



**International Labour Organization- International Programme on the  
Elimination of Child Labour  
ILO/IPEC**

Final version  
14 November 2012

**Terms of Reference  
For  
Independent Final Evaluation**

**“Supporting actions to meet the 2015 targets to eliminate the worst  
forms of child labour in Lusophone countries in Africa through  
knowledge, awareness raising and south-south cooperation”**

ILO Project Number:	RAF/10/55/USA
ILO Iris Code	102606
Geographical Coverage:	<b>Lusophone countries in Africa</b> (Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Mozambique and São Tome and Prince)
Project Language(s):	<b>English and Portuguese</b>
Starting Date:	31 December 2010
Completion Date:	31 December 2012
Duration:	24 months
Executing Agency:	Governmental, employers', workers' and non-governmental
USDOL Donor Contribution:	<b>US\$ 500,000</b>

## List of Abbreviations

ABC	Agência Brasileira de Cooperação (ABC–Brazilian Cooperation Agency)
AP	Action Programme
C182	ILO’s Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, No. 182 of 1999
CL	Child Labour
CPLP	Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries
DBMR	Direct Beneficiaries Monitoring and Reporting
DED	ILO/IPEC Geneva's Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programmes
EIA	Evaluation and Impact Assessment section of ILO/IPEC (was DED)
FAO	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization
HQ	Headquarters
IA	Implementing Agency
IABA	Integrated Area Based Approach
ILO	International Labour Organization
IO	Immediate Objective
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
NAP	National Action Plan
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NPA	National Plan of Action
PALOP	Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PSAP	Portuguese-speaking African countries
SPIF	Strategic Programme Impact Framework
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labour

---

---

## I. Background and Justification

1. The aim of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child labour (IPEC) is the progressive elimination of child labour, especially its worst forms. The political will and commitment of individual governments to address child labour - in cooperation with employers' and workers' organizations, non-governmental organizations and other relevant parties in society- is the basis for IPEC action. IPEC support at the country level is based on a phased, multi-sector strategy. This strategy includes strengthening national capacities to deal with this issue, legislation harmonization, improvement of the knowledge base, raising awareness on the negative consequences of child labour, promoting social mobilization against it, and implementing demonstrative direct action programmes (AP) to prevent children from child labour and remove child workers from hazardous work and provide them and their families with appropriate alternatives.
2. The operational strategy of IPEC has over the years focused on providing support to national and local constituents and partners through their projects and activities. Such support has to the extent possible been provided in the context of national frameworks, institutions and processes that have facilitated the building of capacities and mobilisation for further action. It has emphasized various degrees of a comprehensive approach, providing linkages between action and partners in sectors and areas of work relevant for child labour. Whenever possible specific national framework or programmes have provided such focus.
3. IPEC has promoted the development and implementation of National Plans of Action (NPAs) or National Action Plans (NAPs) as such national frameworks. A NPA is a strategic framework of integrated and coordinated policies and initiatives at different levels to eliminate specified Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL) in the country. It is a nationally owned initiative that emphasizes the need to address the root causes of child labour, linking action against child labour to the national development effort, with particular emphasis on the economic and social policies to combat poverty and to promote universal basic education. The International Labour Organization (ILO), with the support of many development organizations and the financial and technical contribution of the United States' Department of Labor (USDOL) has elaborated this concept based on previous national and international experience. It has also established innovative technical cooperation modalities to support countries that have ratified the ILO's Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, No. 182 of 1999 (C182) to implement comprehensive measures against WFCL.
4. The most critical element of a NPA is that it is implemented and led by the country itself. The countries commit to the development of a plan to eradicate or significantly diminish the worst forms of child labour in a defined period. This implies a commitment to mobilize and allocate national human and financial resources to combat the problem. IPEC has over the years implemented a number of country-specific projects of support of multi-year duration focusing both on policy and institutional support through the enabling environment and of direct support to communities, families and children through targeted interventions.
5. The experience with NPAs has suggested a range of approaches to establish and implement national frameworks to provide the comprehensive approach, the linkages and the mechanisms for developing the knowledge, mobilising the actors, institutions and resources; and to plan effective coherent national action as part of the broader national development. The experience also showed that the degree of support needed to get this process going in different countries can vary and that specific strategic initiatives can be identified as often key to the process, focusing on influencing important policies and processes.
6. The Global Action Plan (GAP), proposed in the 2006 Global Report on Child Labour and endorsed by the Governing Body at its November 2006 sitting, called on all ILO member States

to put appropriate time-bound measures using National Action Plans (NAP), in place by 2008 with a view to eliminating the WFCL by 2016.

