



***Mtoto  
Kwanza***

# **WEKEZA**

## **Interim Evaluation**

May 20, 2015

Management Systems International

Evaluator: Deborah M. Orsini

# WEKEZA

## Interim Evaluation

May 20, 2015

Evaluator: Deborah M. Orsini

**This report was prepared by Management Systems International.  
Corporate Offices:  
200 S. 12th St., Arlington VA 22202 USA  
Tel: + 1 703 979 7100**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACRONYMS</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>I. EVALUATION OBJECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RESULTS TO DATE</b> .....	<b>2</b>
A. Project Scope.....	3
B. WEKEZA Stakeholders .....	4
C. Wekeza Theory of Change and Project Activities .....	5
D. WEKEZA Results Framework (RF).....	7
E. WEKEZA Results to Date by Intermediate Objectives (IOs).....	9
<b>III. EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND FINDINGS</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>VII. CONCLUSIONS, GOOD PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>41</b>
A. Conclusions .....	41
B. Good Practices.....	43
C. Recommendations .....	44
<b>ANNEXES</b>	
Annex 1. Terms of Reference .....	47
Annex 2. Questions Matrix .....	56
Annex 3. Persons Interviewed .....	59
Annex 4. Evaluation Schedule.....	61
Annex 5. National Stakeholders Meeting Agenda and Attendees .....	63
Annex 6. Stakeholder Feedback .....	66
Annex 7. Wekeza Indicator Analysis.....	72
Annex 8. Youth Income Tracking Table .....	81

## ACRONYMS

ADP	Area Development Program
BSD	Business Skills Development
CHODAWU	Confederated Hotel, Domestic, Allied Workers Union
CL	Child Labor
CLC	Child Labor Committee
CLMS	Child Labor Monitoring System
CLU	Child Labor Unit
CMEP	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
COBET	Complimentary Basic Education Program in Tanzania
CPG	Commercial Producers Group
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CV	Commercial Village
DBMS	Direct Beneficiary Monitoring System
DCLC	District Child Labor Committee
DCPT	District Child Protection Team
DCI	Data Collection Instrument
DCT	Data Collection Table
DEO	District Education Officer
DSW	Department of Social Welfare
FCS	Foundation for Civil Society
GoT	Government of Tanzania
GPRMA	Government Performance and Results Modernization Act
CPIMS	Child Protection Information Management System
IDS	Institute of Development Studies
IEC	Information, Education, Communication (materials)
IGA	Income Generating Activity
ILFS	Integrated Labor Force Survey
ILO	International Labor Organization
IO	Intermediate Objective
IRC	International Rescue Committee
KIWOHEDE	Kiota Women’s Health and Development
KTCU	Kigoma Tobacco Growers Co-operative Union Ltd
LCA	Law of the Child Act (2009)
LGA	Local Government Authority
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MF	Micro-Franchise
MLAP	Market Led Agricultural Production
MoAFS	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
MoCDGC	Ministry of Community Development, Gender and Children
MoEVT	Ministry of Education and Vocational Training
MoHSW	Ministry of Health and Social Welfare
MoLE	Ministry of Labor and Employment
MVC	Most Vulnerable Children
NAP	National Action Plan on the Elimination of Child Labor
NGO	Non-governmental Organization

NISCC	National Inter-Sectoral Coordinating Committee
NYDT	Nyakitonto Youth for Development Tanzania
OCFT	Office of Child and Forced Labor and Trafficking
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
RF	Results Framework
SB	School Board
SACCO	Savings and Credit Cooperative Organization
SC	School Committee
SIDO	Small Industries Development Organization
SIP	School Improvement Plan
SWO	Social Welfare Officer
TASAF	Tanzania Social Action Fund
TAYODEA	Tanga Youth Development Association
TOT	Training of Trainers
TUCTA	Trade Union Congress of Tanzania
UNICEF	United Nations Children Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
USG	United States Government
VCLC	Village Child Labor Committee
VETA	Vocational Education and Training Authority
VICOBA	Village Community Bank
VTC	Vocational Training Center
WEKEZA	<i>INVEST: Supporting Livelihoods and Developing Quality Education to Stop Child Labor</i>
WSDP	Whole School Development Plans
WV	World Vision

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This interim evaluation report addresses findings, conclusions and recommendations regarding the implementation of **WEKEZA** (*Wezeshu Ustawi, Endeleva Kiwango cha Elimu Kuzuia Ajira Kwa Watoto*, or, in English: *INVEST: Supporting Livelihoods and Developing Quality Education to Stop Child Labor*). The United States Department of Labor's (USDOL) Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) funds this project via a \$10 million, four-year grant to the International Rescue Committee (IRC). A consortium of partners including IRC, World Vision (WV), Kiota Women's Health and Development (KIWOHEDE), Tanga Youth Development Association (TAYODEA), the Foundation for Civil Society (FCS) and the University of Dar es Salaam's Institute for Development Studies (IDS) is responsible for project implementation, working in collaboration with the Government of Tanzania (GoT) Ministry of Labor and Employment (MoLE) and District Child Labor Committees (DCLCs) in the project's six target districts and 54 villages within the Kigoma and Tanga Regions.

Field work for this interim evaluation carried out over 10 working days involved site visits to four villages in each region, interviews with project beneficiaries (parents, children, and youth) and stakeholders (head masters, teachers, school committees (SC) and school boards (SB), DCLCs and Village Child Labor Committees (VCLCs). Interviews also included national level stakeholders, including cooperating ministries, international agencies and the U.S. Embassy. The project organized a stakeholder meeting on the final day of the evaluation to present preliminary evaluation findings for stakeholder comment and to obtain input on recommended actions for the last two years of the project.

*Theory Of Change:* to reduce the incidence of child labor in Tanga and Kigoma regions the Wekeza project addresses six factors that drive child labor: poor school attendance, low household income, lack of youth employment opportunities, absence of social protection services, need for child labor policies and programs at the local and national level, and lack of awareness of child labor issues in the community. Project activities include direct education, livelihoods and youth employment services to beneficiary households (HHs); and technical assistance and coordination with local governments authorities (LGAs) and national stakeholders to increase beneficiary access to social protection; to include child labor in national educational, agricultural and other social protection policies and programs; and to change attitudes within target communities regarding child labor, including awareness raising on the negative efforts of underage domestic service.

Detailed findings regarding results and best practices from each of the six project components are presented in the body of this report. This Executive Summary presents a synthesis of conclusions reached from the field work and project document review, along with recommended actions to enhance project performance in the 20 months before project end.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The evaluation concludes that with continued focused attention especially to livelihoods and youth interventions and social policy and CLMS support and combined with accurate data collection, the project should be able to achieve its objectives and targets within the project period. Progress is above average for IO1 (Education) and IO6 (Awareness Raising); acceptable for IO2 (Livelihoods) and IO3 (Youth), and behind schedule for IO4 (Social Protection) and IO5 as concerns implementation of the Child Labor Monitoring System (CLMS). The slower progress for IO2 (Livelihoods) and IO3 (Youth) is due in part to the four-month

delay in initiating the baseline study and in part to issues related to beneficiary uptake of the direct services offered (for IO2, group dynamics issues among beneficiary HHs; for IO3, skepticism regarding training among the early cohorts).

Wekeza project management has adopted proactive strategies for 2015 to increase beneficiary HH engagement in Commercial Producer Group (CPG) activities and to increase intake of beneficiary youth, which should enable the project to meet its E and L targets this year. However, this goal would be facilitated if the following adjustments were made, in line with beneficiary interests: allowing more youth 18-24 years of age to pursue vocational training and more beneficiary HHs to pursue non-agricultural Income Generating Activities (IGA) vs. agricultural CPG activities.

In terms of **sustainability**, using the project's eight-pillar sustainability strategy as a reference, the evaluation concludes that the project has made significant progress in two areas: community mobilization and resource replacement and strengthening, and that adequate progress has been made in capacity building, integration of project interventions in GoT program priorities, incorporation of child labor language in key policy documents and regulations, structure and system building, publication and promotion of child labor policies and processes, and partnership building.

Effective project **data collection and analysis** has been handicapped by the lack of clean DBMS beneficiary data, faulty DBMS formulas for CMEP performance indicators, and insufficient training and oversight of VCLC monitors to ensure reliable data collection. A new M&E team is in place since August 2014 and is taking steps to remedy these problems. Given project M&E issues and to streamline the CMEP process at the project mid-point, a series of five to eleven CMEP indicators could be cut from the PMP, enabling the M&E team to focus on the most important performance indicators. The school quality of education index indicator is an important measure that should be developed as soon as possible with the Education team. Related data should be reported by the October 2015 TPR.

The project burn rate has improved from 30% in October 2014 to 57% in January 2015. Adjustments to the budget over the last two years of the project should be geared to maximize project performance, with the most significant value-add appearing to derive from (1) increased CSO field support across education, livelihoods, youth and awareness raising, and (2) standardization of education services, including uniforms, supplies, and shoes to COBET students and shoes to primary school children; and of start-up funding and tools to youth.

Major conclusions by project component are summarized below.

## Education

- Education drives the overall Wekeza child labor strategy, per stakeholders and beneficiaries
- SCs and SBs strengthening has substantially increased community solidarity (school feeding)
- COBET is one of the project's most outstanding achievements (32 centers of which 18 are new)
- Teacher training is highly relevant, with new skills being applied in all Wekeza schools

- National Education Task Force on CL is a critically important step in coordinating CL policies
- Poor infrastructure (latrines, roofs, floors especially) is a serious problem that requires project attention for the well-being of its beneficiary children

### **Livelihoods**

- “Planting the seed” for LH takes time given group dynamics but is KEY to sustainability
- VICOBAAs are the glue for livelihoods, building solidarity and confidence
- Anecdotal evidence exists of increases in production (e.g. increase from 5 to 8 sacks of cassava)
- CPGs and IGAs require regular monitoring (bi-weekly if possible)- CSOs could assist
- Demand for IGAs is significantly higher than demand for CPGs

### **Youth**

- Vocational training and enterprise modules are market relevant
- Anecdotal evidence exists of increases in youth income
- Much higher demand exists among all youth 15-24 years of age for vocational training vs. micro-enterprise and especially vs. micro-franchises
- Micro-franchises are very labor intensive which handicaps the very small Youth team
- Micro-enterprises are most successful among risk-taking youth
- Peer mentoring and start-up tools are critical to sustain youth enterprises
- Increasing size of BSD classes to 50+ may compromise the quality of training

### **Social Protection**

- Little progress in beneficiary access to TASAF or CHF
- Critical need to ensure integrated efforts between child labor and child protection – local committees, integrated training and awareness raising
- TASAF could provide useful community-level support to improve school infrastructure

### **Increased Capacity to Integrate CL Issues into Policy/Clms**

- Strong Wekeza project role in mobilizing national partners post-ILO IPEC
- Need for MoLE ownership and leadership, notably as concerns CLMS
- Base for CLMS exists in Wekeza villages: VCLC monitors, data collection instruments, bylaws
- Current opportunity to propose child labor as MoLE *Big Results Now* focus



## Awareness Raising

- VCLC and SC/SB play key roles in building awareness
- Kiwohede village-level awareness raising strategy are well designed and effective
- Slogans work– *Mtoto Kwanza! (Children First!)*
- Local level awareness raising campaigns may generate more long term benefit than Dar campaigns

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** The evaluation considers the following actionable recommendations, grouped by category and based on interim evaluation findings, as priority measures to enhance performance over the 20 months until project end.

## Monitoring and Evaluation

- Verify and upload HH, child, youth follow-up form data by end February 2015
- Eliminate 5 indicators from PMP to streamline data collection and reporting:
  - IO2- Livelihoods:**
    - target HH with increase in assets (not needed since HHs are reporting increased income);
    - % change in unit price of products sold (complex indicator to report)
    - % change in volume per unit area (complex indicator to report; change to HH report)
  - IO5- CL Policy/Capacity Building**
    - % LGA actors demonstrating capacity to collect, analyze and disseminate CL data (proxy measure- # LGAs with operational CLMS is already included)
  - IO6- Awareness Raising**
    - % of effective awareness raising campaigns (complex measure given qualitative nature; proxy is the other indicator for IO6.1- # persons receiving message)
- Consider eliminating 6 education indicators if data has not already been collected (75% attendance rates and perseverance)
- Correct DBMS formulas on remaining indicators
- Report on final list of consolidated indicators in March 2015 TPR
- Provide ongoing training and mentoring to VLCL monitors with quality control by Data Managers of follow-up forms submitted for each remaining TPR
- After submission of March 2015 TPR, review CMEP system components- indicators, DCIs, and DBMS generated reports, to determine other possible options for streamlining remaining reports
- Develop school quality index (IO1.2) and measure progress among all Wekeza schools by October 2015 TPR

## Education

- Standardize inputs and procurement processes across regions and districts for:
  - COBET student uniforms, supplies and shoes
  - Primary school student shoes

- Include partial payment of SS exam fees in Wekeza beneficiary contribution
- Develop strategy to co-finance repairs to unsafe schools
- Use ToT-trained instructors to provide interactive teaching, Healthy Classrooms and ASER training in non-Wekeza schools

## Livelihoods

- Identify mechanism for providing bi-weekly monitoring of CPG and IGA activities (e.g. CSOs) in all districts to supplement livelihood staff support
- Adjust targets so that more beneficiary HH can pursue IGA vs. CPG activities
- Collect loan repayment data from VICOBA groups as a proxy to assess the sustainability potential of the VICOBA groups

## Youth

- Provide start-up kits (capital and/or tools) to all youth immediately upon graduation
- Allow youth 18-24 to select vocational training as option and reduce the target for microbusiness accordingly, especially micro-franchises where there is no spontaneous demand
- Contract with youth graduates for Wekeza-purchased uniforms
- Encourage target villages to contract with youth graduates to construct beehives
- Increase the number of BSD classes in 2015 vs. increasing class size- 30 persons is a maximum

## Social Protection

- Pilot a community-level TASAF initiative to repair schools with worst infrastructure problems

## Integration of CL issues into LGA and national policies and programs/CLMS

- Continue CL policy coordination efforts with MoEVT, MoAFS, MoHSW
- Encourage strong MOLE leadership for CLMS and NAP 2
- Provide specialized technical assistance for CLMS creation using local expert in database design
- Coordinate CLMS design with the Prosper project which has its own CL data collection system
- Support MoLE to launch CLMS with pilot by September 2015
- Train new MoLE inspectors on Child Labor
- Encourage MoLE adoption of Child Labor as **BIG RESULT NOW**
- Distribute draft bylaws to all VCLCs and encourage adoption

## Awareness raising

- Integrate social protection issues into awareness raising campaigns

## Sustainability

- Expand TOT/TDP to other schools in same district then all districts in region
- Organize meetings of all CSOs once every six months to review best practices

Note: A color coding of **green to flag progress** and **yellow to flag deficiencies** is used throughout this report.

