



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation Office

Creating the enabling environment to establish models for child labour free areas in Kenya – Final evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries: Kenya

Final Evaluation: November 2013

Mode of Evaluation: Independent

Administrative Office: DWT/CO-Kenya

Technical Office: FPRW/IPEC

Evaluation Manager: Peter Wichmand

Evaluation Consultant: Lotta Nycander and
Andrew Riechi

Project Code: KEN/09/50/USA

Donor & Project Budget: USA, US\$ 4.6 million

Keywords: Child labor

Executive Summary

(Extract from the full report)

The **International Labour Organisation (ILO)** has been implementing the IPEC project entitled Creating an enabling environment to establish models for child labour free areas in Kenya Support to the implementation of the National Action Plan for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour with special focus on agriculture and older children (herein referred to as SNAP or the Project) under a tripartite framework.

The US Labour Department has funding the Project with a total budget of USD 4.6 million and the Government of Kenya has contributed in kind. The implementation period was from 30th September 2009 with the official start up and was closed on 31 November 2013 (the total duration was 46 months).

The Project involved all categories of ILO constituents and partnered with many stakeholder

organisations, coordinated by a Project team in Nairobi at the national level. At district level the project activities were coordinated by locally based project coordinators in Busia district in Western Province, Kitui district in Eastern Province and Kilifi district in the Coast Province.

This is a report of the final evaluation of the SNAP Project, undertaken by a team of two independent evaluators, with a field mission in Kenya in September – October 2013. The evaluation methods were mainly qualitative, including a thorough documentation review, in-depth interviews and meetings in all operational areas and with all categories of the Project stakeholders as well as focus group discussions. Quantitative data was gathered from secondary sources and care was made to as much as possible triangulate the information gathered (see details in section 2 Part I of this report and Annex III, Part II of the evaluation report).

Methodology of evaluation

The project evaluation was carried out during September – October 2013, primarily through:

- Developing an evaluation methodology;
- Reviewing relevant documentation using a format for synthesising findings and reflections;
- Interviewing key ILO staff in Geneva in August-September;
- Data collection in Kenya during 8th to 27th September, jointly with a national consultant;
- Visiting the three district project areas, holding/attending meetings and Focus Group Discussions;
- Attending a Validation Workshop in Nairobi in which the key preliminary

findings were presented and discussed through groups work followed by presentation by the participants.

- Analysing the findings and making recommendations based on the conclusions;
- Drafting an evaluation report, incorporating feedback consolidated by ILO; and
- Writing a final evaluation report.

Key Conclusions

The Project has clearly had an impact and generated an interest within Kenya. It has provided a source of inspiration and built capacity and contributed to understanding on the elimination of child labour within Kenyan government, the ILO constituents and civil society organisations, which is a significant achievement. The senior officials in the Child Labour Division/Ministry of Labour have been committed and actively supported many Project related activities and the working relationship with the Project management team was found to be good. Other social partners contributed in raising awareness of child labour issues and the implementing agencies played instrumental roles in producing the results.

The devolution of power to new County Governments is among others intended to increase the protection of children against social and economic exploitation - part of the many duties of the new counties. At the time of the evaluation, the priorities and resource allocations of the new County development plans were not known. The on-going changes in the government structure leading to a combination of two ministries and new departments in the Ministry dealing with e.g. child and social welfare services may, in the short term, lead to child labour taking a back seat in favour of more general children welfare issues.

The SNAP team has followed most of the recommendations from the Mid Term Review undertaken in 2012, and has accounted for its follow-up actions in its progress reporting. It is noted that some recommendations were outside the control/reach of the Project team such as the official enactment of the Child Labour Policy and the National Action Plan on Child Labour. As for reaching the targets, the Project has achieved effectively, through implementing an integrated area based approach at district level. Most quantitative targets have been surpassed; i.e. for removal 3,857 (target 3,700), prevention 4,409 (target 4,155), and economic support to families of

child labourers 1,557 (target 1,000). The exception is boys and girls targeted for “protection” (safety in work places). It appears this target was set unrealistically high, as only 147 children/youth were reached with safety measures in work places (target was originally 300, later reduced to 100).

The Project staff, its stakeholders in the three districts and the staff Child Labour Division/Ministry of Labour have performed well, in terms of integrating child labour concerns in various policy discussions and making inputs to policies and programmes in cooperation with the Division staff and other Nairobi-based ILO staff. At district and country level, SNAP has informed/advocated for child labour issues to be part of the local development plans for the new county governments. However, the fact that the Government still had not endorsed/adopted the child labour policy, the National Action Plan or Hazardous List at the time of the evaluation should be a matter of concern for ILO, the constituents and the civil society organisations but are clearly beyond the control of the Project.

The Project’s advocacy and communication strategy has generally worked well through well-planned series of actions to influence policies and change. The factors identified that make it relevant to replicate it in other areas are first and foremost the placing of the spotlight on the worst forms of child labour, creating a space for stakeholders to voice the need for action to eradicate the it and communicating information and knowledge widely at both at district and national level. The Project’s partnering with others has been quite significant and has generated additional resources to run the Project and to achieve its goals – through national and district level partnerships. The Network of government and non-government organisations initiated by the Project in 2010, now coordinated by the MoL has been vibrant and is one of the more interesting developments at the national level. As no sitting allowances need to be paid to the attendants it should have a fair chance to function also after the Project ends.

The evaluation team found that capacity building has been a strong and effective element throughout the Project duration and has contributed well to making officials and civil society actors more aware about child labour issues, its complexities and measures that need to be put in place. The Project has managed to support all three districts in establishing models and considerably increased the

visibility and dissemination of messages. It has actually contributed to the reduction of incidences of child labour and ensured that more children are in school – while others have gained various job related skills and self-employment. SNAP has created an environment for the models, and piloted activities that contributed to the reduction of child labour in three districts.