7. At the time of developing the project document, only Cape Verde had a NAP – ‘The National Strategic Plan Against Child Labour 2009’. NAPs were under development in Sao Tome and Principe and Mozambique, and there were no plans in Angola and Guinea Bissau.
8. From the perspective of the ILO, the elimination of child labour is part of its work on standards and fundamental principles and rights at work. The fulfilment of these standards should guarantee decent work for all adults. In this sense, the ILO provides technical assistance to its three constituents: government, workers and employers. This tripartite structure is the key characteristic of ILO cooperation and it is within this framework that the activities developed by the Programme should be analysed.
9. ILO have developed Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) and these are being introduced to provide a mechanism to outline agreed upon priorities between the ILO and the national constituent partners within a broader UN and International development context.
10. The DWCP defines a corporate focus on priorities, operational strategies, as well as a resource and implementation plan that complements and supports partner plans for national decent work priorities. As such, DWCPs are broader frameworks to which the individual ILO project is linked and contributes to. DWCPs are being gradually introduced into various countries’ planning and implementing frameworks. The status of the DWCPs for the five Portuguese-speaking African countries (PSAP) is as follows:
  - Guinea Bissau: 2012 – 2015, final version approved December 2011
  - Mozambique: 2011 – 2015, completed in Portuguese, being translated into English
  - Cape Verde: 2012 – 2015, signed December 2011, being further reviewed
  - Angola: in drafting stage
  - Sao Tome and Principe: in drafting stage
11. ILO is promoting the concepts of South-South cooperation and Triangular cooperation within its development assistance framework.
  - South-South cooperation is a framework for cooperation between two or more developing countries. Based on principles of solidarity, equality, and non-conditionality, developing countries can provide sustainable solutions to their own problems at lower cost and with better results.
  - Triangular cooperation refers to the cooperation of ‘North’ countries and ‘South’ countries, where the contribution from the North could be in the form of financial or technical assistance.

### **Programme Background**

12. In May 2006, in Brazil, the Ministers of Labour of the eight members of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries (CLCP) adopted a Declaration that pledged to join efforts in the prevention and eradication child labour, to promote the exchange of experiences, and to strengthen multilateral cooperation between member states. Additionally, a Common Action Plan (2006-2010) was developed, which converted the goals outlined in the Declaration into an operational plan for the cooperation of the Lusophone countries in combating child labour. This Plan was revised in a tripartite meeting on social dialogue and child labour in October 2010 in Maputo. IPEC begun to mobilize the donor community in order to be able to contribute to this Plan, which recommended: 1) The adoption of NPAs to combat the worst forms of child labour, 2) creation of national tripartite commissions for combating child labour, as well as 3) sharing good practices among CPLP countries. The Brazilian Government, the European Commission, the Spanish Cooperation Agency and the US Department of Labor have all contributed to supporting the implementation of the Plan.

