporting procedures not entirely clear • Initial delay in project approval especially at Geneva • Sustainability question

Jesus Cares Ministry	On-going/withdrawal and rehabilitation reintegration into education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrew 425 children by the end of the last quarter but the number is still rising • Mobilised direct funding from USDOL • In the process of rehabilitating and providing education supporting to withdrawn children 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial delays in project approval • Sustainability question
M-Films	On-going/Video campaign on WFCL and establishing collaboration with NGOs and other stakeholders/ sensitizing the public and NGOs/influencing legislation and enforcement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues and themes for focus identified • Filming and compilation and categorization of information has been done • Previewing of documentaries is on-going 	
Children in Need Network	On-going/ Development of an advocacy strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft advocacy strategy in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change over of Director affecting pace of strategy development • sustainability
Ministry of Labour and Social Services	Proposal just approved. Will focus on completion of policy and legislation on CL and support to the CLU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft policy prepared but not finalized • Child labour unit opened up • Received budget line from Government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low capacity of CLU • Pace of drafting policy slow

Kalulushi Municipal Council	Proposal just approved/ to carry out withdrawal, rehabilitation and reintegration		
Artists Promoting Children's Rights (child labour ambassadors)	Proposal just approved/sensitization on children's rights/ small library on children's rights		
Children in Crisis	On-going/ child rights clubs, school debates, essays and art competitions on CL, formation of CL task forces, newsletters, t-shirts for sensitisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 child rights clubs formed in 20 schools • 1047 children reached as opposed to targeted 800 • Debated initiated in schools. • Only 16 out of planned 40 interviewed of children done 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability question
Ministry of Education	Proposal just been approved to incorporate child labour into curriculum of higher institutions of learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainstreamed child labour into primary and secondary school curricula (grades 5-12) • Received budgetary allocation from Ministry of finance and national planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slow pace of approval of projects by IPEC Geneva • Finance budgetary line threatened with withdrawal due to late clearance of project proposal.

Taken together, these proposals should all support the attainment of the project goals, notably the development of legislation, direct support to rural communities, greater advocacy or social mobilisation and mainstreaming of child labour concerns.

Kenya

Here CBP implementation has been supported by the development of a National Action Plan against Child Labour and the review of labour legislation. A draft child labour policy is awaiting approval by the cabinet and the government has maintained its commitment to the

provision of free primary education. The selection of Action Programmes does seem to properly reflect the thematic priorities agreed upon by all stakeholders during the national SPIF. Seven out of ten Action Programmes have meanwhile been approved, six of which are operational or just kicking off, while one was at the stage of agreement signature during the evaluation. Three other APs are in the pipeline.

So far, the targets for direct action are being met. According to the national assessment, 155 boys and 133 girls have already been withdrawn from child labour and given training through vocational attachments. The programme has also started sensitizing trainees on the risks of HIV/AIDS and facilitated the formation of three new Child Labour Committees. As a result of the training of journalists, 19 newspaper articles have been published recently. It is believed that the recording of a campaign song will also impact positively on public awareness. The ongoing media campaign also offered a number of opportunities for organisational collaboration and concrete follow-up.

However, the quality of information and vocational training is hampered by the lack of promotional education material or text books for the trainees. Some implementing agencies are also thought to be in need for training in management skills, resource mobilisation or gender sensitisation and might become overstretched due to their involvement with other IPEC projects as well. Unfortunately, little progress seems to have occurred with regard to the second immediate objective and most partners were unaware of the existence of a sub-regional newsletter or website. The following chart depicts the status and intervention results to date:

Summary of status of action programmes in Kenya

AP	STATUS	TYPE OF INTERVENTION	ACHIEVEMENTS	CHALLENGES
MOL	Priorities have been realigned since Kenya was identified to implement TBP, to focus on enhancing the capacity of the CLD	Policy and legislation	Have brainstormed amongst themselves and identified their capacity needs.	Frequent transfers of staff resulting in delays. Staff has been increased at the CLD. Recently have deployed a full-time manager for the CLD.
FKE	AP approved and IA opening bank account.	Awareness raising and social mobilization		
COTU	AP operational.	Social Mobilisation	COTU's policy reviewed to integrate child labour. 3 CLC have been formed.	Lack of IEC materials for use by local CLC at household levels
UON	AP approved but not operational	Building knowledge base and dissemination		
USK	AP operational	Direct Action	133 girls and 155 boys withdrawn and trainers identified to offer them training. 636 prevented through provision of desks to schools.	Loss of incomes by those withdrawn. Some children find it difficult to identify courses to be trained in.

ANPPCAN	AP recently approved	Social Mobilisation	Has prepared for the project, for example, planning workshops have been scheduled, 4 polytechnics identified and 16 primary schools identified as well.	
ANPPCAN	A mini AP implemented	To organize a children's summit on Child Labour.		
CLAN	AP recently approved	Awareness raising and social mobilization		Difficulties in internalization of the SCREAM pack.
CWSK	AP recently approved & started	Direct Action		
ACDC	Mini AP operational	Awareness raising and social mobilisation		
AMWIK	AP operational	Awareness raising and social mobilization	2 journalists' workshops held. A song on child labour has been composed and put on CD.	The leadership within most media houses is yet to understand and prioritize WFCL
AMWIK	A mini AP implemented	Awareness raising and social mobilization	A newspaper supplement to mark the WDACL was done.	

Uganda

The activities of the national IPEC office resulted in significant progress with the mainstreaming of child labour concerns into the revised national poverty strategy and the creation of general awareness in society. Old and new project partners have engaged in joint planning of project activities and seemed remarkably well aware of the activities of one another. The effects of a targeted media campaign were being felt and the development of a national advocacy strategy was underway.

Direct action programmes by KIN, UYDEL and ANPPCAN focus on withdrawal and prevention and have begun reintegrating children into formal education or vocational skills training. The national SPIF has placed a lot of emphasis on awareness raising and each of the implementing agencies has been contributing one way or the other. The project's mainstreaming activities appear to having a significant impact in bringing CL issues to the fore. The good networking record of the Uganda IPEC office under the project will be further improved with the establishment of the National Coalition Against Child Labour.

However, there was much less success in the realisation of other project targets. Based on the performance assessment of the Project Monitoring Plan, none of the districts had so far integrated child labour in their development plans and no new Child Labour Committees or Child Rights Clubs had been formed during the period under review. The draft child labour policy was still pending and several indicators provided no substantial information on targets. More importantly, implementation of Action Programmes had not begun at the time of the evaluation. While a total of 13 Action Programme Proposals was in the project pipeline, the only AP currently providing for policy development was still under review.

The following six Action Programmes have so far been finalised in Uganda:

- ANPPCAN: (a) development of a national advocacy strategy and (b) establishment of local Child Labour Committees;
- Uganda Youth Development Link: Direct Action;
- Kids in Need: Direct Action;
- Makere University: integration of child labour in the curriculum of Social Work;
- Rural Development Media Communications: awareness and community mobilisation.

Summary Chart of Action Programmes in Uganda

	TITLE OF AP	Area of intervention	Implementing agency	STATUS
1.	Integration of Child Labour Education in the curriculum of Social Work at Makerere University	Mainstreaming	Department of Social work and social administration, Makerere University.	Submitted to Procurement
2.	Empowerment of children in the prevention and elimination of Child Labour	Mobilisation/children's participation in debates on child labour issues.	Uganda Child Rights NGO Network (UCRNN)	Ready to be submitted to procurement
3.	Developing a national advocacy strategy on the worst forms of child labour	Advocacy/creating an enabling environment	ANPPCAN (U)	Submitted to Procurement
4.	Establishment and operationalisation of a national coalition against Child Labour.	Advocacy/creating an enabling environment	Child Labour Unit.	Still being reviewed.
5.	Strengthening the Capacity of Child Labour Unit	Mainstreaming/policy formulation/enforcement	Child Labour Unit.	Still being reviewed .
6.	Strengthening the capacity of KIN communities to prevent and withdraw children from hazardous street activities (Direct Action)	Direct action	Kids In Need (KIN)	Submitted to procurement
7.	Strengthening the capacity of Child Labour Committees to prevent and withdraw children from hazardous informal sector activities	Social mobilisation/direct action	ANPPCAN (U)	Submitted to Procurement
8.	Rehabilitation of commercially sexually exploited children in Kawempe division, Kampala and Busia Town Council	Direct action	Uganda Youth Development Link	Submitted to Procurement.