## I. EVALUATION OBJECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY

### A. Evaluation Objective

The objective of this interim evaluation is to provide OCFT, the grantee, project partners, project stakeholders and other groups working to combat child labor an assessment of the project's experience in implementation and its effects on project beneficiaries. The evaluation report provides recommendations on measures to enhance performance, based on evaluation findings and conclusions. These findings, conclusions and recommendations will serve to inform project adjustments that may be required to strengthen results, and to inform stakeholders on the design and implementation of subsequent project phases or future child labor elimination projects.

### B. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation methodology is both qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative information was obtained through field visits involving interviews with beneficiaries (parents, children, youth) and stakeholders. Quantitative data was obtained from the project's TPRs through October 2014 and from results data requested during the evaluation. Project staff were present only to provide introductions to stakeholders and beneficiaries. For interviews involving village and district-level beneficiaries and stakeholders, a native Swahili speaker provided interpretation services. Specific data collection methods included:

***Review of documents***, including the project Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP), baseline survey report, Project Document, Cooperative Agreement, TPRs, work plans, OCFT comments on TPRs, OCFT Management Procedures and Guidelines, and project files (intake and follow-up forms).

***Field visits*** to a cross-section of project sites, including both success stories and more challenging locations, and where observation of actual project activities or outputs is possible.

***Interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders:*** parents, children and community members in areas where direct services and awareness-raising activities occurred, as well as teachers, local and national government representatives, union and CSO officials, project partners, grantee staff and ILO and US Embassy representatives regarding the project design, accomplishments, challenges and sustainability.

***Stakeholder Meeting***, organized at the end of the evaluation period, bringing together a wide range of stakeholders, including government, beneficiaries and the implementing partners, and serving to present preliminary evaluation findings, to solicit recommendations from attendees, and to obtain clarification or additional information from stakeholders, including those not interviewed earlier.

### C. Limitations

Fieldwork for the evaluation lasted only two weeks, which limited the number of sites (eight villages of 54 total, or 15%, selected by project staff) included in the evaluation sample. Not all stakeholders could be interviewed directly (notably the Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives). As such, findings for the evaluation are based primarily on information

collected from background documents and in interviews with a limited number of stakeholders, project staff, and beneficiaries, selected by the grantee. The accuracy of the evaluation findings is therefore dependent upon the integrity of information provided to the evaluator from these sources.

#### D. Evaluation Scope

The Wekeza evaluation was conducted over ten working days, with 3.5 days allocated to site visits in each of the two target regions, two days to meetings with project partners and stakeholders in Dar and the final day to the project stakeholder meeting. A total of eight villages, four per region, and 14 schools and vocational centers were visited. Interviews included the following groups or individuals (see Annex 3):

- 6 DCLCs, 8 VEOs, 8 VCLCs, 5 Youth groups
- 6 CSOs
- 5 primary schools, 4 secondary schools, 2 COBET Centers, plus interviews with SC/SBs, teachers, parents, and students from six of these institutions
- 5 VICOBA groups
- 4 Commercial Producer Groups
- 3 Income Generating Activities Groups
- 2 Child Rights Clubs
- 3 Technical Schools plus interviews with the Directors and six Technical Trainers
- 1 micro-franchise sponsor plus youth micro-franchisees

**Key Informants** from stakeholder organizations, including the Ministry of Labor and Employment (MoLE), the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare (MoHSW), UNICEF, ILO, Wekeza Educational Task Force, and the Trade Union Congress of Tanzania (TUCTA). It was not possible to schedule requested meetings with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MoAFS) or the Ministry of Community Development, Gender and Children (MoCDGC), although feedback was obtained from the MoCDGC at the Wekeza Stakeholders Meeting on January 30, 2015.

## II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RESULTS TO DATE<sup>1</sup>

In December 2012, USDOL's Office of Child Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) awarded a \$10 million, four-year cooperative agreement to the IRC to implement a project entitled **WEKEZA** (*Wezesha Ustawi, Endeleva Kiwango cha Elimu Kuzuia Ajira Kwa Watoto*, or, in English: *INVEST: Supporting Livelihoods and Developing Quality Education to Stop Child Labor*). A consortium of partners including IRC, World Vision, KIWOHEDE, TAYODEA, FCS

---

<sup>1</sup> The results tables included in this report were compiled at the evaluator's request by the project team, with randomized validation by evaluator to assess accuracy. The results tables do not include sex-disaggregated data since the project reports on this to USDOL in its semi-annual TPRs. The evaluator did review gender balance for IO1 (education) and IO3 (youth). For all reported output data, the gender balance was never lower than 45/55 female/male and most often at parity (50/50).

and the University of Dar es Salaam’s Institute for Development Studies, is responsible for project implementation, working in collaboration with the GoT Ministry of Labor and Employment (MoLE) and District Child Labor Committees (DCLCs) in the project’s six target districts in Kigoma and Tanga Regions.

## A. Project Scope

The project is designed to provide services to at-risk and working children, unemployed youth, and their families to reduce the incidence of child labor in two regions of Tanzania: Kigoma and Tanga, with a focus on the agriculture and domestic services sectors. In its two target regions, the project works in six districts and 19 wards identified in Table 1 below, reaching a total of 54 villages.

TABLE 1. TARGET REGIONS, DISTRICTS AND WARDS		
REGION	DISTRICT	WARD
KIGOMA	Kasulu	Titye, Kagera-nkanda, Kitagata, Heru-Ushingo
	Uvinza	Nguruka, Mganza, Mtegowanoti, and Itebura
	Kigoma/Ujiji	Bangwe, Kitongoni and Mwanza Kaskazini
TANGA	Korogwe	Mpare, Mkalamo and Mnyuzi
	Muheza	Mtindiro, Kwafungo and Songa
	Tanga	Mzingani, Kiomoni and Kirare

The project scope is challenging for several reasons. First, physical distances are significant: the two target regions are at opposite ends of the country, with target villages in each region separated by more than 300 kilometers. Air travel is either unavailable (Tanga) or unreliable (Kigoma), resulting in frequent road travel for staff. Field trips often involve 6+ hours of driving per day. Second, the project is implemented by six diverse partners who work in cooperation with seven CSOs for field support and training. In 2015, the number of local CSOs will increase to 15 to expand education, livelihoods, youth and awareness raising support in all districts. Third, project staff are based in three locations: the project director and three technical specialists (Education, Livelihoods and Child Labor Policy) are in Dar es Salaam, with three technical staff in each of the two regional field offices. Finally, the project includes six interdependent project components that provide services and technical assistance to 15,560 direct beneficiaries and 3,570 indirect beneficiaries (see Table 2).

<b>TABLE 2. PROJECT BENEFICIARY TARGETS</b>		
<b>Direct Beneficiaries- Unit: Individuals</b>		
Children 5-14	Primary 4,500 Secondary 2,000 COBET 1,500	8,000
Youth 15-24	Youth 15-17 3,500 Youth 18-24 700	4,200
Households	Agricultural focus 2,400 Income generating activities 960	3,360
<b>Total:</b>		<b>15,560</b>
<b>Indirect Beneficiaries- Unit: Individuals</b>		
School Teachers	135 schools x 2 teachers	270
School Committees/School Boards	135 schools x 20 members	2,700
Village Child Labor Committees	54 villages x 10 members	540
District Child Labor Committees	6 districts x 10 members	60
<b>Total:</b>		<b>3,570</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL: 19,130</b>		

With 19,130 direct and indirect beneficiaries, the per-beneficiary cost of the \$10MM Wekeza project is \$525. While this evaluation is not intended to measure project cost/benefit, this per beneficiary investment is in line with that of other similar projects. The \$525 calculation uses a conservative estimate of household beneficiaries and does not account for the fact that project benefits also accrue to the community as a whole in terms of improved incomes and child well-being.

**Basic services and timeline:** The project work plan calls for provision of direct education services (uniforms, scholastic materials, and school fees) to two cohorts of 4,000, the first slated for enrollment in formal or non-formal education by December 2013 and the second by December 2014. All other education activities (quality of education and community engagement) will continue through project end.

Livelihoods services (value chain analysis, producer group formation, production training, marketing support, village banks) are slated to be provided to 3,360 households. Service provision began in August 2013, immediately after completion of the baseline survey, and will continue over the life of project.

Youth employment services needs assessment and company mapping began in May 2013. Curriculum development, training implementation and business support services began in August 2013. Business support services to beneficiary youth will continue through the end of the project.

## **B. WEKEZA Stakeholders**

Wekeza works with six main stakeholder groups:

1. **National Project Advisory Committee (PAC):** The PAC meets bi-annually and includes Commissioners from the MoLE, MoCDGC, MoHSW, MoAFS, directors of project partners, representatives from other child labor projects (Plan International and Prosper), the Association of Tanzania Employers (ATE) and the Trade Union Congress of Tanzania

(TUCTA). The PAC is chaired by the MoLE Permanent Secretary with support from the MoLE Child Labor Unit (CLU).

2. ***District Child Labor Committees (DCLC)***: DCLCs are critical partners in Wekeza implementation, providing guidance to the District Council and support to Wekeza in its target wards and villages. DCLCs encourage local governments to include child labor concerns in their development plans and budgets and ensure local ownership of child labor interventions. The committees advise the District Council on programs contributing to the elimination of child labor and assist in mobilizing resources for the implementation of CL interventions at district level. A district-level Wekeza focal person provides support to each DCLC and coordinates with target villages on behalf of the DCLC.
3. ***Village Child Labor Committee (VCLC)***: VCLCs support the project in identifying beneficiaries based on DCLC-approved selection criteria. Once beneficiaries are identified, VCLCs conduct intake with beneficiary households (HHs) and submit intake forms to project facilitators who forward them to Wekeza local coordinators for review and submission to the data managers for data entry. The VCLCs are responsible for ongoing monitoring of beneficiary HHs, children and youth. Each VCLC member monitors from 10 to 15 children to ensure that they remain in school.
4. ***School Principals and Focal Teachers***: The project enlists the support of school principals and WEKEZA focal point teachers to monitor school attendance of beneficiary children, support teacher professional development and promote active involvement of the SC/SBs.
5. ***School Committees and School Boards (SCs and SBs)***: At the village level, SCs and SBs engage parents to support the well-being of children attending school and safety of the school facilities.
6. ***District and Field Officers***: District representatives from national ministries, ranging from agriculture to community development to trade, provide technical assistance and training to beneficiary households in livelihoods areas such as beekeeping, livestock, crop production, etc.

### **C. Wekeza Theory of Change and Project Activities**

To reduce the incidence of child labor in Tanga and Kigoma, the Wekeza project addresses six factors that drive child labor: poor school attendance, low household income, lack of youth employment opportunities, absence of social protection services, need for policies and programs addressing child labor issues at local and national level, and lack of awareness on child labor issues in the community. The Wekeza strategy and activities to curb each of these factors are summarized below.

#### **Increase school attendance among target children**

Given the quality deficits in the education system, parents often see more value in sending children to work rather than to school, especially in families with very low income. To encourage school attendance, WEKEZA seeks to lower financial barriers to school, to improve the quality of education, and to leverage engagement of communities to support school attendance. The project provides some form of the following services to its target population of



4,500 students in primary grades, 2,000 youth in secondary grades and 1,500 out-of-school children in COBET (Complimentary Basic Education in Tanzania).

- School uniforms, supplies and partial support for school fees to reduce parents' financial burden
- Teacher professional development and remedial support training to improve quality of education
- Assessment of school safety and health
- SC/SB capacity building, development of school improvement plans and community outreach

#### **Increase incomes of target households**

Poor households often rely on income from child laborers to meet their subsistence requirements. WEKEZA's livelihood interventions are designed to increase farmers' income through diversified crops, improved farming techniques leading to increased production, improved market access, and increased off-farm income generating opportunities. Households are also able to increase their savings through the creation or strengthening of village cooperative banks (VICOBAs). WEKEZA provides the following direct services to raise incomes among target households:

- Train farmers and producers in market-led agricultural and income generating activities
- Provide basic inputs to HH groups (seeds, fertilizers, pumps, beehives, etc.)
- Establish commercial producer groups (CPGs) to track product output and quality and increase production of marketable products
- Establish VICOBAs and furnish savings start-up kits (cash box, ledger, pen, rulers, calculator, ink, stamp pad, and passbooks) to increase household savings and provide small loans to members for school or livelihood expenses
- Over time, form Commercial Villages (CVs) among CPGs to leverage better prices

#### **Increase employment among target youth 15-24**

Youth of legal working age lack opportunities for employment or the vocational or entrepreneurial skills to create their own businesses. Many remain at home, creating a financial burden for their families, or engage in hazardous work. Wekeza targets 3,500 youth 15-17 years of age to receive market-relevant business skills development (BSD) training, plus vocational training or apprenticeships. To complement the HH livelihoods strategy, Wekeza also supports 700 older youth aged 18-24 who are heads of households or caregivers of children who are engaged in or at risk of child labor. These youth receive the same BSD<sup>2</sup> training, followed by opportunities to create micro-enterprises or engage in micro-franchises. These youth receive business start-up kits which include small start-up allowances (100,000 to 150,000 shillings) or start-up tools such as sewing machines. For skills where tools are costly, such as carpentry, the project is considering providing small groups of youth one set of tools to share.

#### **Increase availability of Social Protection Services**

There is limited information available to Wekeza target beneficiaries on national Social Protection services. To increase access to available services, Wekeza mapped the available services and trains the VCLCs and DCLCs on the provisions of the Law of the Child Act (LCA)

---

<sup>2</sup> BSD training covers concepts such as capital and operating costs, budgeting, customer service and business plan development along with life skills modules on goal setting, self-confidence, decision-making, and problem-solving. It is based on the Street Kids International Toolkit, Toronto, Canada.

and on key services, including the Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF). Wekeza also translated the LCA into Kiswahili and produced child-friendly versions for children. Wekeza provides training to VCLCs and DCLCs on advocacy for increased social protection services to help reduce household vulnerability. To further strengthen ties between its beneficiaries and social protection services, Wekeza recruited district Social Welfare Officers (SWOs) to serve as their focal points in the districts. The SWOs help to organize workshops with beneficiary children and their families to provide information on social protection services and programs.

#### **Improve government capacity to monitor child labor trends and to develop policies and programs to reduce child labor**

Village, ward and district authorities have limited information on child labor. At project start, there were no DCLCs or VCLCs in place to track and remove children from child labor. Wekeza has worked with local governments to support establishment and training of DCLCs and VCLCs and to promote adoption of bylaws and district level CL policies. On the national level, Wekeza mapped gaps in CL policy and is working to mobilize support for creating and piloting a Child Labor Monitoring System (CLMS) that would capture CL data on the village level to feed into a national monitoring system.