13. Since the adoption of the Plan, progress has been uneven across the five PALOP countries due to lack of national resources to devote to the development of the national plans, as well as lack of resources within IPEC to provide technical, financial, and other needed support.
14. Since 2010, when resources have been secured from the Spanish Aid Agency, IPEC has been able to provide support for the development and implementation of national action plans against the worst forms of child labour in Cape Verde and Guinea-Bissau through the provision of training programmes to strengthen institutional capacity. This work is complementary to the USDOL-funded project.
15. Since the signing of the Declaration in 2006, some limited actions related to supporting education have been underway in Angola under the EU-funded project “Tackling child labour through education” (TACKLE). The TACKLE project does not however focus on the development of a national action plan.
16. In addition, projects have been funded by various donors to address child labour in Angola and Mozambique. In Angola, a USDOL-funded project to eliminate the worst forms of child labour and to provide educational opportunities for victims of the worst forms of child labour developed a child labour monitoring system and withdrew and prevented 2,402 children from the worst forms of child labour in agriculture, herding, and charcoal making. In Mozambique, through a 3-year USDOL-funded project, 2,177 children were withdrawn and prevented from engaging in child labour in agriculture, domestic work, street work, and commercial sexual exploitation.
17. Apart from the actions identified in paragraphs 13, 14 and 15, ILO/IPEC has not been involved in other systematic work on child labour in the project countries..
18. Complementing this Project, the Government of Brazil (ABC) is funding a 2-year initiative (2012 – 2014) in the same five countries focusing on the enhancement of knowledge on child labour. The ABC project shares the same title as the USDOL one and the project code is RAF/12/50/BRA. The ABC-funded project focusses on social mobilisation and awareness raising. The USDOL-funded project focuses on national policies and strengthening national consultation mechanisms. The ABC component will serve as the platform to level the ground for coordinated national/regional actions amongst national/regional stakeholders and social partners and engage, sensitize and mobilize them around actions to combat the worst forms of child labour in Lusophone countries in Africa. The USDOL-funded project (the project being addressed by this evaluation) and the ABC-funded project were intended to be implemented at the same time as one overall programme with two complementary components. The ABC component was planned to start in January 2012 and received funding in August 2012.
19. The development objective of the USDOL-funded project is: Contribute to speed up the pace of the child labour eradication in Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Sao Tome and Principe. The project will provide technical support, advice, and assistance to the five countries in Portuguese-speaking Africa to either develop or refine their national child labour action plans, to provide support to the implementation of their national action plans to combat the worst forms of child labour, or to mainstream child labour into other existing policy frameworks.
20. The two immediate objectives of the project are:
  1. By the end of the project, National Action Plans (NAP) will be developed, revised or strengthened in the five PALOP countries.
  2. By the end of the project, National tripartite Committees or other consultation mechanisms will be active in addressing Child Labour issue in Policy Level and national legislation

21. This Project, in coordination with the partner project funded by Brazil, is implemented in the spirit of South-South-triangular cooperation and in the context of the follow-up to the 2010 Global Child Labour Conference in The Netherlands and the lead up to the Global Child Labour Conference that will take place in 2013 in Brazil

This Project will build and follow up on the priorities identified by the countries during two planning meeting, which are in line with the CPLP Action Plan and coordinated with existing IPEC projects in Angola, Cape Verde and Guinea Bissau. These meetings took place in May (Brasilia) and October (Maputo) 2010, where representatives from the governments (Ministries of Labour, Education and Social Affairs), trade unions and employers' organizations of the five countries identified their needs.

22. The overall project management is centralised in Geneva where the CTA is based. Support is received from the ILO offices in Lusaka, Yaoundé, Dakar, Lisbon and Brasília. The project is guided by an informal consultation committee in Geneva composed of diplomats from the permanent missions to the UN from Angola, Mozambique, and Cape Verde along with Brazil and USA.

### **Evaluation background**

23. ILO considers evaluation as an integral part of the implementation of technical cooperation activities. Provisions are made in all projects in accordance with ILO evaluation policy and are based on the nature of the project and the specific requirements agreed upon at the time of the project design and during the project as per established procedures. The Evaluation and Impact Assessment (EIA) section of ILO/IPEC provides an independent evaluation function for all ILO/IPEC projects.
24. Evaluations of ILO/IPEC projects have a strong focus on utility for the purpose of organisational learning and planning for all stakeholders and partners in the project. As per ILO/IPEC evaluation approach, a participatory consultation process on the nature and specific purposes of this evaluation was carried out to determine the final Terms of Reference. The present Terms of Reference are based on inputs from key stakeholders received by ILO/IPEC-EIA in the consultation process and on standard issues to be covered by a project final evaluation.
25. The project document states that a final independent evaluation will be conducted at the end of the project implementation. The complementary ABC-funded project will also be subject to an end of project evaluation. The findings of this evaluation will contribute to the evaluation process and findings of the latter one so that an overall evaluation of the combined project is achieved.