	TITLE OF AP	Area of intervention	Implementing agency	STATUS
9.	Mainstreaming CL into Federation of Uganda Employer's Programmes and policies.	Mainstreaming	Federation of Uganda Employers	Being finalised
10.	Mainstreaming of CL in the polices and programmes of National Organisation of Trade Unions of Uganda	Mainstreaming	Trade Unions	Being finalised
11.	Strengthening the Capacity of the Uganda National Teachers Union.	Mainstreaming/social mobilisation	Uganda National Teachers Union	Being finalised
12.	Creating Awareness and mobilizing community action against Child Labour.	Awareness raising	Rural Development Media Communications	Submitted to Procurement
13.	Strengthening the Capacity of the Family and Protection Unit, Uganda Police	Mainstreaming/social mobilisation/enforcement	The Family Protection Unit, Uganda Police	Being finalised

Once approved and implemented, these programmes will be contributing significantly to the realisation of the project goals, especially with regard to community mobilisation, mainstreaming and direct support.

Ghana

As a result of serious delays in project implementation and resignation of the previous Country Programme Coordinator, project partners have so far not begun implementation and have not been able to effectively enhance their institutional capacities in the context of the CBP. Nonetheless, project stakeholders have made some progress in terms of awareness raising and sensitisation, notably through an initiative of Women in Broadcasting, to enhance the capacity of journalists in the country on child labour issues as part of a mini-programme, and through preparations for assisting the Women & Juvenile Unit of the Ghana Police Force to sensitise its personnel on child labour issues. The new CPC has been successful at submitting four Action Programmes and starting work on the compilation of the donor inventory.

However, the national child labour policy has not yet been adopted and – without the intended direct consultation taking place during the course of the evaluation - the perception among some project stakeholders remained that the institutional capacity of the Child Labour Unit seemed still comparatively weak. According to the findings from Ghana's national report, networking and coordination among IAs were equally weak and inadequate skill levels were partly responsible for the considerable delay in the programme. Also, lack of proper coordination between the Ministry of Manpower Development & Employment and the Ministry of Women and Children's Affairs hampered effective coordination within responsible government ministries.

The involvement of the District Assemblies in the preparation and implementation of the Action Programmes remained limited to date. However, stakeholder involvement was set to increase markedly as a result of the efforts of the newly appointed CPC and the process initiated by the mid-term evaluation. Furthermore, it appeared that an effective collaboration between the government, on one hand, and organisations of workers and employers on the other is underway in the development of a national advocacy strategy. The realisation of this Action Programme could be a basis for a good practice.

At present, Action Programmes by the following partner agencies have been finalised and are included in the pipeline:

- International Needs Ghana: Community mobilisation and direct action;
- Regional Advisory and Information Systems/Rains: Direct Action;
- Youth Development Foundation: Direct Action;
- Center for Community Studies, Action and Development: Child Participation;
- School of Social Work: Curriculum Reform.

Summary chart of planned Action Programmes in Ghana

No	Name of Implementing Agency	Location	Title of Action Plan	Area of Intervention	Status of Action Programme	Proposed Date of Implementation
1	Regional Advisory and Information Systems (RAINS)	TAMALE	Prevention of young Girls in Tolon /Kumbungu and Savelugu/Nanton District in Northern Region from engaging in 'Kayaye' activities	Withdrawal	Agreement to start work	Oct 04
2	International Needs-Ghana (ING)	ACCRA	a.Prevention and withdrawal of children in Commercial Sexual Exploitation in Accra	Withdrawal	Agreement stage	Oct 04
3			b. Mobilation of CLCS to prevent & withdraw Child from fishing.		Procurement stage	Oct 04

4	Youth Development Foundation (YDF)	KUMASI	Progressive elimination of CL in Illegal mining and stone quarry in Adansi West & Ga District	Withdrawal	Procurement stage	Oct 04
5	Centre for Community Studies, Action and Development (CENCOSAD)	ACCRA	Interactive Child Labour Project	Child Participation	Receiving technical input	Jan 05
6	School of Social Work-Accra (SSW)	ACCRA	?	Curriculum Development	Receiving technical input	Jan 05

Taken together, these proposals should eventually support the attainment of the project goals, notably with direct support to vulnerable communities, greater awareness or social mobilisation and the mainstreaming of child labour concerns. The development of the knowledge base, the finalisation of a CLMS, and the creation of an enabling environment through policy and legal interventions seem to have been relegated to the incoming TBP, as their implementation are likely to require more time, additional financial resources and an integrated approach. To a certain extent, this might reduce the overall impact of the CBP in Ghana.

Nigeria

In Nigeria, the government has repeatedly renewed its commitment to the project as well as to free compulsory basic education. A number of important pieces of legislation have recently been passed and the project sought to use this conducive framework for targeted awareness-raising activities. One hundred and fifty children were reported as having been prevented from exploitative work through the provision of other services not related to education. Further, the CBP in Nigeria has successfully increased networking among stakeholders and fostered inter-agency collaboration. To address institutional capacity needs in technical and financial reporting, training for Implementing Agencies is jointly planned with WACAP. As part of the sub-regional project dimension, work on the inventory has been completed.

Nonetheless, the programme has suffered some implementation delays, due to bottlenecks in the process of formulating or approving Action Programmes and the lack of appropriate internet facilities or a reliable electricity supply necessary for effective communication. In cooperation with the local ILO Area Office, the project has sought to address these problems through the purchase of a power generator and the installment of an appropriate internet facility. In view of the size of the country, resources for project monitoring have been insufficient. Also, the evaluation team could not establish full information on existing quantitative targets as part of the performance information contained in the monitoring plan.

Out of a total of eleven Action Programmes proposed, five have been approved and six are currently in the pipeline. In addition, two mini-projects have been implemented successfully, including a campaign for homes free of child labour. All Action Programme Proposals

already under implementation seem capable of attaining their direct action targets and relevant to the development of a comprehensive national advocacy strategy, the training of social workers and the sensitization of the media. In line with the consensus developed at the national SPIF, their area of focus is child domestic work.

The implementing agencies have been carefully selected on the basis of their previous track records. ANPPCAN's proposal for the strengthening of child labour committees in Southern Nigeria is currently under review in Geneva, whereas three APSOs in support of the Federal Ministry of Labour & Productivity, the Federal Ministry of Women's Affairs and of the Federal Ministry of Information are currently being assessed by the CPC and the CTA. Other proposals being developed concern the cooperation with faith-based organisations and the sensitization of legislators, and a further proposal is expected from the Nigeria Labour Congress. Three planned research items have been merged into a larger UN programme planned with UNICEF and UNODC.

A summary of the status of Action Programmes is presented below:

Summary of status of Action Programmes in Nigeria

S/N0	TITLE	IMPLEMENTING PARTNER	START DATE (ACTUAL)	CURRENT LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION	REMARKS
1.	Development of National Advocacy Strategy Against Child Labour	Women Trafficking and Child Labour Eradication Foundation (WOTCLEF), Abuja	April, 2004	Ongoing:- Technical-Committee- developed and reviewed draft of National Advocacy Strategy document produced	Draft document articulated by experts and select strategic stakeholder inputs
2.	Building the capacity of Children in Domestic Work through Education and Training to Enhance their Future Prospects in Nigeria	Women's Consortium of Nigeria (WOCON), Lagos	May, 2004	Ongoing:- Preparatory activities for identified at-risk and victim children accomplished	Preparatory activities now expected to dovetail into empowerment (educational, psychological and skills acquisition) activities
3.	Withdrawal and Prevention of Child Domestic in South West Nigeria	Human Development Initiatives (HDI), Lagos	June, 2004	Ongoing:- Mobilization of working partners, contacts and material resources preparatory to actual withdrawal and prevention work	Preparatory synergies created for effective withdrawal and prevention work in the context of emergent challenges and expected efficiency of outputs – project very much on course
4.	Strengthening Media Capacity to Eliminate Child Labour and Child Trafficking	News Agency of Nigeria (NAN), Abuja/Lagos	June, 2004	Ongoing:- Initial series of media sensitization achieved	Antecedant media sensitization for a more quantum and technically enhanced mobilization in place
5.	Development and Pilot Testing of Child Labour Education Manual for Training of Social Workers in Nigeria	Directorate of Assisted Programmes and Linkages (DAPAL), Niger State College of Education, Minna	October, 2004	Contacts and preparation for first consultative workshop completed	Office records evidence that appropriate experts have been contacted and invited for the first activity of the project