The Project staff played an instrumental role in implementing the integrated area based approach in a systematic way and getting organisations and people on board to support the aims of the Project. However, one weakness observed in the chain of the community level monitoring system was that the linkages between the District Child Labour Committees and the Local Child Labour Committees are weak.

After the recommendations from the Mid Term Review in 2012, the Project intensified its efforts to involve 15-17 year olds from the agricultural sector and the partnership with Ministry of Agriculture. However, the extension system in Kenya has been dwindling for a long time and it appeared that “child labour in agriculture” is not high on the priority list of the MOA. Thus it was assessed as unrealistic that it can play any significant role vis-à-vis eliminating child labour in agriculture - unless resources from the Kenyan government or external technical support for this purpose materialises. Although it took off late in the Project cycle, the cooperation with FCI on the other hand generated an interesting model that could be implemented in other areas, in advocating against child labour and simultaneously mobilise small-scale farmers to become commercialised.

Regarding availability of relevant skills training it was found that the three District Youth Polytechnics involved with the Project were requested to adjust their skills training courses to last for six months duration instead of one year, apparently in order to fit in with the timing of the overall field implementation. It was intended that the training courses would be carried out in a friendly educational environment. It was however clear that there were problems regarding the environment and quality of the training, as well as some environmental conditions in the polytechnic schools.

Families have been supported with various socio-economic interventions and hand-outs to help boost or supplement their incomes (1,444 families were

assisted). The evaluation acknowledges the results and the simple rationale behind the strategy to help improve families’ incomes to enable them to send children to school and not to labour. From observations made by the evaluation team, however, and the information received during discussions with the beneficiaries in the project districts, it appears that the assistance might not lead to *long-term or sustainable* improvements, simply because of the complex realities experienced by families living in poverty.

The evaluation team assessed that gender disparities/inequality was acknowledged in the Project’s steering and planning documents and also taken into account in the implementation of IABA to combat child labour in the selected district levels for which it is commended. The Project has been gender-responsive in terms of disaggregating the data gathered on its activities involving girls and boys respectively through its monitoring system - which is commended. Among the weaknesses of the Project’s approach was an inadequacy in making a difference regarding children/young people’s engagement in commercial sex with some exceptions. Further, the Project has not been able to challenge prevailing socio-cultural gender norms, for instance in terms of offering non-traditional skills training or opportunities to girls who would/could not stay in formal education - as was prescribed in the Project Document.

The overall project design is based on earlier IPEC experience and is well thought-through, and the comprehensive work plans follow the logic of the design. Placing local external coordinators within government offices in selected districts has made good sense as it has demonstrated what can be done locally to combat child labour through a pilot with external resources and concerted efforts. The 6-monthly progress reports are rich in narrative and provide essential information – but not very reader-friendly as the narratives are placed in tables.

Lessons Learned

1. ILO needs to explore alternative methods and approaches in its technical cooperation activities, when advocating for education and against child labour, as the striving to meet set quantitative goals in a short/limited period of time may actually generate success only in the short-term.

2. More attention needs to be paid to quality aspects of education and training in particular when enrolling young boys and girls as residents (boarders) in polytechnic/TVET institutions. Much more monitoring and follow needs to be done. The success of training should not be dependent on co-financing agreements with parents/families living in poverty. More learning needs to be done on how ILO, its constituents and development partners can support child labourers/former child labourers both girls and boys to acquire competences that may enhance their ability to secure and retain a job – which should include skills related to teamwork, problem solving, information and communications technology (ICT) and language skills.

Good practices

Among the good practices identified are:

1. The child labour Network set up at the national level.
2. The support to small-scale farming households to raise their economic status through new the introduction of new technology, increased production and commercialisation. The innovative element here was the entry point identified by the Project to advocate against the worst forms of child labour which appeared to have worked well and should be replicated.

Recommendations

1. ILO should, in discussions with partners (globally), work out technical cooperation on child labour issues that are even more focused on policy-making and institution-building and less focused on attempting to reach targets in terms of withdrawing children from work. This should be more geared to ensuring that the combat against child labour has institutional homes and are less project-driven as it were.
2. The Area Advisory Councils and the District Child Labour Committees should follow-up, and ensure that the new County governments allocates resources to meet the needs to eradicate child labour through education and skills training in up-coming new development plans.
3. The National Steering Committee should work with the government so the child labour policy and the national action plan are finally enacted and that the list of hazardous work is published (gazetted) as

part of the Employment Act. The members of the child labour Network coordinated by MoL, should build on the momentum created by ILO-IPEC and ensure that primarily government resources are allocated also at national level to support further efforts including the enforcement of policies.

4. The GOK should replicate the feasible elements of the strategies used by ILO-IPEC in other areas in Kenya, making use of the human resources and capacity built among ILO's constituents and partner organisations.

5. ILO must in the future ensure that its technical cooperation projects that offer children or young people enrolment in training institutions with boarding arrangements have adequate standard as well as commitment from the part of the institutions - closely monitored by the implementing agencies and ILO project staff.

6. ILO-IPEC should be more realistic in the expectations that the practice of giving hand-outs in Kenya will lead to increased and sustainable socio-economic wellbeing. The ILO-IPEC should place more efforts in learning and spreading knowledge about the FCI village commercialisation model, which appears to be a more holistic way to assist small-scale farmers to enhance their economic status and can provide a good entry point to advocate against harmful child labour and maintaining children in school. ILO and its partners should look into the possibilities of promoting the implementation of this model also in other areas and countries.

7. ILO and its constituents should identify new ideas to enable girls, especially, to venture into typical male-dominated skills training and job areas in order to increase their opportunities on the job market.