---

## **II. Purpose and Scope**

---

### **Purpose**

26. The main purposes of the final evaluation are to:
  - a. Assess the extent to which the project has achieved its stated objectives at outcome and impact level and to identify the supporting factors and constraints that have led to this achievement or lack of achievement;
  - b. Identify unintended changes, both positive and negative, in addition to the expected results
  - c. Identify the level of sustainability of the results of the project;
  - d. Identify unintended positive and negative changes at outcome and impact levels;
  - e. Determine the implementation effectiveness and efficiency of the project;

- f. Establish the relevance of the project implementation strategy;
- g. Identify lessons learned and potential good practice, especially regarding strategies that can be applied further;
- h. Provide recommendations to project stakeholders to support the completion or further development of initiatives supported by the project.

## Scope

- 27. The evaluation will focus on the USDOL-funded ILO/IPEC programme mentioned above, its achievements and its contribution to the overall national and regional efforts to achieve the elimination of WFCL. The evaluation should focus on all the activities that have been implemented or were planned to be implemented since the start of the project to the moment of the evaluation mission.
- 28. The evaluation should look at the programme as a whole, including issues of initial project design, implementation, lessons learnt, replicability and recommendations for current and future programmes.
- 29. The contribution of ILO/IPEC to the national NPA process normally covers the promotion of an enabling environment, and the role of technical advisor or facilitator of the process of developing and implementing the NPA. In order to assess the degree to which this contribution has been made, the evaluation will have to take into account relevant factors and developments in the national process. The focus of the evaluation however will be on the ILO/IPEC project “Supporting actions to meet the 2015 targets to eliminate the worst forms of child labour in Lusophone countries in Africa through knowledge, awareness raising and south-south cooperation”.
- 30. The evaluation should identify intended (i.e. planned) and unintended results in terms of outputs and outcomes. Some of the unintended changes could be as important as the ones planned. Therefore, the evaluation team should reflect on them and identify lessons to be learnt.
- 31. The analytical scope should include identifying levels of achievement of objectives and explaining how and why they have been attained. The purpose is to help the stakeholders to learn from the on-going experience.

### **III. Suggested Aspects to be Addressed**

- 32. The evaluation should be carried out in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy; the ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-Based Evaluations; the specific ILO/IPEC Guidelines and Notes; the UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards, Ethical Guidelines, Code of Conduct; and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard.
- 33. The evaluation will address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability to the extent possible as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-Based Evaluation: Principles, Rationale, Planning and Managing for Evaluations, January 2012 [http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_168289/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_168289/lang--en/index.htm)
- 34. Gender concerns should be addressed in accordance with ILO Guidance note 4: “Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of projects” [http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165986/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm) All data should be sex-disaggregated and different needs of women and men and of marginalized groups targeted by the programme should be considered throughout the evaluation process.

35. In line with results-based framework approach used by ILO/IPEC for identifying results at global, strategic and project level, the evaluation will focus on identifying and analysing results through addressing key questions related to the evaluation concerns and the achievement of the Immediate Objectives of the project using data from the logical framework indicators.
36. Annex I contains specific suggested aspects for the evaluation to address. Other aspects can be added as identified by the evaluation team in accordance with the given purpose and in consultation with ILO/IPEC Geneva's Evaluation and Impact Assessment section (EIA). It is not expected that the evaluation address all of the questions detailed in the Annex; however the evaluation must address the general areas of focus. The evaluation instrument (summarised in the inception report) should identify the general areas of focus listed here as well as other priority aspects to be addressed in the evaluation.
37. The main categories that need to be addressed are the following:
- Design
  - Achievement (Implementation and Effectiveness) of Objectives
  - Relevance of the project
  - Sustainability
  - Special Aspects to be Addressed