6	Mobilization of Faith-Based Organizations for Combating and Eliminating Child Labour	Child Rights Information Bureau (CRIB) – Fed. Ministry of Information and National Orientation, Abuja	Still in the Pipeline and envisaged to start (Dec. 2004)	Forwarded to Chief Technical Adviser for inputs	Proposal evidences potential for involving a critical segment of civil society in CBP
7	Promoting the Participation of Children in the Fight Against Child Labour	Child Development Department (CDD), Fed. Min. of Women's Affairs, Abuja	Envisaged to start (Dec. 2004)	Implementing partner has concluded proposal, which has been forwarded to CTA	Proposal has potential for propagating ILO Conventions and Nigeria's Child Rights Act (Including Child Labour Concerns)
8.	Establishment of Child Labour/ Neighbourhood Committees in Endemic Communities of South East/South-South Nigeria	African Network for the Protection and Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect in Nigeria (ANPPCAN), Enugu	Envisaged to start (Oct. 2004)	Under review in Geneva	A proactive Action Project for prevention of the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Nigeria
9.	Facilitating the Implementation of Child Labour Programmes in Nigeria	Child Labour Unit (CLU), Fed. Min. of Labour, Abuja	Envisaged: Dec. 2004	Proposal forwarded to CTA for inputs	Proposal evidences potential for the realization for the goals of ILO Conventions on Worst Forms of Child Labour in Nigeria
10.	Advocacy/Sensitization Rally for Local Government Officials, Traditional Rulers, Opinion Leaders, Representatives of Grassroots Organisation, Youths and Women Groups	Nigeria Labour Congress (NLC)	-	Proposal awaited from IP	-

Taken together, these proposals should all support the attainment of the national project goals in Nigeria, notably the direct support to children at risk, greater advocacy and social mobilisation.

In Kenya, Nigeria, and Zambia, IPEC offices and their partners have thus successfully planned their SPIFs, participated in periodic workshops at the national and/or sub-regional levels, developed and gotten approval for action plans, and begun to implement activities. In Ghana and Uganda, all of these steps except implementation have been taken. With the formulation of national Action Programmes at different stages in all five project countries, the project remains significantly delayed. All in all, Action Programmes appear to be fully reflective of

thematic priorities identified in the context of the various SPIF exercises and have effectively incorporated the pre-selected areas in national programmes.

Overall, the areas of intervention focus primarily on awareness-raising, social mobilisation, networking and direct action as well as on the development of the knowledge base and – to a lesser degree – on an enabling policy environment. This is also a reflection of the fact that the realisation of the support to MoLs, as foreseen under several Action Programmes, has not yet started. Nevertheless, the finalisation of national child labour policies does remain an important project element, especially in Nigeria, Uganda and Zimbabwe. Successful implementation of the pre-selected APs on the development of national advocacy strategies will also surely contribute to furthering policy formulation on child labour issues.

Issues of sustainability

Awareness of the need for special sustainability provisions has been growing in the aftermath of the country programmes, when most final evaluations found serious fault in this regard. However, so far no specific sustainability measures seem to be in place under the overall (sub-regional) CBP and the vast majority of organisations remain without clear exit strategies. Likewise, the mobilisation of external resources does not seem to feature strongly on the agenda of national stakeholders.

Yet all project partners seem to have recognised the importance of involving local communities, child labour committees or local government structures in the implementation of project activities. This suggests that sustainability has so far been enhanced under the CBP not only by building technical and organizational capacities but also by increasing local ownership and apparently responding to available political will.

In theory, as a national IPEC staff and its implementing partners adapt the Menu of Interventions to develop their country's SPIF, and then meet at periodic workshops to review and modify or continue their activities, they learn to plan collaboratively. Then, in implementing the various interconnected activities of the SPIF, they conjointly learn to work collaboratively in pursuing the direct-action targets and in building capacities. Through participating actively in these processes, implementing partners (including government officials) become stakeholders as they build capacities and develop commitment (or "ownership") regarding the plans and activities they have helped to make and carry out. By the end of the CBP, therefore, each national programme which has met its targets and developed both its tailored and its preselected capacities will have built the human, institutional, and social capital to: (1) keep functioning successfully by mobilizing additional, non-IPEC resources; (2) undertake new efforts (e.g., a TBP to eliminate the worst forms of child labor; or (3) begin some combination of both the preceding.

In practice, the Mid-term Evaluation has shown that this scenario is underway in the five countries. NGOs particularly, public institutions and government agencies to a lesser degree, are becoming increasingly aware of the need to think about, plan, and act for the sustainability of child-labor efforts. Several partners are developing ways of increasing community involvement to mobilize resources (skills, labor, funding, or other). For example, some are seeking to leverage current resources by integrating "graduates" of their earlier programs to act as mentors for the children following them out of child labor. Others are drawing teachers and parents into support groups for children reenrolled in school. Still another source of resources which may be drawn upon is the donor community in each country, though so far

donors other than IPEC seem involved only on a consultative basis to IPEC staff. And finally, some project members (e.g., in Uganda and Ghana) are working to reform and/or supplement national education systems to provide realistic and durable alternatives to children and their families.

Accordingly, in Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Uganda, and Zambia, stakeholders are beginning to discuss (and, at the level of implementing partners, to plan for) mobilizing resources and other efforts to carry on after the CBP. Much of this discussion (and the planning, where it exists) focuses on increasing involvement by communities, government, or both. For example, implementing partners in Kenya, Nigeria, and Uganda have discussed how they have mobilized trainer/mentors into helping older children withdrawn from child labour to develop new job skills in vehicle repair, tailoring, and beauty/barber shop operation. Partners in Uganda also have expressed hopes of drawing government funding at district and/or national levels into dealing with child labour as they have done earlier with HIV/AIDS. Up to now, all of these efforts remain in the discussion or initial stages, and few of the stakeholders have actually mobilized resources sufficient to sustain – by themselves – child labour activities beyond the CBP.

6. Lessons learned and emerging good practices

Given the delays in implementation, it would be premature attempting to identify any lessons learned from the experience of the Capacity Building Programme so far. Consequently, the following remarks are based only on current lessons and should be considered preliminary. While all of them require further verification, the positive examples of emerging good practices each contain one or more of the following elements that are thought to justify inclusion under this section: successful resource mobilisation, enhanced visibility, good cost efficiency, improved networking or increased sustainability.

Lessons learned

- On the whole, the participatory design process and the mechanisms for recurrent planning have so far proven successful in paving the way for enhanced sustainability.
- The menu of interventions can function as an effective tool for planning national interventions, but much more country-level experience is needed to judge its benefits for monitoring the implementation and performance of project activities.
- Working with child labour committees at the community level and identifying target groups beyond the main urban areas has further improved the sense of local ownership.
- Project implementation and performance are affected by existing administrative and institutional arrangements. IPEC risks developing a serious credibility problem with many partners, if the long delays associated with approval processes and the cumbersome administrative procedures are not addressed. Likewise, in view of the great work load and many demands, the human resource-capacity of national project offices needs to be increased.

- The existing national institutional frameworks that are centred on the functions of the child labour units continue to lack capacity and are still insufficiently equipped with human and financial resources.
- There tends to be a consensus among stakeholders that the National Steering Committees generally do not fulfill their expectations. If their role is to extend beyond mere rubber-stamping, the mandate of the Committees needs to be reviewed with a view to letting them play a more active role in advocacy or advisory work.
- It seems obvious that the attainment of the objectives of the CBP concerning the development of policy and legislation will require the adoption of National Child Labour policies as a matter of priority.
- The provisions for sustainability need to receive greater attention throughout the entire process of project design, implementation and assessment of impact. The amount of time remaining to the CBP and its various Action Programmes is too short to build fully sustainable capacity, even though important steps (strengthened technical and organizational capacities, increased local ownership, etc.) have been taken.
- There exists considerable scope for programmatic collaboration between different IPEC initiatives and projects. Such possibilities for synergies should be explored systematically. It will also be critical for project success in Kenya, Zambia and Uganda to forge strong linkages with policies and projects dealing with HIV/AIDS.
- The establishment of a comprehensive child-labour monitoring system seems beyond the scope of the Capacity Building Programme and might require its own, separate sub-regional project.
- Inter-agency networking can be improved by joint involvement in sensitisation activities and local mapping exercises. In Kenya and Nigeria, the collaboration between different Implementing Agencies in the area of awareness-raising, social mobilisation and direct action led to a number of synergies at both the national and local levels. Likewise, experience in all the countries has highlighted the importance of building upon local initiatives emerging from the interaction of Child Labour Committees with law enforcement officers, labour officers and traditional authorities.
- Implementing agencies in all five project countries need to increase their efforts at documenting ongoing experiences. To this effect, training seems necessary that could perhaps also form part of the sub-regional project activities or one of the national planning workshops.
- The inclusion of the views of beneficiary children in selected stakeholder workshops, such as the one in Ghana, enhances legitimacy and relevance of the deliberations. In all cases it serves to highlight the importance of sustainable social support strategies that also address the needs of the parents and larger communities of the children concerned.