#### **Change community attitudes toward child labor, especially in domestic service**

There is a widespread lack of understanding about the negative effects of child labor, notably child labor in domestic service. Wekeza works on the village and national level to raise awareness about CL. Local awareness campaigns use traditional and modern forms of outreach, including methods adapted to low literacy populations. Working through its awareness raising partner, Kiwohede, Wekeza supports local theater, village discussions and displays of posters and signs in its target villages. Wekeza has launched a campaign against underage domestic service in Dar, with messages posted on public buses.

### **D. WEKEZA Results Framework (RF)**

The Wekeza Results Framework (RF) graphically represents the logic of the project's theory of change and demonstrates how the components contribute toward the overarching objective of reducing the incidence of child labor in target regions.

The Wekeza RF on the following page is color coded to illustrate those components where **significant progress** has been achieved and those where **progress is lagging** as of the date of the interim evaluation. These results are discussed in Section E with specific key performance questions answered in Part III, Key Evaluation Questions and Findings.

**Critical Assumptions:**

Political situation in country is stable  
Local economies generate employment  
Target LGA willing to cooperate  
Relevant infrastructure does not impede progress (ag- roads, markets; schools- electricity etc.)

**Project Objective: Incidence of Child Labor in target districts reduced**

**Indicators:**

POC.1 #/% of project beneficiary children in child labor  
POC.2 #/% of project beneficiary children engaged in hazardous child labor  
POH.1 #/% of target HH with child laborers below legal working age  
POH.2 #/% of target HH with children in hazardous labor

**IO 1: School attendance among target children increased**

Indicators: #/% of target children of compulsory school age attending school  
#/% of target children attending 75% of F/NF programs  
#/% of target children persisting in F/NF programs  
#/% of eligible children completing assigned program of F/NF studies  
POH.4 #/% of target HH with all children of compulsory school age attending school  
E 1 -4 # children receiving educational services

IO1.1 Economic obstacles to school attendance reduced

IO1.2 Quality of education increased

IO1.3 Community support for education increased

IO1.2.1 Teachers' skills improved

IO1.2.2 Safety and health of learning environment improved

IO1.2.3 Availability of teaching/learning materials increased

**IO4: Beneficiaries receive benefits from national social protection services**

Indicators: #/% of LGA providing 3 core services; #/% of target HH accessing services for first time

IO4.1 CLC capacity to assist beneficiary HHs or groups to access Social Protection services increased (CSOs, LGAs)

IO4.2 Knowledge of type, benefits, sponsors and means of accessing key social protection services increased

**IO2: Incomes in target HH increased**

Indicator: #/% of target HH with increase in income/assets (disaggregated by farmers & alternative livelihood HH)  
L1 # HH receiving LH services

IO2.1 Access to markets increased (agricultural and alternative products)

IO2.3 Production of marketable products and services increased

IO2.2 Producer Group Collective Bargaining Power Increased

IO2.4 Use of improved production techniques increased

IO2.5 Provision of micro-finance increased

IO2.6 Producer knowledge and skills increased

IO2.7 Active local producer groups operating

**IO3: Employment among target youth 15-24 increased**

Indicator: #/% of target youth employed

IO3.1 Target youth access to business opportunities increased (apprenticeships, micro-franchises)

IO3.2 Target youth business/ life/entrepreneurial skills increased

IO3.3 Improved market- relevant training

**IO6 Community attitudes towards child labor, especially in domestic service, changed\***

Indicator: #/% of target HH sending children for domestic services  
#/% of HH reporting changed attitudes towards child labor, especially in domestic service

IO6.1 Strengthened delivery of CL message

IO6.2 Improved Child Labor message developed

IO6.3 Improved child labor awareness raising strategy in place

**IO5: Child labor issues included in relevant development/education/anti-poverty/other social policies and programs at national level**

Indicators: C1- # of policy initiatives to which project has contributed substantively

IO5.1 CLMS data informs LGA by-laws and ordinances

IO5.2 Increased capacity of government actors to collect, analyze, and disseminate CL data

\*IO6 co-financed with other donors

## E. WEKEZA Results to Date by Intermediate Objectives (IOs)

### IO 1: School Attendance Among Target Children Increased

IO 1 progress toward meeting its targets is the highest of any of the direct service components to date (see Tables 3, 4 and 5 below). This is reflected in the green shading of IO1 on the Results Framework on page 7 above. At the beginning of the current Project Period 5, Wekeza has exceeded its total target of 8,000 school enrollments by 538 students (7%), with significant over-achievement for COBET enrollments (2,035 enrolled vs. 1,500 target, or 35% higher than projected). The only enrollment category where the project target is not yet achieved is secondary school where 1,884 of 2,000 target students have been enrolled (94% of target). This is due to the fact that most initial Wekeza beneficiary HHs did not have secondary school students given their poverty level and general lack of commitment to education at project start. The project had to devise a different recruitment method to identify and assist at risk SS students: Wekeza education staff consulted with the SS Head Master and School Board to identify students on the MVC list who are at risk of dropping out due to parents' low income level. These students were then added to the beneficiary list, and their parents invited to join CPG or IGA groups.

All DCLCs, DEOs, school inspectors, head teachers, teachers and VCLCs interviewed in the six districts and eight villages visited confirmed the following results for IO1:

- Significant increases in attendance in Wekeza target schools- some schools doubled enrollments
- Improved exam results among all beneficiary students and corresponding high pass rates
- Significant increase in SC/SB involvement and support for schools
- Upswing in community involvement- two villages have organized and implemented a first-time **school feeding** program for their primary school, with maize and beans donated by parents
- Reinforcement of COBET program with 14 centers reactivated and 18 new centers created
- High relevance and teacher use of interactive teaching skills taught in Wekeza workshops
- Creation of a National Education Task Force on CL focused on developing policies to reduce CL
- Despite increased awareness, continuing infrastructure issues (roofing, floors, lack of latrines)

District education and village officials praised Wekeza's work in enrolling drop-outs in COBET and, in Kigoma, in agreeing to provide uniforms and supplies (not originally budgeted) to the COBET students, which enhances their sense of belonging. To date, COBET students in Tanga have not received uniforms or shoes. They also commended Wekeza for its contribution of a small stipend to COBET teachers given that most volunteer their time and receive no payment from MoEVT. The COBET uptake is especially strong in Kigoma where many rural children had dropped out and had no recourse to reintegrate schools until the COBET centers were revitalized or actually created with Wekeza assistance.

Teachers were very positive in their feedback about the five-day interactive teaching techniques training. Inspectors and head teachers in all six districts confirmed that teachers trained returned to train others at their schools and were practicing what they had learned in their classrooms.

Secondary school parents raised an issue unforeseen by the project of hidden contributions that parents are required to pay, beyond the 20,000 shilling per semester fee. These contributions cover the cost of desks, watchmen, and supplies. Students are also required to pay 20,000 shillings for Form 2 exams and 50,000 shillings for Form 4 exams. If fees are not paid, students do not receive their exam results or certification that they have completed secondary school, in the case of Form 4. These fees pose a significant financial burden on poor families. A new national educational policy is expected to be announced shortly, but it is unclear if it will address SS exam fees. During interviews stakeholders affirmed their commitment to lobby for waiver of exam fees for MVC which includes Wekeza students.



School feeding program in Kigoma

National stakeholders stressed Wekeza's important role in coordinating discussion of CL between the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MoEVT) and the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare (MoHSW). At Wekeza's request, the MoEVT Commissioner created a National Task Force on CL for his ministry and nominated representatives from key departments (primary, secondary, non-formal education) to participate in regular meetings. Members are drafting guidelines for teachers and counselors on how to identify children engaged in or at risk of child labor and how to support children who are newly reintegrated. They are also proposing curriculum modifications to address CL. The task force members interviewed indicated that Wekeza sustainability will be bolstered through such curriculum revisions that will remain in place after the project ends. The MoHSW is a close partner in this effort, suggesting social protection options to assist children returning to school.

TABLE 3. WEKEZA SCHOOLS- UNIT: SCHOOLS OR COBET CENTERS									
SCHOOLS	KIGOMA Schools/Centers				TANGA Schools/Centers				TOTAL
	KIGOMA UJJI	KASULU	UVINZA	Total	TANGA	MUHEZA	KOROGWE	Total	
Primary	13	13	23	49	10	9	9	28	77
Secondary	6	5	4	15	5	3	3	11	26
COBET	7	6	9	22	5	2	3	10	32
Total	19	18	27	64	15	12	12	39	135

TABLE 4. WEKEZA-ASSISTED COBET CENTERS									
COBET	KIGOMA Centers				TANGA Centers				Grand Total
	KIGOMA UJJI	KASULU	UVINZA	Total	TANGA	MUHEZA	KOROGWE	Total	
Existed but not functional	5	4	5	14	0	0	0	0	14
Newly established	2	2	4	8	5	2	3	10	18
Total	7	6	9	22	5	2	3	10	32

TABLE 5. EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENTS- TARGET VS. ACTUALS- UNIT: STUDENTS ENROLLED												
School Type	KIGOMA- Students Enrolled					TANGA- Students Enrolled					GRAND TOTAL	
	UJJI	KASULU	UVINZA	Target	Total	TANGA	MUHEZA	KOROGWE	Target	Total	Target	Total
Primary	871	690	1054	2500	2615	606	631	767	2000	2004	4500	4619
Secondary	335	297	358	1000	990	276	282	336	1000	894	2000	1884
COBET	167	400	866	750	1433	210	93	299	750	602	1500	2035
Total	1373	1387	2278	4250	5038	1092	1006	1402	3750	3500	8000	8538

## IO 2: Incomes in Target HH Increased

Progress toward meeting targets is on track for the livelihoods component (see Table 6 below). At the beginning of Period 5, the project has exceeded its total target of 960 Income Generating Activity (IGA) HHs by 11% (1,065 HH involved vs. 960 target). However, it is only at 75% of target for Commercial Producers Groups (CPG) (1,497 HHs involved vs. 2,400 target). The World Vision LH specialists and MoAFS counterparts are confident that the CPG targets will be met, especially now that the focus of project activities is moving from group demonstration plots to individual initiatives where farmers not inclined to work in groups on the demonstration plot may be more motivated to become involved when they farm their own land. The LH specialists noted also that there is a significantly higher demand for IGAs even among farmer groups because these are interesting new activities with the potential to generate additional income beyond their agricultural produce.

The project is very close to achieving its VICOBA target of 120 groups, with 114 groups now in existence (95% of target).

All Village Executive Officers (VEOs), farmers groups, IGA groups and VICOBA members interviewed in the six districts and eight villages visited confirmed the following results for IO2:

- “Planting the seed” for the livelihoods component takes time but is the KEY to sustainability
- VICOBA members are the glue in the livelihoods component- they build solidarity and confidence
- Inputs are greatly valued by CPG and IGA groups (seeds, pumps, beehives)

- Early results from recent harvests (cassava and honey especially) indicate that production has increased using the new production techniques (reflected in green shading on the Results Framework)

The Wekeza LH initiative was based on adapting a World Vision Area Development Program (ADP) approach to CPGs and IGAs from a program designed for entrepreneurial farmers to one that targets the poorest families who represent only a small proportion of the population in each target village. Under the ADP plan, farmers volunteer to participate. Under Wekeza, HHs are selected by the project based on income criteria. Given the lack of self-selection, a certain percentage of beneficiary HHs are reticent to participate. Some are not motivated by group activities; others do not wish to provide labor for a group plot. Certain others maintain they are too poor to contribute even small amounts to a VICOBA. The project has had to work hard to engage the more reticent farmers. Project staff report that as production increases on demonstration plots and on certain individual plots, and as VICOBA members are able to obtain small loans, attitudes among the more reticent HHs are changing. Participation of DCLC members in project activities has helped to convince some of the reticent farmers to participate. Staff stress that Period 5 is a critical time because group members must learn how to cooperate as they begin to farm, produce honey or raise livestock individually. They are now required to share inputs received collectively, e.g. pumps and beehives.

Once individual initiatives are underway the next LH step is to group the CPGs and IGAs into Commercial Villages (CVs) which would seek to negotiate sales agreements that take advantage of the CV economies of scale. Staff advises that this will take time: results on this level may not be measurable until just before or after the end of the project. Staff also raised the issue of how to integrate Wekeza CPGs with other producer groups in the community to ensure collaboration vs. competition for the same crops or products.

The Wekeza HHs interviewed during the evaluation all acknowledged the significant change in their lives from the project's LH activities. The following statement reflects the sentiments expressed by men and women alike: "***We were slaves to our own poverty– Wekeza gave us hope and confidence.***"

The District Trade Officers and Community Development Officers all spoke highly of the project's value chain training. These officers confirmed the challenge of building group dynamics based on their own observations of farmer groups in their districts. They stressed the need for regular follow-up to the groups once individual production begins. Talisda is assisting in Korogwe District, but more support is needed in the remaining districts.

IGA members in the four villages visited where beekeeping was taught were extremely proud of their new initiative and were confident that they will find a local market for their honey. Discussions around how the five beehives provided by the project would be shared led to the suggestion that the youth being trained in carpentry by Wekeza could be contracted to build more beehives for the village beekeepers.

TABLE 6. LIVELIHOOD ACHIEVEMENTS- TARGETS VS. ACTUALS UNIT: BENEFICIARY HH												
Type of Service (HHs)	KIGOMA Beneficiary HH					TANGA Beneficiary HH					GRAND TOTAL	
	UJIJI	KASULU	UVINZA	Target	Total	TANGA	MUHEZA	KOROGWE	Target	Total	Target	Total
CPG	0	423	322	1200	745	126	54	572	1200	752	2400	1497
IGA	299	45	32	480	376	273	301	115	480	689	960	1065
<b>Total</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>468</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>1680</b>	<b>1121</b>	<b>399</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>687</b>	<b>1680</b>	<b>1441</b>	<b>3360</b>	<b>2562</b>
<b>Creation of VICOBAAs (number of groups)</b>												
VICOBA	14	20	20	60	54	20	12	28	60	60	120	114

### IO 3: Employment Among Target Youth 15-24 Increased

IO 3 progress toward meeting its LOP targets for youth employment (see Table 7 below) is the lowest of any of the direct service components- 57% of the LOP target for vocational training (1,978 vs. LOP target of 3,500) and 56% of its LOP target for microbusiness (391 vs. LOP target of 700). However, recognizing the labor intensive nature of this effort, the Wekeza ProDoc established incremental annual targets for enrolling youth. In this regard, project performance is on track, with 1,978 youth in vocational training vs. a 30-month (Period 5) target of 2,000 (- 1%) and 391 youth in microbusiness vs. a 30-month (Period 5) target of 400 (-2%).<sup>3</sup>

Project youth specialists identified three factors that have affected IO3 performance. **First**, uptake was very slow among target youth at project start. Per interviews with youth during the evaluation, many of them had been unemployed and inactive for several years, with little ambition or hope for the future. Others were members of street gangs or employed in very hazardous conditions, such as loading heavy bales on trucks. Most had difficulty believing that any project would offer them the chance to learn a trade or start their own business without strings attached. This attitude affected enrollment when services were first offered in August 2013 and did not change until the youth who had participated began to create their own small enterprises (tailoring, consumer trade, carpentry) or obtain jobs as masons, drivers or mechanics. Wekeza's credibility soared at that point. Uptake increased significantly in 2014 and has continued through now. The project has also taken creative measures to ensure that youth take this opportunity seriously: beneficiary youth are now required to sign a pledge to finish their program in front of the Village Executive Officer who countersigns the agreement.