#### **IV. Expected Outputs of the Evaluation**

38. The expected outputs to be delivered by the evaluator are:
- A desk review of appropriate material
  - Preparation of an evaluation instrument, reflecting the combination of tools and detailed instruments needed to address the range of selected aspects. The instrument needs to make provision for the triangulation of data where possible (to be included in the inception report).
  - Telephone interviews with the donor, with members of the project consultation group in Geneva and ILO/IPEC staff supporting the project
  - Interviews with the participants of the sub-regional conference in Sao Tomé
  - An evaluation/reflection session within the sub-regional conference facilitated by the evaluator
  - Debrief with key stakeholders following the field mission if requested
  - Draft evaluation report in English and Portuguese. The evaluation report should include and reflect on findings from the evaluation mission including the sub-regional conference that will be attended and should include:
    - ✓ Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions and recommendations
    - ✓ Clearly identified findings
    - ✓ A table presenting the key results (i.e. figures and qualitative results) achieved per objective (expected and unexpected)
    - ✓ Clearly identified conclusions and recommendations (identifying which stakeholders are responsible)
    - ✓ Lessons learnt
    - ✓ Potential good practices
    - ✓ Appropriate Annexes including present TORs and a listing of everyone consulted during the evaluation
  - Final evaluation report incorporating feedback from stakeholders.
39. The total length of the report should be a maximum of 30 pages for the main report, excluding annexes; additional annexes can provide background and details on specific components of the project evaluated. The report should be sent as one complete document and the file size should

not exceed 3 megabytes. Photos, if appropriate to be included, should be inserted using lower resolution to keep overall file size low.

40. All drafts and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided both in paper copy and in electronic version compatible for Word for Windows. Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with ILO-IPEC and the consultants. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of ILO-IPEC. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.
41. The draft final report will be prepared in English and Portuguese with the English version as the official version. This report will be circulated to key stakeholders (those participants present at the sub-regional meeting and members of the consultation committee will be considered key stakeholders), including project staff for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated by the Evaluation and Impact Assessment section (EIA) of ILO/IPEC Geneva and provided to the evaluator. In preparing the final report the evaluator should consider these comments, incorporate as appropriate, and provide a brief note explaining why any comments might not have been incorporated. The final report will be in English and Portuguese with the English version as the official version.

## **V. Evaluation Methodology**

42. The following is the proposed evaluation methodology. While the evaluation team can propose changes in the methodology, any such changes should be discussed with and approved by EIA and the Project, provided that the research and analysis suggest changes and provided that the indicated range of questions is addressed, the purpose maintained and the expected outputs produced at the required quality.
43. The evaluation will be carried out using a desk review of appropriate materials, including the project documents, progress reports, outputs of the programme and the projects (action programmes), results of any internal planning process and relevant materials from secondary sources. At the end of the desk review period the evaluation consultant will prepare a brief document indicating the methodological approach to the evaluation in the form of the evaluation instrument, to be discussed and approved by EIA.
44. The evaluator will be asked to include in the inception report the evaluation instruments that will be used for documenting and analysing the achievements of the project and the contributions of the sub-projects (Action Programmes) to the programme.
45. The evaluator will interview the donor representatives, members of the project consultation group in Geneva and ILO/IPEC HQ and regional backstopping officials through conference calls early in the evaluation process, preferably during the desk review phase.
46. The evaluator will attend the sub-regional conference for the elimination of child labour in CLCP countries to be held in Sao Tome from 3<sup>rd</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> December 2012, and will conduct interviews and focussed group discussions (FGDs) with participants from all five CLCP countries and with participants from Brazil and USA and with project and ILO staff present.
47. The evaluator will plan and facilitate some sessions of the sub-regional conference. Information will be obtained through these sessions on achievement and constraints of the project and will identify lessons learnt. Towards the end of the conference the opportunity should also be taken

to present initial findings of the evaluation to the stakeholders present for their verification and comment.

48. The evaluator will be responsible for organizing the methodology the reflection/evaluation sessions of the conference. The identification of the number of participants of the workshops and logistics will be the responsibility of the project team.
49. The consultant will meet with relevant stakeholders from Sao Tome and Principe who are not attending the conference.
50. The evaluator will be responsible for drafting and finalizing the evaluation report. The findings of the evaluator will incorporate the feedback from the stakeholders in the conference. The draft report will be circulated to stakeholders in English and Portuguese for their feedback and comments. The evaluator will further be responsible for finalizing the report incorporating any comments from stakeholders as appropriate.
51. The evaluation will be carried out with the technical support of the ILO/IPEC-EIA section and with the logistical support of the project CTA in Geneva. EIA will be responsible for consolidating the comments of stakeholders and submitting them to the evaluator.
52. It is expected that the evaluator will work to the highest evaluation standards and codes of conduct and follow the UN evaluation standards and norms.