Emerging good practices

- Improved networking among partners and internal collaboration between different IPEC projects has been encouraged by the approach of the CBP. The participatory approach of the self-evaluation-cum planning exercises has facilitated this process and resulted in stronger institutional linkages, evident in all countries. In Ghana this might possibly lead to ILO's traditional Social Partners jointly developing a national advocacy strategy.
- As examples from Zambia seem to indicate, access to income-generating activities and the availability of community schools can help to ensure continuous educational support, especially for older children, beyond the duration of the project. If these efforts succeed in mobilising additional resources and maintaining a good cost efficiency, they seem worthy of being replicated.
- Some implementing agencies in Kenya and Zambia have begun withdrawing children prior to the disbursement of funds and the formal start of their Action Programmes, which has helped them to go beyond their targets for direct action. To the extent that these actions can be matched in the long run by high-quality services in rehabilitation and reintegration, they would appear to provide a good basis for replication.
- The participation of community-based social workers with training in psycho-social counselling is a critical trust-building and monitoring mechanism in the programmes of most partners implementing direct action. Moreover, the participation of former child labourers as role models, as in Uganda, created special visibility and seemed to go a long way toward motivating children at risk to stay with educational alternatives.
- The strategic involvement of the Uganda Postal Service, and of church leadership in Zambia and Nigeria, seems a promising approach to awareness-raising and social mobilisation. It can lead to improved networking among institutions of civil society and entails possibilities for future resource mobilisation by other business enterprises or individual congregations. Provided the experiences remain encouraging, they should be replicated in other African countries where the church and other religious institutions play important roles in cultural life.

7. Conclusions and recommendations

The overall design process and its national applications displayed a careful problem analysis and a participatory approach that were generally adequate. The project strategy was generally appropriate, increasingly well integrated into national development policies and relevant to both national development strategies and regional priorities. National project planning incorporated the logic and priorities of the sub-regional planning exercise.

However, the operationalisation of the capacity-building goals, indicators of achievement and the sub-regional level interventions remained at times unspecific. Only limited attention to gender issues (e.g., separate facilities and programs for girls and boys in direct-action programs) was observed in the implementation of the activities of the Capacity Building Programme. The status of project implementation was severely affected by initial delays in the start-up phase and the lengthy approval processes needed for implementation of the Action Programmes.

International and national project personnel were found to be highly committed and professional. The management structures and institutional set up of the project appeared adequate, albeit in need of additional staff resources to handle the ambitious scope of the programme. While the evaluation found no need to adjust the targets for project beneficiaries, the durations of Action Programmes and the overall programme were seen as inadequate.

The selection of implementing partners through the participatory SPIF process resulted in an efficient division of roles, based on comparative advantages, in all project countries. Also, a certain flexibility in the allocation of the budget allowed for programmatic shift of funds, when implementation delays in Ghana made an increase in funds for Zambia possible. However, in general, the budgeted amounts for the APs and their effective monitoring by CPCs seemed a bit on the low side. Given the lack of school capacity and rehabilitation centers, the evaluation found that provision for capital investments in buildings or school infrastructure under the CBP could increase project efficiency in some instances in the long run.

The project has so far been able to consolidate achievements of the earlier country programmes, enhance IPEC's own internal project collaboration and succeed in mainstreaming child labour concerns to a certain extent. It also helped to mobilize stakeholders, increase media attention, instill a greater sense of ownership and create more public awareness.

Yet, any increase in skills or institutional capacity will remain difficult to measure and to attribute specifically to the activities of the project. In fact, both national policy and institutional frameworks were found to be lacking capacity in all project countries. Therefore, reform or revitalisation of the National Steering Committees was found to be crucial. This would not only speed up the endorsement of APSOs, but it could also have an important lobbying effect on Governments and act as an important ingredient in the strengthening of community-based child labour committees. Greater visibility of government commitment would be an important prerequisite in this regard that would also help to ensure better sustainability of results.

Against this background, the evaluation recommends:

a) no major changes of strategies with regard to project design, but:

- to consider extending the project duration of similar projects with a focus on regional capacity-building to a minimum of four years in future;
- to place more attention on general capacity needs and the management skills of implementing agencies;
- to take the existing constraints of the educational infrastructure into consideration when planning for the sustainability of educational alternatives;
- to limit the geographical scope of similar projects in the future or to increase the project staff commensurate with the current scope;
- to systematically strengthen the synergies with other IPEC programmes and include the findings of previous (final) evaluations in the project design;
- to establish better indicators of achievement regarding the intended benefits of the sub-regional project elements,

b) to speed up activities with regard to project implementation and:

- to adjust workplans and implementation timetables of Action Programmes to take account of previous delays, review indicators and set realistic targets for the attainment of sub-regional goals;
- to significantly shorten the approval process for Action Programmes and to continue simplifying the reporting formats;
- to tackle the institutional prerequisites for effective policy coordination by reviewing the roles of the Child Labour Units and the National Steering Committees;
- to expedite project activities directed at assisting partner governments with the rapid finalisation of national child-labour policies and the development of the required list of hazardous forms of child labour;
- to put additional emphasis on the attainment of the second immediate objective by using resources earmarked for the participation of non-core countries in sub-regional activities for concrete follow-up activities in core countries;
- to better operationalise the goals of capacity building and the sub-regional information exchange by developing more qualitative indicators of success and concrete follow-up;

c) to maximize the contribution of newly proposed activities with regard to project performance by:

- deepening the participation of local Child Labour Committees in monitoring activities and to better involve District Assemblies by mainstreaming child labour concerns into their development plans;
- stepping up activities for the identification of project-related sustainability provisions and the documentation of lessons learned, as a basis for the identification of good practices;
- increasing efforts to develop indicators that would help measure the outcome or impact of activities rather than the intended output;
- including training for fund-raising and resource mobilisation in the activities of the project;
- highlighting opportunities for programmatic linkages with the two forthcoming Time-bound Programmes in Kenya and Ghana.

8. Annexes:

A. Schedule of team leader's meetings and tasks

Date	Time	Activity	Place
Friday 3 September	9-1 pm	Briefing with IPEC Travel to Lusaka	Geneva
Saturday 4	1pm-5pm	Meeting with CTA and CPC	Lusaka
Sunday 5	9-6pm	Review of documents and planning meeting with National Consultant	Lusaka
Monday 6	8 – 6 pm	Partner visits: Ministry of Education Children in Need Ministry of Labour ILO Area Office	Lusaka
Tuesday 7	8 - 6pm	Partner visits: Anglican Children's Project Jesus Cares Ministry Child Labour Ambassadors	Lusaka
Wednesday 8	8-11 pm	Preparation for project workshop Partner visit: Children in Crisis and Child Rights Club	Lusaka
Thursday 9	8.30 – 6 pm	Partner workshop	Lusaka
Friday 10	9 – 3.30 pm	Wrap-up	Lusaka
Saturday 11		Travel to Nairobi	
Sunday 12	9 – 5 pm	<i>Review of documents</i> Consultation with CPC and national consultant	Nairobi
Monday 13	7.45 – 7 pm	Partner visits: Association of Media Women of Kenya UNDUGU Society Ministry of Labour Preparation for Workshop	Nairobi
Tuesday 14	8.30 – 6 pm	Partner Workshop	Nairobi
Wednesday 15	9 -	Wrap-up	Nairobi
Thursday 16		Travel Meeting with CPC and second international consultant	Kampala
Friday 17	9-7 pm	Consultations:	Kampala

		Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Security and CPC	
Saturday 18	9-3pm	Field visits: Kids in Need UYDEL	Kampala
Sunday 19		Review of documents and preparation for Workshop	Kampala
Monday 20	8.30-5pm	Partner Workshop	Kampala
Tuesday 21		Wrap Up	Kampala/Entebbe
Wednesday 22		Consultation with CPC, CTA and APSPPO review	Accra
Thursday 23		Partner Workshop	Accra
Friday 24		Partner visit: International Needs Ghana	Accra
Saturday 25		Review of documents	Accra
Sunday 26		Review of documents	Accra
Monday 27		<i>Meetings with evaluator of Country Programme and at Ministry of Manpower</i> Wrap up Travel	Lagos
Tuesday 28		Transfer to Abuja and meeting with CPC and national consultant:	Abuja
Wednesday 29		Partner consultation: Child Labour Unit and WOTCLEF	Abuja
Thursday 30		Partner Workshop	Abuja
Friday 1 October		Wrap-Up and debriefing with CTA	Abuja
Saturday 2 October		Travel	London - Berlin
Monday 4 – 9 October		Report writing	Berlin
Saturday 13 November – Sunday 21 November		Report revision	

B. Note on evaluation methodology

Background:

IPEC's Capacity-building project (CBP) in Anglophone Africa is focussing on **five core countries** and was developed in 2002 against the backdrop of experiences with national programmes in **Kenya, Zambia, Uganda, Ghana and Nigeria**. At the time, the existing national programmes included a combination of awareness-raising, training and capacity-building as well as direct action elements.