**Second**, all Wekeza youth beneficiaries must first complete a business skills development (BSD) curriculum which involves five days of instruction and market research. All youth participants interviewed confirmed the value of the program, but the fact that all must complete that training before going on to vocational or microbusiness training meant that placements were backlogged. This backlog was relieved in mid-2014 when the project began to work with local CSOs to provide the BSD training.

<sup>3</sup> Incremental annual targets for vocational training are Year 1- 500; Year 2- 1,000; Year 3- 1,000; and Year 4- 1,000. At the period 5 or 30 month mark, the target would be 2,000. For microbusiness the incremental annual targets are Year 1- 100; Year 2, 3 and 4- 200 each, at the period 5 or 30 month mark the target would be 400.



**Third**, and perhaps most importantly, this component is handicapped by staff size to support the component. Only one staff person is allocated per region to support oversight of youth recruitment, placement and monitoring. The project design assumed that Tayodea and other youth CSOs would support implementation; however, CSO capacity has proven more limited than expected.

The highest demand among both age groups (15-17 years old, or children of legal working age and 18-24 years old, or unemployed youth heads of household or caregivers) is for vocational training, and most particularly among the 18-24 year olds who are all supposed to pursue some form of microbusiness. This has led some youth to dissimulate their age in the hopes of being accepted to vocational training.

Of all the programs offered, the micro-franchise program has been the most challenging to organize, due in part to the fact that there are few companies able to provide such opportunities (there are none in rural Kigoma) and many already have a wide network of local distributors. It is also due to the lack of interest in this option among youth, none of whom request this option voluntarily. The experience has served as a useful pilot but managing it has been very time-consuming for youth staff already stretched very thin.

For the micro-enterprises, most youth have used their start-up capital to begin trade activities, buying and selling consumer products, ranging from embroidered bed covers to soap. There is an attrition rate of approximately 15% among these youth, but this is considered acceptable given that not all are entrepreneurial. To ensure that the attrition rate remains low, the project is organizing peer mentoring in which the most successful youth entrepreneurs mentor those who need advice and support.

Youth participants at the vocational schools visited (65 youth), from the youth apprenticeship program (four youth), from two micro-franchises (four youth), and from micro-enterprises (14 youth) all stated that Wekeza “gave us a second chance.” During interviews they demonstrated resourcefulness, inquiring as to when they would receive small tool sets for their skills areas (to date, there is no uniform Wekeza policy regarding start-up kits for Youth programs), and confirming that they are actively seeking markets and learning how to fend for themselves without support from their families. Of note is the number of youth who stated they plan to use their income to pay for their siblings’ school fees so they can stay in school.

The three vocational training program directors interviewed confirmed the following:

- Wekeza youth are motivated but must adapt to the discipline of a technical school
- Many youth lacked basic literacy skills on arrival; schools provided supplemental classes
- 75% of youth attend all classes; those who miss certain days do so because of the cost of transportation to the school but are nonetheless able to pass the practical exams to obtain their certificate
- Wekeza should provide a start-up kit to all participants upon graduation. To date, the policy is not standardized. For trades where tools are expensive, such as carpentry, groups of graduates should work together cooperatively with one shared set of tools

A concern raised by several stakeholders and shared by the evaluator involves the practice of increasing the size of the BSD training groups to make up the deficiency in project targets. In

November and December 2014 Wekeza organized a push to increase beneficiary numbers by over 1,000 youth. Class sizes in the BSD program were increased from 20 to 50 per class. Given the fact that the Street Kids International curriculum had already been reduced from the standard 10 days to five and that the youth trained need a good understanding of markets and life skills as the building block for this component, it appears counterproductive to enroll such large numbers in BSD classes. It would be better to organize more classes with fewer students than fewer classes of such large size.

Table 7 indicates progress to date toward targets. Table 8 provides the training plan developed for 2015 to decrease the gap between actuals and targets.

**TABLE 7. YOUTH ACHIEVEMENTS- TARGETS VS. ACTUALS UNIT: YOUTH PARTICIPANTS**

Type of Youth Service	KIGOMA- Youth Participants					TANGA- Youth Participants					GRAND TOTAL		
	UJJI	KASULU	UVINZA	LOP Target	Total	TANGA	MUHEZA	KOROGWE	LOP Target	Total	LOP Target	30-month Target	Total
Vocational training	222	246	433	1750	901	444	328	305	1750	1077	3500	2000	1978
Micro franchise	0	0	0	350	0	32	24	49	350	105	700	400	391
Micro Enterprise	26	83	121		230	32	16	8		56			
<b>Total</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>2100</b>	<b>1131</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>2100</b>	<b>1238</b>	<b>4200</b>	<b>1800</b>	<b>2369</b>

**TABLE 8. YOUTH TRAINING PLAN JANUARY – JUNE 2015**

Training Type/Title	Lead partner	Target beneficiaries	Training Date/Month
BSD: Life/Entrepreneurship and Business Skills	Youth CSOs	1800 youth beneficiaries 15-24	360 youth/month February – June 2015*
Beekeeping training	WEKEZA	60 youth/Tanga + 60 youth/ Kigoma	February- March 2015
Vocational/apprenticeship skills training	Training providers	500 youth	March 2015 and June 2015
Skins/hides processing training	WEKEZA, CSO	30 youth/Tanga region	February 2015
Savings and Loan group training	CSO	300 Youth aged 18 - 24	March and April 2015
Poultry keeping training	WEKEZA	50 youth	March 2015
Agriculture skills training and support	WEKEZA	50 youth	March 2015

\*Training classes should be maintained at 30 students maximum

## **IO 4: Beneficiaries Receive Benefits from National Social Protection Services**

IO4 focuses on two results<sup>4</sup>: first, increased knowledge of social protection services that Wekeza beneficiaries should be able to access; and second, linking beneficiaries to available services. Discussions with DCLCs and VCLCs and with national level stakeholders during the evaluation indicate:

- Overall, progress in increasing social protection for vulnerable groups has been slow- the Wekeza October 2014 TPR stresses the “need for a comprehensive national system of social protection that will provide adequate coverage to needy groups,” and cites the lack of programs in particular for most vulnerable children, including those in child labor.
- While a Draft National Social Protection Framework has been developed, it has not been approved despite UN and Wekeza efforts to build capacity and develop policy around this framework.
- There is limited coordination between child labor initiatives (under MoLE) and child protection programs (under MoHSW) although multiple opportunities exist for cooperation in areas such as awareness raising and policy planning to ensure that children engaged in or at risk of child labor are included under child protection programs.
- Despite Wekeza efforts to promote cooperation between target districts and at least two national social protection programs identified as priority by the project, the Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF) and the Child Health Fund (CHF), there are no concrete results to date in terms of obtaining benefits for beneficiary families.
- Wekeza field staff express concern that TASAF direct cash transfers to beneficiaries could diminish the impact of Wekeza’s programs which focus on self-reliance.
- In an effort to maximize coordination with social protection services, Wekeza selected the district Social Welfare Officer (SWO) as its focal person in all its target districts.
- Wekeza is planning to review opportunities with UNICEF to harmonize CL and social protection programs in the one district where their projects overlap (Kasulu in Kigoma Region).

The project is also working with TASAF on the national level to determine how access to TASAF funds might be facilitated, with a preference for utilizing TASAF funds for community projects such as school infrastructure rather than individual cash transfers.

## **IO5: CL Issues Included in Relevant Development/Education/Agriculture/Other Social Policies at national level**

As preparatory steps to achieve IO5’s two sub-IOs (increased government capacity to collect, analysis and disseminate CL data and CLMS data inform LGA bylaws and ordinances), WEKEZA mapped CL issues against current education/agricultural/other social policies and programs at the national level and has held consultative meetings on how to develop and launch a CLMS system building on CL monitoring data in both the Wekeza and Prosper project regions.

---

<sup>4</sup> IO4 has the second smallest budget allocation of the six project components (\$221,000 over 4 years, including funds for Kiwohede and other CSO support to communities for social protection).

Interviews with project stakeholders, government officials and Wekeza staff confirmed the following:

- All stakeholders acknowledge a strong and effective Wekeza role in mobilizing national partners regarding CL issues, filling a gap that was created when the ILO IPEC project ended.
- Wekeza has made significant progress with the MoAFSC and MoEVT through national level Task Forces created to review ways to mainstream CL issues into the policies and programs of those ministries- the former was created in June 2014 and the latter in September 2014; MoEVT in particular has been very proactive (see IO1 results above) in seeking mechanisms to mainstream CL into its formal and adult education curricula.
- MoLE coordination of child labor policy and programs is handicapped at times due to the large number of policy issues requiring its attention and to the current specific focus on employment; support from Wekeza is key to maintaining momentum behind the child labor agenda.
- NAP has not been implemented.
- If CLMS is to take off, support for the system must extend beyond donor-funded projects.

*CLMS* is a key Wekeza deliverable and is described in the project document as a system that would address “identification, referral, protection, and prevention of child labor through a coordinated monitoring and referral process covering all children living in a given geographical area.” The CLMS will likely pilot as a paper-based system working in one of the target districts of Wekeza or the Prosper project<sup>5</sup>, with a mid-term goal of developing a web-based CLMS database at the national and district levels to facilitate collection of CL data. Per the Wekeza project document, the CLMS should include the following characteristics:

- Focus on children in child labor identified by any partner in the field, including VCLCs, community members, teachers, and labor inspectors, with indication of the risks to which they are exposed;
- Record of referrals for identified children to the most appropriate education or work alternative to ensure they are withdrawn from child labor or dangerous work;
- Verification of whether the children have been shifted from dangerous work to an appropriate situation (school or other);
- Tracking of children after removal, to ensure that they continue to pursue satisfactory alternatives; and
- Capacity to aggregate data on the extent and nature of child labor by village, ward, district, region and nationally on solutions adopted for identified child workers.

Wekeza has created a base for a CLMS system by training VCLCs and encouraging adoption of LGA-level bylaws that address community planning and budgets for prevention of child labor.

---

<sup>5</sup> The Prosper (Promoting Sustainable Practices to End Child Labor) project focuses on removing child laborers 15-17 years of age from tobacco plantations in Urambo and Sikonge districts in the Tabora Region. The project is funded by the ECLT Foundation (Eliminating Child Labor in Tobacco) and is implemented by Winrock International. The project works with the Tobacco Producers Association, trade unions and the MoLE and provides economic support (Model Farms Schools and enterprise loans to mothers) and awareness raising in target communities.

These bylaws define roles for social welfare officers and the VCLC in monitoring child labor, and identifying and referring cases of child labor to the appropriate services. Thirteen of Wekeza's 27 villages in Tanga have adopted such bylaws and another 4 villages have prepared draft bylaws for review by their village councils. This represents action by 63% of all Wekeza villages in Tanga.

The larger challenge for institutionalizing the CLMS lies within the MoLE. During evaluation interviews, both a MoLE official and a government child labor expert confirmed that the CLMS is in the MoLE 2015 action plan. Two planning meetings were held in 2014 which resulted in the creation of a CLMS task force mandated to plan for CLMS creation. Wekeza and Prosper took the lead in organizing a task force meeting with key ministries on January 28, 2015, during the evaluation, to discuss the way forward for the CLMS. All key stakeholder ministries were present- MoEVT, MoAFS, MoHSW, MoCDGC-, except MoLE. The group adopted a resolution regarding the need for the CLMS. In a follow-up meeting with a MoLE official the next day, he agreed to organize a formal inter-ministerial meeting on 25-27 Feb to review how to harmonize CLMS suggestions.

### IO6: Community Attitudes Toward Child Labor, Especially in Domestic Service, Changed

All stakeholders, project partners, and target village and district officials interviewed confirmed that WEKEZA has played a very proactive role in raising awareness among LGAs and within



communities to change community attitudes toward child labor.<sup>6</sup> Village-level awareness raising initiatives by Kiwohede are particularly well received, including ‘talking trees’ with sign boards about child labor, local drama presentations and radio shows.

The following factors were stressed by interviewees:

- Pre-project lack of district and village-level knowledge about child labor, ranging from basic definitions (what is the difference between child labor and child work, what work can be done by 15-17 year olds, what rights are guaranteed to children per international norms, etc.) to Tanzanian laws regulating child labor (most villagers were surprised to learn that child labor is illegal in Tanzania) to understanding the negative effects of child labor, especially of underage domestic service.
- Critical role of VCLCs and SB/SCs in building awareness in the villages and within schools
- Slogans are tremendously effective– *Mtoto Kwanza!* (Children First!)

<sup>6</sup> This is all the more impressive given that this component had the smallest budget of any project component- \$153,078 total for four years.

To date Kiwohede has organized more than 120 awareness raising campaigns in the two regions, including from parents’ fora to school debates to drawing competitions to village discussions, involving nearly 6,000 persons. These campaigns are based on a very professional and comprehensive awareness raising strategy and message.

Kiwohede has been active also in the creation of Child Rights Clubs at Wekeza target schools that engage beneficiary children and other classmates in discussions on the effects of child labor. Each of the two Child Rights Clubs interviewed during the evaluation included around 30 members, many of whom spoke readily about what they had learned about children’s rights and how they help to raise awareness among their parents, other children and within the village about child labor.

The issue of child labor in domestic service receives most attention in Tanga, which is a sending region given its proximity to Dar. The local awareness raising campaigns utilize methods appropriate for low literacy populations, e.g. village theater and radio. On the Dar level, Wekeza organized a “yellow flag against domestic service” campaign and a local bus poster campaign to raise awareness about domestic labor given that Dar is a receiving point for domestic help.

On the national level, Wekeza has also worked with local trade unions, including the Conservation, Hotels, Domestic and Allied Workers Union (CHODAWU), which advocates for Decent Work for Domestic Workers, to address the issue of child domestic workers and to support signing of ILO Convention 189 on decent work for Domestic Workers.