#### **The team responsibilities and profile**

53. The evaluation will be carried out by an international evaluator. The evaluator will have the final responsibility during the evaluation process for the outcomes of the evaluation, including the quality of the report and compliance with deadlines.
54. The background of the evaluator should include:

Evaluator (International consultant):

<b>Responsibilities</b>	<b>Profile</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review of programme documents</li> <li>• Development of the evaluation instrument</li> <li>• Briefing with ILO/IPEC-EIA</li> <li>• Telephone interviews with ILO/IPEC HQ desk officer, donor</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff</li> <li>• Interviews with project stakeholders attending the sub-regional conference and those resident in Sao Tome</li> <li>• Facilitate some sessions of the sub-regional conference</li> <li>• Draft evaluation report</li> <li>• Finalise evaluation report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Not have been involved in the project.</u></li> <li>• Relevant background in social and/or economic development.</li> <li>• Experience in the design, management and evaluation of development projects, in particular with policy level work, institutional building and local development projects.</li> <li>• Experience in evaluations in the UN system or other international context as evaluator</li> <li>• Relevant sub-regional experience</li> <li>• Relevant country experience highly preferred</li> <li>• Experience in the area of children's and child labour issues and rights-based approaches in a normative framework and operational dimension are highly appreciated.</li> <li>• Experience at policy level and in the area of education and legal issues would also be appreciated.</li> <li>• Experience in the UN system or similar international development experience including preferably international and national development frameworks in particular PRSP and UNDAF.</li> <li>• Fluency in English and Portuguese is essential</li> <li>• Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings.</li> </ul>

## Evaluation Timetable and Schedule

55. The total duration of the evaluation process including submission of the final report should be within one month from the end of the field mission.

56. The timetable is as follows:

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks	No of days of consultant input
I	Evaluator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Briefing with ILO/IPEC-EIA</li> <li>○ Desk Review of programme related documents</li> <li>○ Telephone briefing with the Project Coordinator, the donor, members of the project consultation group in Geneva, ILO/IPEC, IPEC HQ and ILO regional staff</li> <li>○ Submission of inception report</li> </ul>	4
II	Evaluator with logistical support by project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Attend sub-regional conference for the elimination of child labour in CLCP countries in Sao Tome</li> <li>○ Interviews with project staff and partners</li> <li>○ Interviews with stakeholders participating in the conference</li> <li>○ Facilitation of session in the conference on reflection, learning and evaluation</li> <li>○ Presentation of initial findings of the evaluation to the conference</li> </ul>	7
III	Evaluator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Draft report in English and Portuguese based on consultations from desk review, interviews and presentation feedback</li> <li>○ Debriefing as required</li> </ul>	7
IV	EIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Quality check and initial review by EIA</li> <li>○ Circulate draft report to key stakeholders</li> <li>○ Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to evaluator</li> </ul>	0
V	Evaluator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Finalize the report in English and Portuguese including explanations on why comments were not included</li> </ul>	1
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>19</b>

57. Summary schedule

Phase	Duration	Dates
<b>Desk review and preparation</b>	<b>4 days</b>	<b>20 - 23 November</b>
<b>Field mission</b>	<b>6 days</b>	<b>3 – 8 December</b>
<b>Preparation of draft report</b>	<b>7 days</b>	<b>10 - 15 December</b>
<b>Circulation of draft report</b>	<b>10 days</b>	<b>16 December – 27 December</b>
<b>Finalise report</b>	<b>1 day</b>	<b>By 29<sup>th</sup> December</b>

## 58. Sources of Information and Consultations/Meetings

The following sources should be consulted:

Available at HQ and to be supplied by EIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project document</li> <li>• EIA, ILO and UNEG guidelines</li> </ul>
Available in project office and to be supplied by project management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical progress reports/status reports</li> <li>• Baseline reports and studies</li> <li>• Project monitoring plan</li> <li>• Technical and financial reports of partner agencies</li> <li>• Other studies and research undertaken</li> <li>• Action Programme Summary Outlines</li> <li>• Project files</li> <li>• National Action Plans</li> <li>• Study on good practices and lessons learned</li> </ul>

59. Consultations/meetings will be held with:

- Project management and staff
- Members of the project consultation group in Geneva (by telephone)
- ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials
- Government stakeholders (e.g. representatives from Department of Labour, Social Development etc.)
- Government representatives, policy makers, legal authorities etc. as identified by evaluation team
- Members of the Tripartite Consultative Committee/Mechanism in each country
- Implementing partner agencies
- Child labour programs in the countries
- Social partners Employers' and Workers' groups
- NGO representatives
- Representative of ABC
- USDOL (by telephone)
- US Embassy staff in countries visited

### **Final Report Submission Procedure**

60. For independent evaluations, the following procedure is used:

- The evaluator will submit a draft report in English with a translation in Portuguese to ILO/IPEC EIA in Geneva
- IPEC EIA will forward a copy to key stakeholders for comments on factual issues and for clarification
- IPEC EIA will consolidate the comments and send these to the evaluator by a date agreed between EIA and the evaluator or as soon as the comments are received from stakeholders.
- The final report in English with a translation in Portuguese is submitted to ILO/IPEC EIA who will then officially forward it to stakeholders, including the donor.

## VI. Resources and Management

### Resources

61. The resources required for this evaluation are:

- For the evaluator:
  - Fees for an international consultant for 19 work days
  - Fees for local DSA in project locations
  - Travel from consultant's home residence to Sao Tome in line with ILO regulations and rules

A detailed budget is available separately.

### Management

62. The evaluator will report to ILO/IPEC-EIA in headquarters and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with EIA, should issues arise. IPEC project officials and the project office in Sao Tome will provide administrative and logistical support during the evaluation mission.

## **ANNEX I: Suggested Aspects to Address**

### **Design**

- Determine the validity of the project design, in particular whether it assisted or hindered the achievement of the project goals as set out in the Project Document.
- Assess whether the project design was logical and coherent:
  - Were the objectives of the project clear, realistic and likely to be achieved within the established time schedule and with the allocated resources (including human resources)?
  - Were the linkages between inputs, activities, outputs and objectives clear and logical?
  - Were the different components of the project (i.e. capacity building, policy and legislation, enhancing collaboration and knowledge sharing and south-south collaboration) clearly and realistically complementing each other?
  - How relevant are programme indicators and means of verification? Please assess the usefulness of the indicators for monitoring and measuring outcomes.
  - Was the time frame for project implementation and the sequencing of project activities logical and realistic?
  - Review the appropriateness of the level of project staffing and the management structure.
  - Were the expectations of the roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders realistic and likely to be achieved?
- To what extent have key external factors been identified and assumptions formulated in the Project document? Have the identified assumptions on which the project has been based, proven to be true? Assess the impact of any external factors (expected and unexpected)
- How well did the programme design take into account national and sub-regional efforts already underway to address child labour?
- Assess how the concepts of South-South cooperation and Triangular cooperation have been integrated in the design of the project
- Have gender issues been clearly taken into account in the project design in its components and outcomes?
- Has the strategy for sustainability of project results been defined clearly at the design stage of the project?
- Does the project design fit within and complement existing or previous initiatives (by any organization) to combat child labour?