The project is funded by the US Department of Labour and has a budget of US\$ 5.3. The project's **two immediate objectives** relate to the following:

- At the national level, it is expected that at the end of the project “governments, workers’ and employers’ organisations, NGOs and other partners will have the technical skills and organisational capacity to formulate and implement policies, programmes and other initiatives to facilitate prevention of the worst forms of child labour, and protection, withdrawal, rehabilitation and reintegration of children participating in the WFCL” (*Immediate Objective 1*).
- At the sub-regional level, it is expected that at the end of the project “knowledge and experience on child labour and good practice interventions will have been identified and shared” (*Immediate Objective 2*) among a larger group of countries, including non-core countries such as Ethiopia, Malawi, South Africa and Tanzania.

Based on the project's participatory planning process, the CBP anticipated that partner countries would first identify necessary project outcomes through sub-regional and national SPIF exercises, before then selecting activities from a menu of pre-determined model interventions for adaptation to the national context. Interventions to be supported at national level would thus fall within the broad range of the following elements:

- Building the knowledge base on child labour;
- Dissemination of information;
- Raising awareness;
- Networking, integration and mainstreaming;
- Policy and legislative support;
- Direct action activities.

Reflecting the project's flexible and demand driven approach to planning and monitoring, national activities are to be implemented in four stages with national self-evaluation-cum planning workshops to be held at each stage. It is hoped that these workshops would allow for a systematic involvement of all partners, an effective information exchange, the documentation of experiences and - through a close monitoring of implementation - for possible corrections. This **mid-term evaluation corresponds to the second self-evaluation-cum planning exercise** that is to be conducted by the stakeholder of the project. It therefore forms an integral part of the project methodology and its strategic approach.

Purpose of the evaluation

The **overall objectives** of the evaluation are:

- to review design and implementation of the project in order to facilitate a stock-taking as to what has been learned and achieved to date,
- to assess the existing institutional structures and implementation capacities,
- to foster accountability among project partners and to contribute to informed decisions about new project activities,
- to make recommendations and where necessary, promote any changes in strategy on the basis of emerging experiences,
- and to inform future project planning with a view to promoting local ownership and the sustainability of results.

Evaluation methodology

In terms of the **methodology**, the evaluation adopts a participatory approach for data collection by employing a combination of semi-structured interviews with key informants, implementing agencies and IPEC project staff, of focus group discussions with beneficiaries and preparatory desk reviews. The latter will include the analysis of relevant project documents, technical progress reports, status reports as well as of final evaluation reports of earlier national child labour programmes. As far as the interviews with government officials, social partner representatives and other stakeholders are concerned, these will be conducted with the aim of obtaining opinions of a wide range of project partners and IPEC constituents regarding the project's progress so far. Of special interest is here the perspective of stakeholders on the innovative planning process adopted during project implementation. In addition, participation in the national planning workshops will present additional opportunities for verification of preliminary findings. With this, the workshops can be said to form part both of the external evaluation and the internal planning process.

On the basis of the interviews, the findings of the desk reviews and the conclusions of the national workshops, the consultant team will prepare a draft **evaluation report** as principal output. Based on existing ILO evaluation methodologies, the structure of the report will reflect the suggestions contained in the TORs and address general evaluation criteria, such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, and contain an assessment of the quality of the project design, its implementation and performance. As part of its conclusions, the report will attempt to summarise the factors leading to the relative success or failure of the project's progress towards attainment of the immediate objectives. In addition, the evaluation will result in a number of concrete recommendations and try to establish a few key lessons learned as well as potential good practices.

Evaluation team

All five core countries will be visited by the teamleader, who will be responsible for the overall coordination and consistency of the evaluation. The donor has selected a second international consultant to participate in the work in Uganda, Ghana and Nigeria. At the country level, the **two international consultants** will be assisted by **five national consultants** in the core project countries. The latter are expected to prepare concise national assessments in conjunction with a brief SWOT-analysis that should form the basis of the presentation at the stakeholder workshops and, subsequently, feed into the overall evaluation report. Given the extremely short time for partner consultations in most of the countries to be

visited, the extent to which preliminary findings of the evaluation can already be presented during the planning workshops will thus largely depend on the outcome of the important preparatory work by the national consultants.

Unfortunately, serious time constraints and the difficult logistical arrangements for the field visits made it impossible to develop the evaluation instrument jointly. The **list of suggested questions** that is attached to this note does therefore only serve as a guide for the partner consultations, which are to be conducted by both the national and international consultants. Nevertheless, the use of the instrument is suggested in order to promote a harmonized approach to the country studies under preparation. It is hoped that the entire team of consultants will collaborate as a team and agree on an effective division of labour, so that the final report can be ready by the beginning of October.

C. Question guide for partner consultation

1. Project design:

IPEC staff:

- What was the project design process like? Was it reflecting country priorities and did it include the participation of stakeholders or beneficiaries (bottom-up)?
- How and on what basis did the project strategy define capacity-building needs? Does the project embody a common understanding as to what capacity-building is to entail?
- How have previous IPEC initiatives been used for the design of the project? In which way do CBP-activities differ from those of the past country programmes?
- How realistic was the design in terms of the scope, timing and proposed linkages between countries?
- How well did the project design take into account local capacity and ongoing national efforts?
- How well did the SPIF contribute to identifying/verifying the capacity-building needs of core countries and how did this affect the project strategy? What was the added-value of the programming approach under the SPIF and the “menu of interventions”?
- Has the design included preparation of a monitoring plan, including the break-down of indicators into milestone targets?
- Has the project design identified direct beneficiaries, who will ultimately benefit from the outcomes?

Governments, social partners and implementing agencies:

- To what extent have you as IPEC partner participated in the design of the project?
- Is the project design appropriate, feasible and realistic for achieving the immediate objective of capacity-building? Where would you have put more emphasis? What were the lessons of the former country programmes?
- Is the project design relevant to the national child labour situation and the needs of the target groups? Does the project strategy correspond to national priorities and development policies? Is it gender sensitive?
- How useful do you find the “menu of interventions”, the SPIF or planning workshop approach as part of the project strategy?
- Is the selection of geographical areas, sectors and numbers of children targeted appropriate?

2. Project implementation:

IPEC staff:

- What are your experiences in terms of the efficiency of the project implementation up to now? How would you assess the implementation in terms of management issues, the coordination and information sharing between responsible IPEC offices and the creation of synergies?
- How did the existence of previous IPEC country programmes influence the start-up process (greater efficiency/effectiveness)? How could this be further improved in future?
- What were the reasons and consequences of delays in implementation? How could these be reduced and the delivery rate increased in future?
- Have the SPIF and the self-evaluation-cum-planning workshops worked as strategic planning tools and have they been appropriate to ensure national participation and consensus in decision-making? Are these tools used for monitoring purposes in each country? How effective was the follow-up on the decisions taken or the commitments made at the workshop?
- Was the selection of the implementing agencies appropriate and reflective of past experiences/clear selection criteria? How satisfactory was the level of involvement and activity of partners? Who are the most active partners and who are the least active? Which explanations can you give for the differences in performance?
- Which role do ILO's tripartite constituents and the National Steering Committee play in capacity-building? How effective are the Child Labour Units? How can their capacity and institutional performance be enhanced? Are project staff resources adequate or are partners in need of training?
- What is the main problem regarding the formulation and implementation of direct Action Programmes? Do these programmes make effective use of the model interventions or pre-selected items?
- Are there any new programmatic linkages emerging during project implementation that would tie the project to other child labour or IPEC projects?