The awareness raising materials developed by the project and its partners include posters, t-shirts and baseball caps, stickers, banners and brochures.

## Sustainability

The project has focused on an 8-pillar strategy to reinforce sustainability of project activities and learning and appears to be making adequate progress in all eight categories. Table 9 below summarizes results as reported by interviewees during the evaluation and as described in project TPRs and provides a rating of progress toward sustainability on a scale of 1-3 (1-insufficient, 2-adequate, 3- significant). Table 10 below lists the capacity building programs organized by Wekeza to date.

TABLE 9. SUSTAINABILITY PILLARS RESULTS TO DATE		
Pillar	Results	Rating
Capacity building of key stakeholders and partners	Regular and well-received training has been provided to a broad range of actors, from national ministries to district officials to village child labor committees to schools, parents, and children themselves. A key part of this initiative is the training of local CSOs who will be able to carry on the child labor advocacy and awareness raising work after the project ends. <b>Table 10</b> below summarizes categories and beneficiaries of Wekeza training.	2- adequate but written plan outlining post-project responsibilities for advocacy and monitoring is needed
Community mobilization and involvement	Wekeza has done an excellent job of mobilizing community involvement on both the district and village levels. Nomination of the District SWO as the Wekeza focal person helps to ensure an active DCLC. Empowering VCLCs to monitor beneficiary HH and children has strengthened local engagement and ownership, preparing the way for continued post-project	3- significant but written plan outlining post-project responsibilities for advocacy and monitoring is needed

**TABLE 9. SUSTAINABILITY PILLARS RESULTS TO DATE**

	involvement.	
Resource replacement, replenishment and strengthening	Wekeza has ensured that parents in particular understand the need for their moral and financial support for their children's education. Many have begun to contribute to the cost of vocational training (transport, meals, etc.) for youth beneficiaries and to use VICOBA loans to cover the cost of children's school supplies and supplemental SS fees. Villages are aware of the need for community support for school feeding programs and small infrastructure projects. Several have begun to fund in-kind projects. Plans to link youth entrepreneurs to loans through Savings and Credit Cooperative Organizations (SACCO) and through the Small Industries Development Organization (SIDO) are underway.	3- significant - self-sufficiency practices emphasized from start
Incorporation of child labor language in key policy documents and regulations	Wekeza has created a National Education Taskforce and an Agricultural Advisory Group to review policy options, however both groups would benefit from increased involvement of the MoLE in their deliberations	2-adequate- GoT education and agricultural teams are very engaged; more active MoLE CLU involvement would be helpful
Integration and alignment of project interventions in GoT program priorities	Wekeza education, livelihoods and youth services align directly with GoT program priorities, as articulated in the Poverty Reduction Strategy (Mkukuta), Big Results Now strategy and MoEVT's Non Formal Education Strategy. The missing link is the lack of a strong national child labor strategy which would require implementation of NAP and development of a CLMS to inform MoLE policies and programs.	2- adequate alignment for interventions but stronger GoT child labor programs required in the long run
Structure and system building	Wekeza has established structures and set up basic systems in all target districts and villages. A more formalized list of roles and responsibilities and particularly the interface with social protection committees and activities would be useful, as well as a more structured approach to adoption of village bylaws for the Kigoma Region. The primary outstanding system is the CLMS (see above).	2- adequate- written plan outlining post-project roles and responsibilities for advocacy and monitoring is needed, along with a CLMS
Publication and promotion of child labor policies and processes	The MoEVT and MoAFSC task forces are focusing on promotion of CL policies. Wekeza has translated and disseminated the NAP and LCA. Here again, the missing link is the active engagement of the MoLE in the process.	2- adequate- progress is slowed by the lack of active engagement of the key partner ministry, MoLE
Partnership building to enhance coordination and promote accountability	Wekeza has made good progress in building partnerships and creating networks of organizations that should be able to continue their roles post-project. More frequent consultation and coordination meetings- either virtual or physical- should be planned among partner CSOs and local implementing partners	2- adequate- more frequent networking especially among CSOs and local implementing partners is needed

TABLE 10. WEKEZA CAPACITY BUILDING- TRAINING SESSIONS AS OF 12/14			
Component	Topic	Total Sessions	Total Trainees
Education TOT	Learning Centered Teaching-5 days	6	288 teachers
	Healing Classrooms- pilot- 6 days	2	101teachers
	ASER (remedial reading)-pilot- 3 days	1	22 teachers
	SC/SB governance/awareness	6	513 SB/SC/headmasters
Livelihoods	CPG trainings (value chains, marketing, market linkages, group dynamics)	7	779- Kigoma 588- Tanga
	IGA (beekeeping/livestock/hides)	6	399- Kigoma 632- Tanga
	VICOBA	54 (est)	801
Youth	Business Skills Development	54 (est)	2369
	Enterprise Development	20 (est)	391
	Apprenticeships/Vocational Skills	30 (est)	1978
GoT Capacity Building	Child Labor Laws/LCA- 1 to 3 days	6	418
	CLMS/Social Protection- 1 day	12 (est)	630
Awareness Raising	Campaigns (community forums) on domestic service	12 (est)	1565 (260 persons on average/district)
	CL Basics/Laws	6	120 (20/district- WEOs/VEOs)
	Childs Rights Club	6	309 (50 average/ district- parents, teachers, peer leaders)

### III. EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND FINDINGS

USDOL and Wekeza identified nine key evaluation questions to be addressed during the project interim evaluation (see list and data sources in Annex 2). Questions and related findings are:

#### 1. To what extent did project design support achievement of Wekeza objectives and targets?

The project design was based on six inter-connected components, an area-based approach to reducing the incidence of child labor in the two target regions and a two-tier approach to developing local capacity for child labor support among Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). Each of these design components is discussed below, taking into account feedback from project staff and stakeholders.

**Six-component design:** stakeholders agreed in general that the design was relevant but very ambitious given the choice of target regions and the districts and villages within each region. Several project staff noted that had the project been limited to one region, or to two contiguous regions, impact might have been greater since coordination of activities would have been easier and more cost effective and the environmental context might have been more similar. As it is, Kigoma and Tanga are at opposite geographic ends of the country, with different economic attributes: Kigoma is much more rural compared to Tanga, which is closer to Dar and generally more economically developed. The distances between target districts and villages within each region severely restrict the level of regular staff contact with beneficiaries. Reliance on CSOs provided a low-cost and locally available support option, but also required a learning curve to bring the CSOs up to speed.

Stakeholders all agreed that the combination of the three direct services components (education, livelihoods and youth) is an excellent design which is critical to both the successful launch and



ultimate sustainability of project results: while education benefits, especially for primary and COBET students, immediately draw HHs into the project, the longer-term benefits of increasing HH and youth incomes are what will likely keep children in school after the project ends.

As for specific component strategies, stakeholders considered the design of the **Education component** extremely relevant and effective, resulting in immediate uptake among HHs, schools, teachers and inspectors. The sole exception was the design assumption regarding recruitment of secondary school students. Given that HHs were recruited primarily based on whether there were children in the family engaged in or at risk of child labor, there were usually few eligible SS students in the same household since these very poor families could not afford the substantial SS fees. Any older children in these families had dropped out of school after the primary level. The project modified its recruitment design to meet its SS targets. Rather than recruiting HHs, Wekeza asked SS headmasters to identify eligible students in their schools who were on the MVC lists. These students' HHs were then added to the HH beneficiary rosters. This strategy adjustment only took place in 2014 which slowed the project's progress in attaining its SS targets. Stakeholders pointed out that the design should have provided standard allocations for school uniforms, supplies and shoes for all COBET students and shoes for all primary school students.

The **Livelihoods component** design did not account for the length of time it takes to constitute CPG and IGA groups and to build group solidarity. While project activities remain relevant, the speed of uptake among target beneficiaries was slower than planned, especially for CPGs. Resistance to a group work ethic among certain HHs slowed progress toward targets. The time between each step of the process, from training in new techniques to group demonstrations to individual application of new techniques to formation of productive farmer or IGA groups, to sales leveraged by collective marketing and distribution, is longer than assumed in the design. Performance indicators related to collective marketing agreements may not be achievable within the project period and will require coordination with non-beneficiary producers for efficiency, another element that was missing from the original design. The design also lacked adequate funding to provide regular technical assistance to beneficiary HHs from staff and extension agents.

The **Youth component** design did not fully recognize the difficulty of recruitment among target children of legal working age (15-17) and unemployed youth (18-24), or the financial requirements that parents would face for children enrolled in vocational schools where transport, meals and housing costs had to be covered for six months. The design also did not foresee the very high demand among youth 18-24 for vocational training, as opposed to microbusiness. Staff report that demand for vocational training from youth 18-24 years of age is over four times as high as that for microbusiness, with zero spontaneous demand for micro-franchises. The youth initiative is extremely labor intensive, but the design included only two staff members, one in each region, for 4,200 target youth. The design also assumed significant support from CSOs who faced capacity issues in attempting to design support programs to serve a large number of villages over a large geographic area.

Design of the **Social Protection component** was very vague. Results related to this component were developed during the CMEP 1 Workshop and focus on beneficiary access to three main social protection programs, which some staff consider overly narrow. Other staff noted that if the focus of the social protection component in OCFT projects is including child labor issues in

social protection policy, then it could be folded into the policy strengthening component rather than existing as a stand-alone component.

The **Policy and CLMS component** design assumed MoLE leadership, which has been challenging given the multitude of issues facing the MoLE especially in the current election year. This flags the need to include government commitment to CL as a critical assumption in countries where such commitment might be problematic.

The **Awareness Raising component** design was also vague, but this gave the project flexibility to develop campaign strategies adapted to local conditions. Despite its very low level of funding, the creativity of the local partner has made this component one of the most effective initiatives of the project.

**Area-based approach** to the reduction in the incidence of child labor: given the choice of target regions and the lack of a dominant sector in either region where child labor is prevalent (e.g. tobacco in Tabora), the choice of an area-based approach is logical and enables the project to address the broader issue of child labor in target villages where families might send their children to work in a variety of sectors, such as agriculture (sisal, oranges, tobacco, etc.), domestic service in Dar, or fishing along the lake or ocean. The area-based approach also facilitated project interaction with several trade unions (e.g. Conservation, Hotels, Domestic and Allied Workers' Union- CHODAWU, and the Trade Union Congress of Tanzania- TUCTA) and at least four ministries outside the MoLE: MoAFSC, MoETV, MoCDGC and MoHSW.

**Two-tier local partner capacity building approach:** Project design called for a two-tier approach to building local CSO capacity to support child labor initiatives. The Wekeza Tier 1 grant was to the Foundation for Civil Society (FCS), an umbrella grant-making entity whose vocation is to build grant management capacity among nascent CSOs to enable them to enhance their performance and attract additional grants from new funders. FCS has an established process of vetting CSOs and providing them with incremental training and support to assist them to graduate from small scale to medium scale grants. FCS worked with Wekeza in 2013 to identify a first round of five CSOs, each covering one component for all three districts within a target region. For Kigoma, KIOO covered education, Nyakitonto covered youth while Ndela covered awareness raising. For Tanga, Wolea covered awareness raising and Talisda covered agriculture (but just for Korogwe). The other support requirements were covered by project partners: Tayodea handled youth for Tanga while World Vision worked with extension agents in the three Tanga Region districts, Korogwe, Muheza and Tanga.

That design proved challenging for the five CSOs who were expected to cover three districts with small staffs and limited transportation budgets (grants were \$15,000 each for one year). The design was revised in 2014 to add two new CSOs with the general guideline that one CSO would service one district to cut down on travel and ensure more frequent follow-up. This brought the total Tier Two CSO group to seven, adding CCC for youth in Uvinza and KYDE for youth in Kasulu.

Despite some initial misunderstandings about CSO roles and responsibilities in this two-tier system (FCS sub-grantees were not used to the level of sponsor oversight of their activities nor to such specific deliverables), the system by all accounts has provided a readily accessible and responsive local team that supports Wekeza with a wide variety of tasks. Wekeza staff consider the five CSOs as their eyes and ears on the ground. At the same time, the grants strengthened

grant management capacity in all the CSOs. The 2015 grants are \$27,500 as compared to \$15,000 in 2014. The system encouraged Wekeza to add **eight new CSOs** (see Table 11 below) to the mix, with grants to be awarded by mid-March 2015 in Kigoma and Tanga for education and awareness-raising. World Vision, the project partner for livelihoods is considering grants to CSOs in both regions to support its field staff with bi-weekly follow-up. FCS believes that the CSOs will be able to attract new funding at the end of the Wekeza project. CSOs affirm they have developed new capacity to advocate for child labor issues and to work with target populations using Wekeza materials, which should enable them to provide such services after Wekeza ends.

<b>TABLE 11. TWO-TIER CSOS CAPACITY BUILDING APPROACH</b>						
Sector	Kigoma			Tanga		
	Kigoma	Uvinza	Kasalu	Tanga	Muheza	Korogwe
ED	KIOO		SB/SC - Governance, Awareness	SB/SC - Governance, Awareness	SB/SC - Governance, Awareness	SB/SC - Governance, Awareness
LH	Under WV consideration: bi-weekly follow-up 2015-2016					TALISDA
YOUTH	NYAKITONTO	NEW: CCC	NEW: KYDE	TAYODEA (Project Partner)		
AR/SP	NDELA	Village A/R HH SP	Village A/R HH SP	WOLEA	Village A/R HH SP	Village A/R HH SP

## 2. Are beneficiary children safe while attending school?

During the last quarter of calendar 2014 MoEVT school inspectors made visits to all Wekeza schools, using a jointly developed inspection form filled out in Swahili. These inspections were possible due to transportation allowances provided by the project. The Wekeza education



Typical school latrine

specialists in Kigoma and Tanga confirmed that a complete report on the findings of these inspections is being prepared for the next TPR. The October 2014 TPR contained a summary of one set of inspection results for Kigoma's UJJI District that indicates serious deficiencies in all primary schools in terms of numbers of required classrooms (on average less than half of the required classrooms are available) and latrines (on average **less than 25% of the required number of latrines are available**, and those that are available are in deplorable condition). The TPR draws specific attention to the Kwamzindawa Primary School in Mnyuzi Ward where only two of eight classrooms are in acceptable condition, with the "whole building posing serious

threats to pupils' lives."

The evaluator visited five primary schools, including the Kwamzindawa school, two COBET centers and four secondary schools during the evaluation. Of that number, only two had access to tap water (15%). Two of the primary schools had four classrooms where infrastructure problems were so significant that they had been condemned by the inspectors (see photos).