### **Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness) of Objectives**

- Examine the preparatory outputs of the delivery process in terms of effectiveness of preparation for project implementation.
- How has the project responded to any delays and how well did these responses enable implementation to be caught up
- Examine delivery of programme outputs in terms of quality and quantity; have they been delivered in a timely manner? Assess reasons for any delays and identify lessons for future project implementation
- Assess whether the project has achieved its immediate objectives and identify contributing factors and constraints
- In what way were provisions for child labour prevention strengthened within existing or new national legislation of each country paying specific attention to the development, improvement or implementation of each country's National Action Plan

- Assess the impact of the south-south cooperation exchange and coordination to eliminate WFCL in the region and in each country, identifying capacity built within each country and concrete actions taken as a result of this exchange.
- Review the stakeholders identified in each country to participate in project efforts? Were the stakeholders in the most appropriate office/ministry and did they have the authority necessary to make meaningful changes?
- How has the project responded to positive and negative factors (both foreseen and unforeseen) that arose throughout the implementation process? Has the project team been able to adapt the implementation process in order to overcome these obstacles without hindering the effectiveness of the project?
- Assess the programme monitoring system including the PMP, work plans, processes or systems (i.e. data collecting and processing, analysis and reporting)
- Assess the effectiveness of the programme i.e. compare the allocated resources with results obtained. In general, did the results obtained justify the costs incurred?
- Assess the establishment and contribution of institutional partnerships to project achievements.
- How effectively has the programme leveraged resources (e.g., by collaborating with non-ILO/IPEC initiatives and other programmes launched in support of the NAP processes thus far)?
- Assess the project efforts to coordinate and collaborate with other child-focused interventions supported by other organizations in the countries with particular emphasis on those with work in child labour elimination.
- Review the linkages that the project had with other USDOL-funded projects and other projects and how these effected the achievement of the project objectives.
- Review the value of project team technical support, including the effectiveness of communication, received from programme partner organizations and relevant ILO units (including ILO Geneva, Sub regional and Regional Offices). What was the effect of coordinating the project from outside of the region?

### **Enabling Environment (Capacity Building)**

- Assess the increased capacity of selected government institutions and social partners to advocate for prevention of child labour at the national level in each country.
- Examine the role of the project in building any networks that have been developed between organizations and government agencies working to address child labour at the national and regional level.
- Assess the effectiveness and sustainability of the National Tripartite Committees and other consultation mechanisms, including the effect they have had and will have on child labour policy and national legislation in each country.
- Review the effectiveness and sustainability of the online portal at facilitating information sharing between PALOP countries?
- How relevant and effective were the studies and reports commissioned by the programme in terms of affecting the national debates on child labour?
- Examine how the ILO/IPEC project interacted and possibly influenced national level policies, debates and institutions working on child labour.
- Assess the extent to which the ILO/IPEC project has been able to mobilize resources, policies, programmes, partners and activities to be part of the NAPs.

### **Relevance of the Project**

- Examine whether the programme responded to the real needs of the participating countries.

- Did the strategy address the different needs and roles, constraints, access to resources of the participating countries?
- Identify and assess any emerging trends that the project responded to (or should have responded to) in order to increase the relevance and impact
- Has the project identified any other constraints or opportunities that need to be accommodated in the design in order to increase the impact and relevance of the project?

### **Sustainability**

- Assess the design of the sustainability strategy, its progress and its potential for achievement.
- Determine the potential to sustain the gains of the project beyond its life and what measures are needed to ensure this.
- Assess the likelihood that collaboration and information sharing between Brazil and other Lusophone countries will continue after the end of the project.
- Assess programme success in leveraging resources for on-going and continuing efforts to prevent and eliminate child labour in the context of the NAPs.
- Identify potential good practices and strategies of intervention that could inform future regional child labour elimination projects, especially those that the national partners could incorporate into national policy and implementation.

### **Specific Aspects to be addressed:**

- Assess how the different phasing of the USDOL-funded and ABC-funded elements of the overall combined project has affected the outcomes.
- Identify implications, recommendations and lessons learnt from the experience of the USDOL-funded elements of the combined project for the programming of the ABC-funded elements.
- Assess how far the project has been able to mobilize the tripartite constituents (government, workers and employers) and other actors (civil society, UN, other development agencies) in the countries in action against child labour and in contributing towards achieving the project's goals and objectives.
- How effectively has the project promoted South-South collaboration and the transmission of good practices and experiences in combatting child labour between the five countries and Brazil? Identify any specific actions taken by any of the six countries as a result.
- Identify areas where the south-south modality has specifically contributed to outcomes of the project.
- How effectively has the project linked to other regional initiatives on child labour?