Governments, social partners and implementing agencies:

- How would you assess the implementation efficiency of the project in terms of the approval process for Action Programmes, the thematic or administrative support from IPEC and the cooperation among other partners?
- Were there any major changes or delays that have taken place since the beginning of the project? If so, what were the reasons and consequences for implementation? How could delays be reduced and the delivery rate increased in future?
- How satisfactory is the level of involvement and commitment of the Government and the other project partners? How effective is the National Steering Committee operating? Is there need for a more systematic involvement of project beneficiaries?
- What are the main difficulties in formulating and approving Action Programmes? Are your staff resources adequate or is there need for specific training?
- How successful have the capacity building efforts of the project been? Where do you see the greatest needs? Is there a common understanding of key concepts among stakeholders?
- Do you think that the SPIF exercise or the self-evaluation-cum-planning workshops have been useful in ensuring your participation in decision-making? Are these tools also being used for monitoring the project? How effective was the follow-up on the decisions taken at the workshop?

- Have children participated in the the implementation of project activities?

3. project performance:

IPEC staff

- What are the main achievements of the project to date? Have all national project outputs been realised? How will the pipelined activities influence the attainment of the objectives?
- How successful has the project been in mainstreaming the issue of child labour into national development policies and PRSP? Is this the best or only indicator of success?
- Has the national institutional framework that the project seeks to strengthen become more adequate for tackling child labour? Did project activities succeed in assisting governmental Child Labour Units increase their capacity to coordinate activities effectively? What about the capacity of Implementing Agencies?
- Is the project still relevant to the needs of the country and the national/regional child labour situation? Is it a viable strategy for building capacity?
- How successful were the various Action Programmes in building national capacity and enhancing partner skills? Which of the possible AP objectives was most successful (awareness-raising, community mobilisation, mainstreaming of child labour concerns, resource mobilisation, building the knowledge base, documentation, policy development)?
- During the remaining time of the project, is there any need to change the focus of the objectives or the prioritisation of activities to give the project greater impact? Are there any major bottlenecks that need to be overcome?
- Which long-term impact of the project do you expect at national and sub-regional level? How do you see the sustainability of the project results and mechanisms for child labour monitoring being safeguarded?
- How successful was the project in terms of resource mobilisation and new partner commitments? What kind of exit strategies are being developed by the project? What is the degree of national ownership?
- Are there any lessons learned? Which elements of the project do you see replicable as good practices? Is there anything you would do completely different the next time?
- How would you describe the quality and timeliness of sub-regional project outputs? What kind of follow-up to the sub-regional workshops is planned? How will this contribute to the attainment of the second immediate objective?
- Have the sub-regional inventory on information and donor support sources been completed? How will they be disseminated and updated?
- How will the electronic forum for IPEC partners be used and updated? What about the newsletter?
- How efficient was the use and the more flexible distribution of budgetary resources? In which way did the budget react to differences in national performance?

Governments, social partners and implementing agencies

- What are the main achievements of the project to date? In which way has the project contributed to capacity-building?

- How successful has the project been in mainstreaming the issue of child labour into national development policies and related programmes?
- Has the national institutional framework become more adequate for tackling child labour? Do partners look to the Child Labour Units as a strengthened mechanism to coordinate national activities effectively?
- Has the awareness and understanding of child labour issues increased among your constituents? How are new skills for addressing child labour concerns expressed?
- Have national networks for tackling child labour been strengthened by the project? How effective is the institutional set-up?
- Has the project enhanced the commitment and capacity of the national Government or other project partners to address child labour in future? Are there future activities or commitments of the project partners that will help to ensure sustainability?
- What was the impact of the training workshops on stakeholders? Has the capacity of implementing agencies been increased?
- How effective were the awareness-raising efforts of the project? Did the project succeed in targeted community mobilisation?
- What is the contribution of the Action Programmes to the attainment of the project's immediate objectives? How useful are the model interventions/menu of interventions for the formulation of new APs?
- How would you rate the quality and relevance of the information produced by the project at the sub-regional level?
- Are you aware of the sub-regional project newsletter, the electronic forum for IPEC partners and the production of inventories? Which impact do you expect from these outputs? Do you participate?
- What were the outcomes of the sub-regional workshops? In which way do they contribute to an increase in national capacities (i.e. child labour monitoring etc)? Are there any obstacles to the sharing of information at the sub-regional level?
- Are there any model interventions that have been identified in core countries and shared with other partners?
- Have lessons learned been documented? What are the possibilities for replication of good practices at the sub-regional level?
- How important is the monitoring of ex-child workers in the context of this project?
- How could a similar project be improved in future?

D. Terms of Reference

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMME ON THE ELIMINATION OF CHILD LABOUR (ILO-IPEC)

Terms of Reference Mid-term Evaluation of the Project

***FINAL DRAFT FOR
Contract***

5 August 2004

Building the Foundations for Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Anglophone Africa (CBP)

(P 340 02 100 051 - RAF/02/P51/USA)

I. Background and justification

1. The aim of IPEC is the progressive elimination of child labour, especially in its worst forms. The political will and commitment of individual governments to address child labour—in cooperation with employers' organizations, trade unions, non-governmental organizations and other relevant parties in society—is the basis for IPEC action. IPEC's strategy includes raising awareness on the negative consequences of child labour, promoting social mobilization against it, strengthening national capacities to deal with this issue and implementing demonstrative direct action programs (AP) to prevent children from child labour and remove child labourers from hazardous work and provide them with appropriate alternatives.
2. IPEC has been developing activities in Anglophone Africa for more than ten years. National programmes for the elimination of child labour have been implemented in Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Uganda and Zambia during the period 1999-2002. These national programmes have set the basis for increased action on child labour, raising awareness on the problem and promoting specific capacity building and direct action activities. However, the magnitude of the child labour problem in Anglophone Africa continues to be important, and further capacities in the countries of the region are needed to cope with it, considering especially the additional challenges posed by the adoption of the Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labour, 1999 (No. 182).
3. In this context, in 2002 IPEC developed a technical cooperation programme named "Building the Foundations for Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Anglophone Africa", also known as "Capacity Building Programme (CBP) in Anglophone Africa". The programme's official start date was September 2002, although the project team was set in place only in February 2003. Its planned end date is February 2006. The total budget of CBP provided by the donor—the United States Department of Labor (USDOL)—was set at USD 5.3 millions. The intervention was designed to be implemented at two levels:
 - At the national level, it was expected that at the end of the project "governments, workers' and employers' organisations, NGOs and other partners will have the technical skills and organisational capacity to formulate and implement policies, programmes and other initiatives to facilitate prevention of the worst forms of child labour, and protection, withdrawal, rehabilitation and reintegration of children participating in the WFCL" (Immediate Objective 1). Activities at this level would focus on five core countries: Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Uganda and Zambia.

- At the sub-regional level, it was expected that at the end of the project “knowledge and experience on child labour and good practice interventions will be identified and shared” (Immediate Objective 2). At this level, in addition to the core countries, activities would benefit also non-core countries such as Ethiopia, Malawi, South Africa and Tanzania.
4. Based on a strategic planning process, the programme anticipated that participating countries would select model interventions, outlined in a “menu of model interventions” in the programme document, adapt these to the national context and implement these as sub-contracts given to national institutions and organisations, in line with standard ILO-IPEC procedures.⁷ To allow for flexible planning and implementation in a demand driven way, and to build in capacity building on planning and monitoring, national interventions would be implemented in four stages. Between each stage national self-evaluation cum planning workshops would be held. These workshops would allow for systematic gathering and documentation of experience and for mid-course corrections based on needs and commitments. This mid-term evaluation is considered as one of such partner exercises.
 5. Some of the most relevant initiatives already undertaken by CBP are the following:

National action:

- During the first months of 2004, the formulation of Action Programmes at national level has progressed and implementation of APs has started in the five core countries. It is worth noting that the definition of national priorities has been done following a stakeholder self-evaluation-cum-planning-exercise in each country⁸ and according to the options included in the “menu” of interventions. APs include capacity building activities, awareness raising and direct action with specific target groups. These programmes have been designed and are being implemented by a range of national partners: government agencies, trade unions, employers’ organizations, NGOs and community-based groups.
- Several advocacy and awareness raising activities have been executed with the aim of increasing the attention given to child labour issues in each of the countries, both at the governmental level and among civil society and community-based organizations. The project has actively participated in a series of events in favour of the rights of the children and against child labour in all five core countries.

Sub-regional action:

- Two sub-regional workshops have been held, one on “resource mobilisation, mainstreaming and integration in relation to child labour” (Lusaka, 19 to 21 November 2003) and another one on Training for Child Labour Research (Kampala, 23-26 March 2004). Participants from the 9 countries covered by the project attended the first workshop, while in the second one there was representation from 8 countries. These workshops have been valuable opportunities for promoting networking among key actors of the different countries.
 - A “CBP Discussion Forum” is prepared to be launched (www.ipeafrica.org.zm). A newsletter prepared in collaboration with other IPEC projects in the region is regularly issued in hardcopy and electronic version. The development of an inventory of potential sources of resources/funding is ongoing.
6. According to ILO regular procedures and as agreed with USDOL, the project is due for a mandatory independent mid-term evaluation in September 2004. The evaluation corresponds to

⁷ Interventions to be supported at national level would fall within the broad categories of: Building the knowledge base on child labour; Dissemination of information; Raising awareness; Networking, integration and mainstreaming; Policy and legislative support; Direct action (as action research).