Classes were being held outside for two entire grades. In the condemned classrooms roof beams had given way, the concrete floors were pitted with huge holes and segments of the brick walls were missing. In all of the primary schools visited during the evaluation there was insufficient classroom space and desks for the number of students attending. Most primary school teachers interviewed teach classes ranging from 80 to 120 students, with four children sharing one three-foot long desk designed to accommodate two students. Walls were dingy, floors were dusty, there were no maps, posters, chalk boards or decorations of any kind. There were no play areas or playground equipment. The entire environment was colorless and prison-like.

School Committees interviewed are all acutely aware of the problems and are willing to volunteer their labor to make the repairs, but do not have the financial



Condemned Classrooms



means to purchase the lumber, cement, tin roofing and bricks needed to repair the roofs, walls and floors.

Given safety issues for beneficiary children, there is an urgent need for Wekeza to move forward with SC drafting of Whole School Development Plans and to find creative ways of fundraising or co-financing needed materials. Another option discussed with the education specialists would be requesting that TASAF funds be used for community projects such as primary school repairs, although this community-based mechanism has never been used before.

### **3. Have financial services activities (savings through VICOBAs) been successful?**

Quotes from the members of Wekeza Village Cooperative Banks (VICOBAs) reflect the consensus of opinion of every member of every VICOBA group interviewed during the interim evaluation:



VICOBA members in Kigoma

*“VICOBA changed my life.”*

*“VICOBA gave me my dignity back.”*

*“VICOBA enabled me to keep my children in school.”*

*“VICOBA gave me hope.”*

The Livelihoods component includes creation of VICOBAs in all targeted villages, composed of 20 to 30 members who self-select to constitute a cooperative local bank. VICOBA members consolidate savings in order to provide micro-loans to each other. At the time of the evaluation, 114 VICOBAs had been created- 54 in Kigoma and 60 in Tanga, representing 95% of the life of project target of 120 VICOBAs. Interest in VICOBAs is growing among other project groups, such as youth who are now able to save small sums from their earnings, and teachers who learned of the initiative from their contact with beneficiary HHs.

The VICOBA loans are intended to meet the immediate household needs of the members, which can range from education expenses to funeral expenses to small strategic investments in agricultural production or IGA enterprises. These funds are geared to help families resist the temptation to fall back on child labor as a source of income. WEKEZA trains village animators who train beneficiary HH members on how to set up and manage a VICOBA.

Every group of beneficiary HHs, every DCLC and every national stakeholder representative interviewed sang the praises of VICOBAs. For an investment representing just over \$100 for a

cash box, a ledger and individual passbooks for members, the project has helped created a savings mentality among villagers who before were ashamed when they had to ask for loans from better off neighbors who often shared that information with the entire village. VICOBA groups shared stories of loans received, most of which focused on school expenses and ranged from 30,000 TS to 150,000 Tshs (\$20 to \$100). Aggregate capital per VICOBA among the groups interviewed ranged from 700,000 Tshs (\$415) to over 3,000,000 Tshs (\$1,800). Women are particularly empowered by this tool because they now have resources to meet the needs of their children. Loan repayment data was not available at the time of the evaluation but would be a useful assessment tool to gauge the sustainability potential of the VICOBA groups.

Of all the tools provided by Wekeza, this simple instrument appears to be the most transformative in changing mentalities from dependency to autonomy. As many interviewees noted, “VICOBA is the glue that holds the other livelihood pieces together.”

#### **4. What evidence exists of increase in income among target HHs?**

Given the fact that demonstration plots were just harvested in late 2014 and that most individual field planting only began in 2015, evidence of increased income among target HHs is primarily anecdotal, with some limited data collected from livelihoods monitors in the last quarter of 2014.

During the interim evaluation, farmers interviewed noted that they have increased production thanks to “21<sup>st</sup> century planting techniques” that the project brought them. Most of these techniques involve planting in straight lines using appropriate spacing, utilizing improved seeds and applying fertilizers. Some groups also received small pumps and other were instructed in how to dig water pans for irrigation. Several farmers interviewed reported increased yields, most



Maize Farmers on a Demonstration Plot in Kitaga (Kigoma Region)

citing an average of 50-60% increases (3 to 5 sacks or 5 to 8 sacks of cassava).

A livelihoods monitoring report filled out by VCLCs in Q4 of calendar 2014 reported that in Kigoma, 162 of 268 farmers and IGA participants monitored (60%) had increased income by some measure (somewhat or significantly).

During the same cycle in Tanga, a total of 300 of 674 farmers and IGA participants reported some form of increased income (45%).

VCLCs recently received intensive training in monitoring. As such, the next TPR should yield more definitive information on numbers of farmers and IGAs with increased income.



Beekeepers in Demonstration Area in Songa Batini (Tanga)

It should be noted that Income Generating Activities (IGAs) such as beekeeping, poultry raising, and processed skins and hides are very attractive livelihoods options, even for traditional farmers. The IGAs represent new activities and are viewed as possibilities for augmenting HH income outside of agriculture.

Beekeeping is particularly popular given that beehives are provided by the project to the village IGA group. Participants also receive periodic training from the district beekeeping extension agents.

The project hopes that through VICOBAAs both the farmers and the IGAs will be able to purchase inputs for their activities as they begin to operate individually.

##### **5. Are youth micro-franchising interventions and entrepreneurship modules market-relevant? How effective has the youth employment component been in increasing beneficiary incomes?**

While the youth employment component got off to a slow start (see description of IO3 above), the Wekeza Youth team leader has provided energetic leadership to get the component back on track, while at the same time ensuring that the selection of employment and self-employment opportunities are market relevant. Building off the Youth Employment Market Assessment and Company Profile for Kigoma and Tanga Region Study produced in August 2013 by the University of Dar es Salaam Business School, the project structured programs that would:

- Prepare youth to more efficiently pursue or create employment opportunities by providing business skills development (BSD) and entrepreneurship training adapted from *Street Kids International Business Toolkit*
- Increase youth skills in market relevant vocations to help them gain employment

- Facilitate youth creation of micro-businesses through start-up kits or micro-franchise arrangements

**Market Relevance:** The UDS Business School study had three objectives: (1) identify sectors that have a high growth potential and provide job opportunities for youth, (2) identify players in these high growth sectors with potential for providing apprenticeships, and (3) identify possible partners for micro-franchising in these high growth potential areas. The study recommended sectors and businesses whose production has been growing or has been stable over time and whose activities require fewer resources to pursue, thus facilitating youth entry into these markets. The study identified agriculture as the preferred sector for youth employment in all six districts, with activities ranging from crop production to agro-processing, and including horticulture, timber for construction and furniture making, and honey processing from bee-keeping. These sectors were also identified as areas where youth could access funding through Small Industries Development Organization (SIDO).

Another priority sector identified was livestock husbandry across all districts, notably dairy production, livestock keeping and hides, with poultry an opportunity in Kigoma and cow and goat keeping in Kasulu. Fishing and aquaculture were also proposed given extensive fishing activities in Tanga and Kigoma.

In terms of vocational skills, the study flagged auto works, metal works, carpentry, construction, masonry, bread and soap-making, and tourism (waitresses, hotel clerks). The study identified potential sectors for micro-franchising arrangements (dairy products, bakeries). Tayodea's expertise in youth programs helped to complement the study's list, adding tailoring and barbering. Of the study's list, the only sector in which youth had little or no interest was agriculture.

To ensure that market-relevant technical skills were taught to Wekeza youth, the project inventoried existing vocational institutes, including state-run Vocational Education and Training Agency (VETA) facilities and VETA-certified vocational schools such as the Kasulu Technical Institute. The project also identified master trainers available to provide locally-based skills training in areas such as barbering and tailoring. The project compiled lists of potentially profitable trade and small scale production opportunities such as soap making, bedcover embroidery, and beekeeping, according to market demand in the target districts.

**Vocational training:** Interviews with youth enrolled in vocational programs confirmed their agreement that the training funded by Wekeza is market-relevant. The vocational school trainees interviewed during the evaluation are anxious to begin work but stressed the need for start-up tools or equipment to enable them to practice their trade (e.g. sewing machines for tailors, masonry and carpentry tools for construction trades). Participants in all four groups interviewed demonstrated ambition, enthusiasm and drive for their future activities and made it clear that they understood the value of the unexpected opportunity that they had received.

**Micro-business:** All of the micro-business graduates interviewed confirmed the fact that they had benefited from the BSD and entrepreneurship training received, despite its short duration, and had applied the market research carried out during training to identify, test-market and launch activities for their businesses. Micro-business graduates confirmed receiving between 100,000 and 150,000 Tshs (\$60 to \$90) as start-up capital for their businesses and were able to cite the amount of revenue earned from their activity, which averaged about \$25 per month. According to the Youth Team Leader, after a year 85% of these youth continue to pursue a



business-oriented activity, usually in trading. At least two of the youth interviewed used profits from their business activities to pay their own fees at vocational schools or to return to secondary school.

**Evidence of increased income:** Anecdotal evidence gathered during the youth interviews indicates that youth are indeed earning income from their small scale activities and are motivated to continue to explore market opportunities. Certain of the highly entrepreneurial youth have created multiple businesses and several have created “joint ventures” where they combine resources and talents with other Wekeza youth (construction, tailoring, etc.). Wekeza has instituted an income tracking spreadsheet that the youth monitors fill out on a monthly basis, recording incomes by individual youth and per activity (see Annex 8). Table 12 below provides an analysis of income reported by youth in Tanga from June to December 2014 and compares average total incomes over those seven months and average monthly earning of youth engaged in micro-enterprises to those engaged in micro-franchises, with a slightly higher income level for the latter activity.

<b>TABLE 12. AVERAGE INDIVIDUAL MICRO-BUSINESS INCOME- TANGA</b>		
Activity	Average total individual income (7 months)	Average individual monthly income
Micro-franchise	298,388 Tshs \$178	42,627 Tshs \$25.50
Micro-enterprise	261,800 Tshs \$156	37,400 Tshs \$22.30



Youth trained in metalworking in Tanga



Youth trained by master trainer in tailoring in Tanga



Youth enrolled in the Kasulu Technical School in Kigoma

## 6. Have community attitudes toward child labor, notably in domestic service, changed since project start? What role have SC/SBs played in community awareness raising?

On the basis of the interviews conducted with project direct beneficiaries, VCLCs, DCLCs, teachers, head teachers, CSOs and project staff, community attitudes in the Wekeza target villages have changed dramatically since project start. The degree of change in attitudes was a central question in all the interview protocols for this evaluation, and in every instance, responses were strongly affirmative that attitudes had moved from a ready acceptance of child labor as a part of Tanzanian culture (children become stronger if they work) to a rejection of the concept as not only illegal but also detrimental to the well-being of Tanzanian children. Parents stressed in their interviews how little they knew about the negative effects of child labor and how substantively their viewpoints had changed as a result of project awareness raising. Several mothers noted that they are making sure their children spend no more than two hours helping out in the house and that their children do their homework and report to school.

The shift in attitude is reinforced by the slogans of the VICOBA groups. During the evaluation interviews, each VICOBA member introduced himself or herself with the following pronouncement, made with great fervor:

*Hallo.  
Mtoto kwanza  
Mama- baadaye  
Baba- baadaye kabisa*

*Hello.  
Children first  
Mothers- later  
Fathers- much later*

The dedication voiced by district leaders to putting children first was also impressive. The evaluator met with each of the six DCLCs. In each group, political appointees responsible for community development, youth, education, agriculture and social welfare, expressed their solidarity with the project and their commitment to seeing its efforts sustained post-project.

Beneficiaries HHs expressed appreciation for the opportunities to engage in broad-based local dialogue on child labor and for project services that help them move beyond a culture of dependency to one that is based on responsibility and hope for the future.

SC/SBs have taken their role as advocated for children, especially MVCs, to heart and have played an active role in organizing school-based discussions and promoting responsible parenting in the school community.

As regards child labor in domestic service, project efforts have focused on the Tanga Region, a sending region, and on an awareness raising



"Stop Child Domestic Labor" Bus Campaign

campaign in Dar, a receiving region. Direct inquiry regarding attitude changes on domestic service was limited to one interview of mothers in a Tanga district and on data from a survey conducted by WOLEA, the CSO responsible for domestic service awareness raising in Tanga. The mothers' group stated they were deeply influenced by the awareness raising discussions held in their village regarding the negative effects of domestic service. Among the group of 10 women interviewed, all confirmed that they had taken that message to neighbors in the village, two of whom had recalled their young children to their families from underage domestic service. The WOLEA survey was carried out among 750 HHs in Tanga on attitudes after community dialogue sessions on domestic service. Of the 750 HHs surveyed, only one reported that it still had a child in domestic service. The survey was conducted among a population where the incidence of underage domestic service was estimated to be 6% per the Wekeza baseline study.

In January 2015 Wekeza commissioned a well-known artist in Dar to produce a poster depicting the negative effects of domestic service for underage girls. Local buses in Dar will carry the posters over the next three months in an attempt to raise awareness among the capital's population. However, given the strong positive feedback about the success of the awareness raising campaigns on the village level, the evaluation suggests that the project might want to examine the cost-effectiveness of higher priced Dar-based campaigns vs. local awareness raising initiatives.

## **7. What process is used to collect data reported under the CMEP? What might be improved?**

During the interim evaluation the evaluator met with several staff of the Wekeza project in Kigoma and Tanga to discuss data accuracy and analysis. One noted that a former project staff member had mismanaged the data entry process and was unable to produce accurate reports using the DBMS. When these problems were not resolved by the March 2014 TPR, the project concluded that a new hire was needed. A replacement candidate was identified in August 2014 and brought on board that same month. The current data managers were hired shortly thereafter.

The first task of the new M&E team was to examine the accuracy of DBMS information and the reliability of DBMS formulas. That review revealed that the DBMS data were not clean and that 44 of the 48 DBMS formulas to calculate CMEP indicator data needed to be reprogrammed. There are suspicions but no direct proof that the disgruntled former staff member may have tampered with the DBMS programming before leaving the project. (See Annex 7 for a list of all indicators, DBMS status, and action required to operationalize the DBMS).

The most critical current M&E priority is validating the information uploaded in the DBMS during the beneficiary intake process. During the first intake, data from all forms filled out by VCLCs on eligible HHs were entered into the database. Data clerks hired by a previous staff member were tasked with entering intake data, but they did not cross check the list of HHs interviewed against the list of HHs selected by the DCLCs to receive services. As a result, the DBMS now has approximately 30% more HHs registered than the number actually receiving services. This discrepancy became apparent when the first common indicator calculations were run for the March 2014 TPR. The project team had to resort to a manual count of beneficiaries based on training lists for HH workshops and on teacher lists of students having received Wekeza services.