⁸ These exercises are organized following IPEC’s Strategic Programme Impact Framework approach (SPIF). See the Guidelines prepared by IPEC’s Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section (DED) on this subject for more information.

the second partner self-evaluation-cum-planning exercise to be carried out, as indicated in the project document. This evaluation should serve two basic purposes: a) accountability to the main stakeholders, including government agencies and social partners in the core countries, partner organizations and the donor, on what has been done and achieved so far; and b) learning from the experience to analyze how the project is progressing towards achieving its objectives, plan for the future and, where necessary, to recommend appropriate re-designing.

7. IPEC management and the project staff will use the evaluation results to revise the approach and strategy that is being followed in each country and at the sub-regional level, as appropriate. It is expected that the evaluation will critically assess the modality of implementation, including the use of a “menu of interventions” and the organization of planning workshops with broad stakeholder participation in each country to decide on the best possible options. Therefore, the evaluation should provide credible and reliable information in order to suggest how the project could enhance its impact during the remaining time of implementation, ensuring the sustainability of the benefits that have been or will be generated. The evaluation results will also be used by partners in charge of implementing activities in the field or that support the national efforts against child labour in the region, including USDOL, governmental agencies, trade unions, employers’ organizations, NGOs, international organizations and other key groups in society.

II. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

8. This mid-term evaluation will focus on the CBP project planning and implementation, its achievements and its contribution to the overall national efforts on child labour in each country. With regard to the action programmes developed as part of the project, each of them should be seen as a building block of the overall strategy and assessed accordingly. 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.
9. The overall purposes of the evaluation and the tasks to be carried out include the following:
 - To review the implementation of the project so far and consider any changes in strategy on the basis of emerging experiences, recommending adjustments where necessary
 - To examine current proposed activities and make an assessment of their potential contribution to the implementation of the strategy
 - To review the existing institutional set up and implementation capacity
 - To assess the existing as well as potential linkages between the project and other child labour initiatives being developed in the sub-region, including other planned IPEC programmes, and suggest strategies for cooperation
10. The evaluation will also assess the implementation modality of this project (menu of interventions), including an analysis of sustainability and ownership and implementation procedures. The innovative nature of this modality and element of “learning by doing” should be taken into account for the evaluation.
11. Being a mid-term evaluation, it is also important to analyze the projects’ plans for sustainability and exit strategies. A review of progress achieved to date in promoting local ownership and in promoting long-term sustainability of activities and results initiated under the projects should be included in the analysis.

III. Suggested aspects to be addressed

12. The evaluation should address the ILO established overall evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability (please see *ILO Guidelines for the Preparation of*

Independent Evaluations of ILO Programmes and Projects, section 1.2, November 1997).⁹ Therefore, the evaluation should provide an assessment of the overall impact of the project at the national and sub-regional levels, including a review of the outcomes of the project relative to its objectives.

13. The following are some suggested key evaluation aspects or concerns that have been identified based on consultation with key stakeholders. Other issues can be added as identified by the evaluation consultants in accordance with the given purpose of this exercise and in consultation with IPEC's Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section (DED). One of the tasks of the consultants will be to decide, based on the evidence and available findings, which of the following issues are the most important aspects to be addressed in meeting the purpose of the evaluation.

Concerning the design of the projects

14. Please assess the validity of the project design, including gender-sensitiveness and feasibility, as well as its relevance according to the national context.

- Is the project relevant according to the child labour situation in the targeted countries, including the national strategies to address child labour, poverty alleviation, child protection and education in the core countries?
- Is the project relevant according to the identified needs of the target groups?
- How realistic was the project design in terms of the scope of its regional component and the proposed linkages between countries?
- Is the selection of geographical areas, sectors, and number of children and families targeted through the action programmes appropriate?

15. Concerning the original design of the projects:

- How have previous IPEC initiatives in the targeted countries been used for project design? Were lessons learned from the country programmes in Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Uganda and Zambia successfully incorporated into the project's design?
- How well did the project design take into account local capacity and national efforts already underway to address child labour and promote educational opportunities for all children?
- Is the strategy for achieving the immediate objectives and to contribute to the development objective sound and solid?
- Were the objectives, target numbers and timing of the project realistically set? How did the original design consider the assumptions and external factors that influence the implementation of the project? Are the identified indicators and means of verification, as well as the Project's Monitoring Plan, appropriate and useful for monitoring and evaluation? Is the data needed for the indicators readily available?

Concerning the implementation of the project

16. Please analyze how the Programme is being implemented, in terms of management, coordination and creation of synergies. In particular:

- Please review and assess the efficiency of Programme implementation, including an analysis of the administrative processes and backstopping from ILO Headquarters and from the ILO field offices. Refer also to the respect of calendars and work plans, reasons for delays in implementation and consequences of delays in terms of achievements and delivery of outputs. Please suggest ways of reducing delays in the remainder of the Programme. This analysis should be done for the Programme as a whole and for the specific activities in the individual countries.

⁹ These guidelines can be found at <http://www.ilo.org>, under "Evaluation".

- Please assess the start-up phase of the Programme. Did the fact that the project is built upon the base established by IPEC Country Programmes already underway in the targeted countries lead to an effective and efficient start-up phase for this project? Please include recommendations for speeding and improving the start-up of future IPEC interventions based on the experience with this Programme.
- Assess the efficiency of the administrative and management systems established to support Programme implementation, particularly the way in which funds are transacted and the administrative coordination between the national IPEC offices, the sub-regional IPEC office, and IPEC Headquarters.
- Please analyze the effectiveness of the process for Action Programme approval and allocation of resources to Action Programmes.
- Is the Programme management structure in each country and in the sub-region, in terms of staff and organization, adequate, efficient and effective? Please analyze the mechanisms for building internal capacity (staff training). Assess coordination mechanisms and information sharing between national and sub-regional staff.
- Please assess the actions taken to increase the delivery rate of the project and its results.
- Assess the extent to which monitoring and evaluation tools have been developed and are being used to determine short-term and long-term Programme impact. As applicable, please evaluate the design and effectiveness of these measures.

17. In terms of working with the government, trade unions, employers' organizations, children and other partners:

- Please provide an assessment of government commitments to, and support for, the project, including the participation of Government agencies in the National Steering Committees and a review of all project activities that had government involvement. Analyze how Government participation or lack of participation has affected implementation. Assess as well the commitment of workers' and employers' organizations to, and support for, the project, including a review of all project activities that had their involvement, as appropriate.
- In general, have the stakeholders' commitments been met? Have IPEC's efforts to reach out to appropriate stakeholders, as outlined in the project document and in practice, been realistic?
- Evaluate the level of project participation and commitment shown by NGOs and other organizations, including international agencies, working on the issue of child labour or child protection in general.
- Assess the capacity building efforts made by the Programme with respect to implementing agencies, including training on project monitoring and reporting, as well as training on definitions used by IPEC for identifying a child as prevented or withdrawn. Assess the degree to which Programme staff, implementing organizations and other stakeholders have a clear and common understanding of these concepts.
- Please analyze the process and utility of the self-evaluation-cum-planning workshops organized in each country as a tool for ensuring national participation in decision making about implementation. Is the methodological approach of these workshops appropriate? How consistent was the follow up to the commitments made during the workshops?
- Was the selection of the implementing agencies appropriate? How can their performance be improved?
- Please analyze how children have participated in the activities implemented by the Programme. How could child participation be increased and made more relevant in the future?