The M&E team is now working with the LH specialists to identify which HHs in the database are receiving direct services (CPG or IGA) and to code them appropriately. Paper files are also being checked to determine which children have actually received education services. The M&E team confirms that clean DBMS data should be available for the March 2015 TPR. The M&E officer is working with an external consultant to reprogram the database formulas so that accurate calculations of CMEP numbers and percentages can be made for the indicators whose formulas are incorrect.

**CMEP data collection:** Project staff agreed that the CMEP process had provided their team with an in depth understanding of how the project components fit together into a logical construct. Staff agreed also that the project team needed additional post-CMEP training on how indicator data should be collected and analyzed once the system was in place, particularly given the reliance of the project on volunteer monitors for data collection. The fact that the VCLC monitors were not adequately trained resulted in differences in the way the questions on the data collection instruments (DCIs) were interpreted by the monitors and how they were filled out. The part-time data clerks during the project’s first year did not check the DCIs for uniform reporting procedures. They simply entered whatever response was recorded. For example, the HH follow up form asks HHs if their income has increased due to project interventions. Response choices are NO—SOMEWHAT--SUBSTANTIALLY. Of over 300 responses recorded among target HHs, more than 30 responses were recorded as “O”. This was not a response choice and could be interpreted as “don’t know” or “no increase” or “no answer.”

It was only after Period 4 data collection that the project team realized how faulty the VCLC data collection efforts were. The project team organized VCLC training sessions to emphasize to monitors the importance of their data collection role and to review forms and procedures with each monitor. Data managers in each region are now checking the DCIs as they are submitted to validate entries.

**Data Collection Instruments (DCIs):** Ten DCIs were designed during the CMEP process to collect data against the indicators in the PMP. Seven of these are used to collect data at this stage of the project. The forms highlighted in yellow on Table 13 below are not used for the reasons indicated.

<b>TABLE 13. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS</b>		
<b>Data Collection Instruments</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Who fills</b>
Household Intake and Follow-Up Forms (2)	USED	M&E Team/Project staff/ VCLCs monitors
Commercial Village Follow-Up Form	NOT USED	Too early to report progress- Not until Year 4
Child Intake and Follow-Up Forms (2)	USED	M&E Team/Project staff/ VCLCs monitors
School Inspection Checklist	USED	School Inspectors
Head Teacher/Master Follow-Up Form	USED	Head Teachers/ Head Masters
Youth Intake and Follow-Up Forms (2)	USED	M&E Team/Project staff/ VCLCs monitors
CLC Follow-Up Form	USED	Project Focal person (social welfare officer)
Training Provider Follow-Up Form - Youth	NOT USED	Form revised to collect income data
Country Capacity Tracking Form - CP	NOT USED	Tracked through TPR Annex B
Awareness Raising Monitoring Form	USED	KIWOHEDE M&E Officer

**Data Validation.** As mentioned earlier, project staff, and in particular the M&E Team, must pay careful attention to the data collected by the VCLCs to ensure accuracy and standardized reporting. Table 14 below outlines responsibilities of the full Wekeza team in this process, with

the most critical responsibilities for data validation **highlighted in green**: the M&E Specialist, Data Managers and Clerks, and the VCLC monitors, in coordination with the Technical Managers who have the best sense of what progress has been achieved and can determine if any numbers appear off base.

Two tasks that require immediate attention for reporting purposes are **in red font**. The first is the development of a quality index for the IO1.2 indicator on schools meeting overall quality standards, based on a composite assessment of teacher skills, use of new materials and safety of the school environment. This index should be developed by the Education Technical Specialist, working with the M&E Specialist, and should take into account school inspection reports that examine all three aspects. The current school inspection form does not assess safety. Further, to ensure that these measures are regularly updated, school inspections should be scheduled before each six month reporting period.

<b>TABLE 14. KEY DATA MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES</b>		
<b>Staff</b>	<b>Monitoring/ Data Roles</b>	
	<b>Average Caseload</b>	<b>Staff Role</b>
<b>M&amp;E Specialist</b>	All beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consolidate data (project level), analyze results in line with RF, prepare TPR Annex C for review by Project Director</li> </ul>
<b>Data Managers (2) and Data Clerks (2)</b>	All beneficiaries in each regional office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oversee/perform data entry in Regional Offices using original forms</li> <li>• Generate data reports using DBMS and flag trends of interest</li> </ul>
<b>Education Technical Specialist (1)</b>	8000 children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and approve TPR IO1 submission</li> <li>• Review IO strategy based on results and propose strategy modifications as needed</li> <li>• Interpret data for IO1.2 (<b>index development required</b>)</li> </ul>
<b>Education Managers (2)</b>	4000 children each	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IO1 data review and analysis by region</li> <li>• Written narrative section of TPR</li> </ul>
<b>Focal Teacher 2/school</b>	All beneficiary children in the school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fill section of child follow up form related to school attendance and completion of program of studies</li> </ul>
<b>School Inspectors</b>	103 schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Complete school inspection form every six months</b> (safety and health, teacher skills, use of materials)</li> </ul>
<b>Livelihoods Technical Specialist</b>	3360 households	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and approve TPR IO2 submission</li> <li>• Review IO strategy based on results and propose strategy modifications as needed</li> </ul>
<b>Livelihoods Managers(2)</b>	1680 households each	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IO2 data review and analysis by region</li> <li>• Written narrative section of TPR</li> </ul>
<b>Youth Employment Coordinator</b>	4200 youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IO3 Overall Analysis</li> <li>• IO3 data review and analysis for Tanga</li> <li>• Review IO strategy based on results and propose strategy modifications as needed</li> </ul>
<b>Youth Employment Officer</b>	2100 youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IO3 data review and analysis for Kigoma</li> <li>• Written narrative section of TPR Kigoma</li> </ul>
<b>VCLC Monitors (8 per village)</b>	15-20children in 7 to 10 HHs per monitor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collect data</li> <li>• Review HH data with Data Managers/Clerks for accuracy</li> </ul>

**CMEP Indicators.** In addition to the five DOL project-level indicators and 9 common indicators, 48 CMEP indicators were developed by the project during the CMEP workshops. Based on a review of these indicators with the project M&E Team, it would appear that DOL common indicator L5 could be eliminated since no non-employment or non-economic strengthening services are offered by the project. It appears that five of the performance indicators could be eliminated to streamline the system (**see red shaded indicators in Annex 7**):

***IO2- Livelihoods- delete:***

- target HH with increase in assets (proxy for increase in income but not needed if HHs are reporting if they have increased income);
- % change in unit price of products sold (complex indicator for HHs to report and possible that no change occurs during project period)
- % change in volume per unit area (complex indicator for HH to report; another measure related to increased volume already reported)

***IO5- CL Policy/Capacity Building- delete:***

- % LGA actors demonstrating capacity to collect, analyze and disseminate CL data (proxy measure (# LGAs with operational CLMS) is already included)

***IO6- Awareness Raising- delete:***

- % of effective awareness raising campaigns (complex measure given qualitative nature; proxy is the other indicator for IO6.1- # persons receiving message)

Per the M&E team, a total of 16 indicators **cannot be generated currently** based on DBMS programming. They are flagged in **red font in Annex 7**. These include the five project level indicators, seven IO1 indicators (3 related to 75% attendance, 3 related to persistence and the one qualitative index indicator mentioned above for IO1.2), and the four IO6 indicators (of which one is recommended for elimination).

To generate a performance report using the database, the requisite information must be collected on the follow-up forms and entered into the database. The seven IO1 measures, if retained, should be taken annually since they relate to annual levels of attendance and annual re-enrollment (persistence) in the next school form. At this stage of the project, it is doubtful whether the measures on 75% attendance and persistence merit the effort to collect data on 8,000 children and to enter that data into the database. A decision to exclude these measures would reduce the number of performance indicators by another six (from 48 original to 37 including the five bulleted recommendations for elimination above plus these six)

The school quality index for IO1.2 only concerns 103 schools and is an interesting measure given the project's focus on improving instruction, materials and safety. The IO6 awareness raising data are being tracked but the database must be programmed to calculate the aggregate performance data.

The **project-level indicators** pose special definitional problems. The initial measure of beneficiary children in child labor (POC.1) should be based on the intake forms which identified how many of the beneficiary children were engaged in child labor at project launch. This measure should be taken only once again, for the October 2016 TPR, to determine project start and end measures. Unless the original intake form specifically asked if beneficiary children were engaged in "hazardous child labor" as opposed to "child labor," indicator POC.2 should be dropped. The same applies to the household measures of child labor and hazardous child labor:

measures should be intake and endline only for POH.1. POH.2 should be dropped if the intake form did not differentiate between “child labor” and “hazardous child labor.” If POH.4 data related to all HH children enrolled in education was not entered at intake, a decision must be made as to whether reviewing the 3,360 HH files to obtain and enter that data is justified at this stage of the project period.

The March 2015 TPR will be a critical test of the reliability of the common and project indicator data and of the reprogramming of the DBMS to calculate numbers and percentages for all indicators that are retained. As stated earlier, the accuracy of the data reported will also depend on the careful administration of follow-up forms by the VCLCs and data checks by the data clerks and managers.

**8. Per the 10/14 TPR, the project appears delayed in meeting most CMEP targets but is close to meeting E1/L1 targets. What progress has been made in implementing the project? Is the project is likely to achieve its objectives and targets?**

Per the results analysis in Section II.D above which are summarized in Table 15 below, the project has already achieved its overall education targets and is poised to increase numbers even further with the addition of new COBET students in both regions and the increase in SS students that should occur due to the revised recruitment strategy. The project is on track to meet its livelihood targets by project end (76% of target at the 60% project workplan stage), with results in the VICOBA and IGA arena already surpassing targets. While progress in Youth appears low in relation to the LOP targets, the project set incremental annual targets recognizing the labor-intensive nature of the youth programs. Although it averages 56% of LOP targets, the Youth component is in fact at 99% of its 30-month (Period 5) targets and is confident that the 2,369 youth now completing their vocational and micro-business initiatives will attract strong interest from new youth from target villages. The project expects to achieve its LOP targets without issue.

As concerns the other CMEP indicators, as noted for Question 7 above, the project has encountered significant M&E challenges that the new M&E team is addressing. Renewed efforts to train and mentor VCLC monitors, combined with M&E team data verification and DBMS reprogramming, should produce an accurate and informative March 2015 TPR.

Feedback from beneficiaries, local implementing partners, project partners and key GoT and union stakeholders indicate that the project will be able to achieve its objectives, provided that it continues to work through its Tier Two CSO partners for ongoing follow-up and that its efforts for the youth component (recruitment, BSD training and placement) continue apace. However, **acceleration of youth programming should not compromise the quality of the BSD training delivery.** As noted earlier, batch training of 50+ youth in one class is not justified, even if target numbers are low. It is better to organize more sessions of training and provide adequate mentoring and counseling services for micro-enterprise initiatives than to bundle groups into large training sessions where there is insufficient personal attention to market research and action plan development.

Contribution of the private sector to elimination of child labor under Wekeza is conditioned by two considerations. First, Wekeza is not a sector-specific child labor project, meaning that it does not work directly with a counterpart employer or trade association in a given sector, such as the



tobacco or mining, in its efforts to reduce child labor. Its interventions are focused on beneficiary HHs, in the hopes that raising family and community awareness of the negative effects of child labor, combined with interventions to improve access to education and increase incomes, will produce a lasting change in attitudes and practices regarding child labor.

Second, the project does work with private sector interests to identify markets for increased agricultural production (e.g., cassava, maize, vegetables), new income-generating activities (honey, poultry, goats) and youth employment. These private sector interests will respond to Wekeza beneficiary HH products and services in line with the normal market forces of supply and demand. Wekeza beneficiaries will need to understand that dynamic and respond accordingly. Project partners are working hard to support beneficiary transition from a dependency mentality to self-reliance but this will take time to achieve.

<b>TABLE 15. TARGETS VS. ACTUALS IN WEKEZA DIRECT SERVICE COMPONENTS—UNIT: BENEFICIARIES</b>										
	<b>EDUCATION Beneficiaries</b>				<b>LIVELIHOOD Beneficiaries</b>			<b>YOUTH Beneficiaries</b>		
	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>	<b>COBET</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CPG</b>	<b>IGA</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Vocational training</b>	<b>Micro-business</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>LOP Target</b>	4500	2000	1500	<b>8000</b>	2400	960	<b>3360</b>	3500	700	<b>4200</b>
<b>Total</b>	4619	1884	2035	<b>8538</b>	1497	1065	<b>2562</b>	1978	391	<b>2369</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>103%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>136%</b>	<b>107%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>111%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>57% LOP 99% 30 month</b>	<b>56% LOP 98% 30 month</b>	<b>56% LOP 98% 30 month</b>

USDOL asked that the evaluation examine the current project burn rate given the fact that the October 2014 TPR reported a burn rate of 30%. Wekeza prepared Table 16 below which the evaluator reviewed with the project director. This table updates burn rate projections through January 2015 which are now at 57% as opposed to 30% in October 2014. While this is an improvement, the project should carefully monitor its burn rate in line with planned programming to make sure that investments are made in the highest performing components to maximize results and achieve targets.

Priority investments appear to be additional grants to local CSOs to support training, awareness raising and monitoring for education and especially youth activities, and standardizing allocations for uniforms and supplies and for start-up kits across both regions. Evaluation notes on burn rates are **in red**.