Concerning the achievements of the project

18. In general, analyze the achievements of the Programme so far at the national and sub-regional levels, the progress towards its immediate objectives and the likelihood of achieving them in the planned timeframe and with the available resources. Are the Programme outputs of good quality and delivered timely? Are the identified direct beneficiaries being reached? Identify bottlenecks and major issues and recommend possible solutions as appropriate. In particular:

- How successful has the Programme been in mainstreaming the issue of child labour into ongoing efforts —projects, programmes, policies or plans— of governmental and non-governmental organizations in areas such as education, employment promotion and poverty reduction in each of the countries?
- How successful has the Programme been in creating and strengthening national networks of organizations dealing with child labour issues?
- Evaluate whether the Programme has increased government commitment and capacity to address the problem of child labour in each of the countries.
- Evaluate the relevance and outcome of the training workshops for stakeholders and implementing partners. Has the capacity of implementing agencies and other relevant partners to develop effective action against child labour been enhanced as a result of the Programme activities?
- How effective are Action Programmes to date and how are they contributing to the Programme’s Immediate Objectives? What are the prospective possibilities of successful replication and scaling up of such efforts?
- Evaluate the relevance and outcomes of the sub-regional workshops organized by the project.
- Evaluate the effectiveness, relevance and outcomes of the awareness-raising and advocacy efforts that have occurred as a result of the project. Please assess especially the community mobilization activities carried out by the project.
- Evaluate the quality and circulation of the sub-regional newsletter on child labour produced by the project.
- Considering that this is a regional Programme intended to promote the sharing of good practices across countries, what kind of cross-country sharing has taken place and what is the impact of such sharing? Has the sharing of experience enhanced national capacities in core and non-core countries? In which areas (e.g. child labour monitoring, creation of national coordination mechanisms, etc.)? What obstacles have been encountered in sharing good practices and critical information among the countries?
- How effectively are strategies for child labour monitoring being implemented? Are children assisted by the Programme being effectively monitored and tracked by the?

Concerning the perspectives of sustainability

19. In general, please assess the project’s plans to ensure the sustainability of the benefits generated, as well as its exit strategy. How should the “ownership” of the project be understood and promoted in the national contexts? How has local ownership of the Programme and long-term sustainability of activities initiated under the Programme been promoted to date, and what progress can be identified so far? What kinds of exit strategies are being developed by the Programme? What kinds of commitments does the Programme already have from local partners willing to accept responsibility for Programme areas when the projects end? In particular:
- Is the institutional framework at the national level adequate for ensuring the implementation of child labour activities (including Time Bound Programmes in the cases of Ghana and Kenya)?
 - Assess the extent to which the efforts and strategies carried out through NGOs, public institutions, and government agencies will contribute to the sustainability of the Programme. As direct action gets underway, to what extent are the main implementing agencies laying a foundation for sustainability? How could they improve in this area?
 - Assess Programme strategy and success in leveraging resources for ongoing and continuing efforts to prevent and eliminate child labour in the five core countries.
 - Analyze the efforts done by the Programme at the national level in terms of raising child labour awareness among the donor community and participating in government-donor coordination activities.
 - Assess the level of community, parent and teacher interest and participation in project activities. How has their commitment to, and ownership of, the project changed over time?

- Have Child Labour Units been able to coordinate child labour activities effectively with national labour ministries, stakeholders and implementing agencies?
 - Analyze the perspectives of sustainability for the different components of the Programme, including child labour monitoring.
20. It is recommended to structure the suggested aspects along the following main lines or axes, which could constitute chapters of the evaluation report:
- Quality of the project design and relevance
 - Process of design of the intervention, including relevance according to the national contexts
 - Relevance of the project's implementation modality and approach
 - Implementation and efficiency
 - Management and capacity issues (distinctions by country to be made as appropriate)
 - Working with partners and creations of synergies
 - In general
 - In each country
 - Achievements of the project
 - Main achievement of the project in relation to its objectives and indicators
 - National action
 - Ghana
 - Kenya
 - Nigeria
 - Uganda
 - Zambia
 - Sub-regional initiatives
 - Effects of the project and synergies
 - Evidence and perspectives of sustainability and mobilization of resources (distinctions by country should be incorporated as appropriate)
 - Main findings and lessons learned (distinctions by country to be made as appropriate)
 - Recommendations (including distinction by country and by stakeholder as appropriate)
 - Potential / confirmed good practices

<h3>Methodology and Time Frame</h3>

21. The following is the suggested methodology for the mid-term evaluation. The evaluation team, if considered necessary and in accordance with the scope and purpose of this exercise as described above, can adjust the methodology. This should be done in consultation with DED.
22. The methodology for the evaluation should consider the two levels of project implementation: national and sub-regional. Data gathering and analysis tools should consider this methodological and practical distinction.
23. The evaluation should include a **desk review** of appropriate material, including the project documents, progress reports, evaluation reports of projects implemented before CBP, outputs of the project and action programmes and relevant material from secondary sources. The evaluation will also include **fieldwork** in all five core countries, where interviews with national officials, trade union and employers' organizations representatives and other partners will take place. The fieldwork will build on initial research undertaken by national consultants.
24. In interviews, focus groups and other information gathering exercises, the evaluation consultants should solicit the opinions of a wide variety of stakeholders, including beneficiary children, parents of beneficiaries, teachers, government representatives, representatives from trade unions and employers' organizations, partners, implementing agencies and all major stakeholders,

including IPEC and the donor. Reference interviews should be conducted with child labour monitors, project beneficiaries and local project partners.

25. The evaluation process will include a series of stakeholders' workshops in each country in order to present the preliminary conclusions and recommendations and obtain feedback and additional information. These workshops should also serve as planning meetings for the following phase of the project. One of the focuses of the stakeholders' meetings should be the perspective of sustainability of the projects' benefits and their exit strategy. The results of these meetings should be taken into consideration for the preparation of the draft report.
26. The evaluation process will also include a final debriefing meeting in Nigeria with project staff, IPEC and representatives from the donor.
27. It is expected that the consultants will prepare a brief document indicating the methodological approach to the evaluation (the "evaluation instrument"), to be discussed and approved by the Evaluation Managers at the start of the field mission.

Expected outputs and timeline

28. The evaluation report in draft form and in English should be presented to DED for circulation one week after the finalization of the field mission at the latest. The length of the report should not exceed 50 pages (excluding annexes). The structure of the report should broadly follow the axes presented in paragraph 15. The report should include a specific section on lessons learned from the project that could be replicated or should be avoided in the future, in the same or in other IPEC projects. Finally, the report should include specific and detailed recommendations solidly based on the analysis and, if appropriate, addressed specifically to the organizations responsible for implementing them.
29. IPEC's DED Section will circulate this report to all relevant stakeholders for their comments. A consolidated document including all the comments received to the report will be submitted to the evaluation consultants two weeks after the submission of the draft report. The evaluation consultants should consider the comments for the preparation of the final version of the report, which will also be presented in English.
30. The timeline for the evaluation and the tentative itinerary are the following:
 - Desk Review, including briefing in Geneva: August 25 to September 3
 - Field mission: September 4 to September 30
 - Zambia (4 to 10)
 - Kenya (11 to 15)
 - Uganda (16 to 21)
 - Ghana (22 to 26)
 - Nigeria (27 to 30)
 - Preparation of report: October 1 to October 10
 - The final report should be submitted no later than October 22

Resources and Management

31. The evaluation will be carried out by a team of two international consultants and five national consultants with extensive experience in evaluation of development or social interventions, preferably including practical experience in child labour issues and strategic impact planning. The consultants should have an advanced degree in social sciences, economics or similar and specific training on evaluation theory and methods. Working experience on issues related to child labour,

education and children's welfare will be essential. Full command of English as a working language will be required.

32. One of the international consultants and the national consultants will be identified by DED, while the second international consultant will be identified by USDOL, in the framework of its agreement with Development Associates. The final selection of the international experts will be done by DED and USDOL following a consultation process. The international consultant designated by the ILO will be the evaluation team leader. The team leader will be responsible for coordinating the work of the evaluation team and ensuring that timelines and deadlines are respected.

33. :The following are the resources needed for this evaluation:

- Fees for one international consultant during 38 working days, to be covered by the evaluation budget included in the project document
- Fees for one international consultant during a determined number working days, to be covered by USDOL-EI through special agreement with DA
- Fees for five national consultant during 12 working days, to be covered by the evaluation budget included in the project document
- Fees to cover travel from residence of consultant 1 to Geneva, from Geneva to Lusaka and from Abuja to place of residence, to be covered by the evaluation budget included in the project document
- Fees to cover international travel for consultant 2, to be covered by USDOL-EI through special agreement with DA
- Sub-regional travel expenses and daily subsistence allowances at UN rates for consultant 1 during field mission (approximately 29 days), to be covered by the evaluation budget included in the project document
- Sub-regional travel expenses and daily subsistence allowances for consultant 2 during field mission, to be covered by USDOL-EI through special agreement with DA
- In-country travel expenses for IPEC officials accompanying the evaluation consultants as appropriate, to be covered by the evaluation budget included in the project document
- Costs of organizing the stakeholders' workshops, to be covered by the budget of the project document

34. The evaluation will be managed by the IPEC's DED. In-country management and logistics support will be provided by the CTA of the project and the projects' team as a whole.