**TABLE 16. BURN RATE FOR PROJECT OUTPUTS THROUGH 2014 AT 60% OF PROJECT LIFE**

Organization	Total Budget 2013/2014	Total Expended 12/14	Total Balance	Projected Burn Rate	Actual Burn Rate	Wekeza/Evaluator Comments
<b>OUTPUT 1</b>						
IRC	267,924	177,900	90,024	92%	66%	Y1 large unspent balance due to delayed start. 2015/2016 expenses include school improvements, additional COBET enrollments and uniforms, HC/ ASER teacher training, SC/SB strengthening
WV	729,638	408,437	321,201	92%	56%	Y1 unspent balances due to delayed start
FCS	350,435	24,595	325,840	92%	7%	Grant size increased in 2015 from \$15,000 to \$27,500; 4 more CSOS to be recruited
<b>Sub-Total Output 1</b>	<b>1,347,997</b>	<b>610,932</b>	<b>737,065</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>Evaluation Note: Need standardized policy to provide COBET uniforms, COBET/PS shoes</b>
<b>OUTPUT 2</b>						
WV	940,998	535,626	405,372	92%	57%	Spending picked up in Dec/January; will be reported in March 2015
<b>Sub-Total Output 2</b>	<b>940,998</b>	<b>535,626</b>	<b>405,372</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>Evaluation Note: Support for bi-weekly CPG/IGA monitoring needed</b>
<b>OUTPUT 3</b>						
IRC	298,854	295,091	3,763	92%	99%	High burn rate due to higher than expected per participant voc. training and microbusiness start-up kit costs
TAYODEA	68,367	61,481	6,886	92%	90%	
FCS	20,936	9,523	11,413	92%	45%	Spending will improve with two new Youth CSOs recently added
<b>Sub-Total Output 3</b>	<b>388,157</b>	<b>366,095</b>	<b>22,062</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>Evaluation Note: Standardized approach to start-up kits needed</b>
<b>OUTPUT 4</b>						
IRC	26,255	18,370	7,885	92%	70%	
KIWOHEDE	43,015	40,660	2,355	92%	95%	
FCS	32,278	8,271	24,007	92%	26%	Plans to augment size of existing AR grants with funds for SP
<b>Sub-Total Output 4</b>	<b>101,548</b>	<b>67,301</b>	<b>34,247</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>Evaluation Note: Increase awareness raising grants to cover SP</b>
<b>OUTPUT 5</b>						
IRC	62,632	41,062	21,570	92%	66%	
FCS	34,104	4,185	29,919	92%	12%	Funds to be reallocated to Kiwohede
<b>Sub-Total Output 5</b>	<b>96,736</b>	<b>45,247</b>	<b>51,489</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>Evaluation Note: Ability to burn funds depends on MoLE uptake for CLMS.</b>
<b>OUTPUT 6</b>						
IRC	610	5,542	(4,932)	92%	909%	Adjustments made in 2015 to cover excess
FCS	11,707	9,996	1,711	92%	85%	
KIWOHEDE	36,761	40,534	(3,773)	100%	110%	Increases will be made in 2015 with funds from FCS Output 5
<b>Sub-Total Output 6</b>	<b>49,078</b>	<b>56,072</b>	<b>(6,994)</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>352%</b>	<b>Evaluation Note: Kiwohede is star performer; budget should be increased to enhance performance</b>
<b>Grand totals</b>	<b>2,924,514</b>	<b>1,681,273</b>	<b>1,243,241</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>57%</b>	

## 9. What, if any, unexpected results have occurred?

From interviews conducted during the evaluation and review of project documentation, the most significant unexpected result to date is the reinvigoration and/or creation of COBET Centers. Almost all COBET Centers had died out or diminished significantly in importance four years ago. The lack of facilities catering to students who had dropped out and wanted to reintegrate formal schooling or who were too old to re-enroll was a driving factor for child labor. A Kigoma Education staff noted “drop outs went to the plantations or to the street when the centers disappeared.” Of the 32 facilities supported by Wekeza, 18 (56%) are new creations.

Uptake has been substantial among beneficiary children actually engaged in child labor: COBET enrollments are at 136% of target two years into the project, with demand growing. As the education team noted, “these are truly the primary target children for our project.”



Students reintegrating school via COBET

## VII. CONCLUSIONS, GOOD PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### A. Conclusions

#### 1. Overview of Progress

The evaluation concludes that with continued focused attention especially to livelihoods and youth interventions and social policy and CLMS support, combined with accurate data collection, the project should be able to achieve its **objectives and targets** within the project period. Progress is above average for IO1 (Education) and IO6 (Awareness Raising); acceptable for IO2 (livelihoods) and IO3 (Youth) and behind schedule for IO4 (Social Protection) and IO5, the latter specifically as concerns implementation of the Child Labor Monitoring System (CLMS). Both IO2 (Livelihoods) and IO3 (Youth) were affected by the four-month delay in initiating the baseline study and by issues related to beneficiary uptake of the direct services offered (for IO2, group dynamics issues among beneficiary HHs; for IO3, skepticism regarding training programs among the first youth cohort).

Wekeza project management has adopted proactive strategies for 2015 to increase beneficiary HH engagement in Commercial Producer Group (CPG) activities and to increase intake of beneficiary youth, which should enable the project to meet its E and L targets this year. However, this goal would be facilitated if the following adjustments were made, in line with beneficiary interests:

- allow more youth 18-24 years of age to pursue vocational training
- allow more beneficiary HHs to pursue non-agricultural Income Generating Activities (IGA) vs. agricultural CPG activities.

In terms of **sustainability** and using the project's eight-pillar sustainability strategy as a reference, the evaluation concludes that the project has made significant progress in two areas: community mobilization and resource replacement and strengthening and that adequate progress has been made in capacity building, integration of project interventions in GoT program priorities, incorporation of child labor language in key policy documents and regulations, structure and system building, publication and promotion of child labor policies and processes, and partnership building.

Effective project **data collection and analysis** has been handicapped by the lack of clean DBMS beneficiary data, faulty DBMS formulas for CMEP data, and insufficient training of VCLC monitors to ensure reliable data collection. A new M&E team is in place since August 2014 and is taking steps to remedy these problems. Given project M&E issues and to streamline the CMEP process at this stage of project implementation, a series of five to eleven CMEP indicators could be cut from the PMP, enabling the M&E team to focus on the most important performance indicators. The school quality of education index indicator is an important measure that should be developed promptly with the Education team, and related data reported by the October 2015 TPR.

The project burn rate has improved from 30% in October 2014 to 57% in January 2015. Adjustments to the budget over the final two years of the project should be geared to maximize project performance, with the most significant value-add appearing to derive from (1) increased CSO field support across education, livelihoods, youth and awareness raising, and (2)

standardization of education services including uniforms, supplies, and shoes to all COBET students and shoes to all primary students; and of start-up funding and tools to all youth graduates.

Conclusions by project component are summarized below.

### EDUCATION

- Education drives the overall Wekeza child labor strategy per stakeholders and beneficiaries
- SCs and SBs strengthening has substantially increased community solidarity (**school feeding**)
- COBET is one of the project's most outstanding achievements (32 centers of which 10 are new)
- Teacher training is highly relevant, with new skills being applied in all Wekeza schools
- National Education Task Force on CL is a critically important step in coordinating CL policies
- Poor infrastructure (latrines, roofs, floors especially) is a serious problem that requires project attention for the well-being of its beneficiary children

### LIVELIHOODS

- “Planting the seed” for LH takes time given group dynamics but is KEY to sustainability
- **VICOBAs** are the glue for livelihoods, building solidarity and confidence
- Anecdotal evidence exists of increases in production (e.g. 5 sacks to 8 sacks of cassava)
- CPGs and IGAs require regular monitoring (bi-weekly if possible)- CSOs could assist
- Demand for IGAs is significantly higher than demand for CPGs

### YOUTH

- Vocational training and enterprise modules are market relevant
- Anecdotal evidence exists of increases in youth income
- Much higher demand among all youth 15-24 years of age for vocational training vs. micro-enterprise and especially vs. micro-franchises
- Micro-franchises are very labor intensive which handicaps the very small Youth team
- Micro-enterprises are most successful among risk-taking youth
- Peer mentoring and start-up tools are critical to sustain youth enterprises
- Increasing size of BSD classes to 50+ may compromise the quality of training

### SOCIAL PROTECTION

- Little progress in beneficiary access to TASAF or CHF

- Critical need to ensure integrated efforts between child labor and child protection – local committees, integrated training and awareness raising
- TASAF could provide useful community-level support to improve school infrastructure

#### INCREASED CAPACITY TO INTEGRATE CL ISSUES INTO POLICY/CLMS

- Strong Wekeza project role in mobilizing national partners post-ILO IPEC
- Need for MoLE ownership and leadership, notably as concerns CLMS
- Base for CLMS exists in Wekeza villages: VCLC monitors, bylaws, DCIs
- Current opportunity to propose child labor as MoLE Big Results Now focus

#### AWARENESS RAISING

- VCLC and SC/SB play key roles in building awareness
- Kiwohede village-level awareness raising strategy well designed and effective
- Slogans work– Mtoto Kwanza!
- Local level awareness raising campaigns may generate more long term benefit than Dar campaigns

### B. Good Practices

There are many established good practices within the Wekeza program and other program initiatives that are still in early stages but may yet become good practice, such as the Child Rights Clubs. The list below includes ten good practices observed by the evaluator and frequently cited by beneficiaries and stakeholders during interviews, in a rough order of priority.

1. **VICOBA**s are low cost activities that create confidence, solidary and resilience among members, with a surprising number of HHs using loans to cover school expenses for their children. The group dynamics of VICOBAs have an important spillover effect on CPG and IGA groups.
2. **COBET Centers** enroll many children who are or have been directly engaged in child labor and who had no hope of reintegrating school. The tremendous appeal of these programs among target villages confirms the need for rebuilding and expanding these programs throughout Tanzania. Costs are minimal since classes are held at primary schools after hours and most COBET teachers volunteer their time to these groups of often-forgotten children. Providing school uniforms, supplies and shoes in Kigoma Region has increased the COBET students' sense of belonging.
3. **School Committee and School Board Strengthening**- Wekeza training for SC/SB members has resulted in increased cooperation between parents and teachers and within villages, with significant accomplishments in terms of community solidarity, scholastic discipline and positive parenting. One exceptional result is the creation of parent-sponsored school feeding programs in primary schools which ensures that the poorest children stay at school for the entire day.

4. **CSO field support to Wekeza** in education, livelihoods, youth and awareness raising activities- local CSO involvement not only provides Wekeza with eyes and ears on the ground, it also builds local capacity to continue child labor advocacy and support services after project end.
5. **DCLC creation** to promote district ownership of the child labor initiative-the broad cast of participants in the DCLCs, ranging from the District Commission to the officers for Social Welfare, Community Development, Trade, Education, and Agriculture, ensures better understanding of child labor issues on the local level and active involvement in activities targeting beneficiaries which lends credibility to Wekeza's programs and enhances its chances for sustainability.
6. **LGA Bylaws outlawing child labor-** the adoption of bylaws on the village, ward and district level that outlaw child labor and identify sanctions for violations is a significant disincentive for families who might still be tempted to send their children into local child labor or to urban areas for underage domestic service. Bylaws are now in place in 13 of 27 Wekeza village in Tanga, with another four villages poised to enact similar measures. This is a good practice for replication in Kigoma.
7. **Regular school inspections** to determinate the quality of education at Wekeza schools- involving school inspectors in regular bi-annual inspections of Wekeza schools provides an opportunity to raise awareness within the MoEVT and among DEOs of the importance of interactive teaching skills, adequate teaching materials and safe school environments.
8. **Community-level awareness raising** using village-level tools such as drama, radio, signs and community dialogue- the success of the Kiwohede-led awareness raising initiatives was recognized in all villages visited. Beneficiary HHs and VCLC members confirmed that they had gained new knowledge of regulations regarding child labor and its negative effects, were prepared to advocate for children's rights and to find means through livelihoods activities and VICOBA's of keeping their children in school.
9. **VCLC monitor training, mentoring and data checks-** given that the project relies on VCLC monitors to track beneficiary progress in meeting its performance objectives, adequate training, mentoring and data checks are critical to collecting accurate data for the Wekeza project and, hopefully, for the subsequent implementation of the CLMS.
10. **Peer mentoring-** given that Wekeza youth are new to the micro-business world with few role models available to them, the project's tactic of selecting successful, entrepreneurial youth as mentors for those who are just starting out is an effective mechanism to build confidence, create linkages and develop good business strategies.

### C. Recommendations

The following list of priority recommendations, grouped by category, builds on the interim evaluation findings and represents the actionable items that the evaluation considers necessary to enhance project performance over the remaining 20 months until project close-out begins.

#### Monitoring and evaluation

- Verify and upload HH, child, youth follow-up form data by end February 2015

- Eliminate 5 indicators from PMP which already includes simpler alternate proxy indicators

**IO2- Livelihoods:**

- target HH with increase in assets (proxy for increase in income but not needed if HHs are reporting if they have increased income);
- % change in unit price of products sold (complex indicator for HHs to report and possible that no change occurs during project period)
- % change in volume per unit area (complex indicator for HH to report; another measure related to increased volume already reported)

**IO5- CL Policy/Capacity Building**

- % LGA actors demonstrating capacity to collect, analyze and disseminate CL data (proxy measure (# LGAs with operational CLMS) is already included)

**IO6- Awareness Raising**

- % of effective awareness raising campaigns (complex measure given qualitative nature; proxy is the other indicator for IO6.1- # persons receiving message)

- Eliminate 6 education indicators if data has not already been collected (75% attendance rates and perseverance)
- Correct DBMS formulas on remaining indicators
- Report on final list of consolidated indicators for March 2015 TPR
- Provide ongoing training and mentoring to VLCL monitors with quality control by Data Managers of follow-up forms submitted for each remaining TPR
- After submission of March 2015 TPR, review CMEP system components- indicators, DCIs, and DBMS generated reports, to determine other possible options for streamlining remaining reports
- Develop school quality index (IO1.2) and measure progress among all Wekeza schools by October 2015 TPR

**Education**

- Standardize inputs and procurement processes across regions for:
  - COBET student uniforms, supplies and shoes
  - Primary school student shoes
- Include part or all of SS exam fees as part of Wekeza beneficiary contribution
- Develop strategy to co-finance repairs to unsafe schools
- Use ToT-trained instructors to provide interactive teaching, Healthy Classrooms and ASER training in non-Wekeza schools

**Livelihoods**

- Identify mechanism for providing bi-weekly monitoring of CPG and IGA activities (e.g. CSOs) in all districts to supplement livelihood staff support
- Adjust targets so that more beneficiary HH can pursue IGA vs. CPG activities
- Collect loan repayment data from VICBOA groups as a proxy to assess the sustainability potential of the VICBOA groups



## Youth

- Provide start-up kits (capital and/or tools) to youth immediately upon graduation
- Allow youth 18-24 to select vocational training as option and reduce the target for microbusiness accordingly, especially microfranchises where there is no spontaneous demand
- Contract youth graduates for Wekeza-purchased uniforms
- Encourage target villages to contract with youth graduates to construct beehives
- Increase the number of BSD classes offered in 2015 instead of increasing class size- 30 persons is a maximum

## Social Protection

- Pilot a community-level TASAF initiative to repair schools with the worst infrastructure problems

## Integration of CL issues into LGA and national policies and programs/CLMS

- Continue CL policy coordination efforts with MoEVT, MoAFS, MoHSW
- Encourage strong MOLE leadership for CLMS and NAP 2
- Provide specialized technical assistance for CLMS creation using local expert in database design
- Coordinate CLMS design with the Prosper project which has its own CL data collection system
- MOL/IP coordination of CLMP-pilot by September 2015
- Train new MOLE inspectors on Child Labor
- Encourage MoLE adoption of Child Labor as **BIG RESULT NOW**
- Distribute draft bylaws to all VCLCs and encourage adoption

## Awareness raising

- Integrate social protection issues into awareness raising campaigns

## Sustainability

- Expand TOT/TDP to other schools in same district then all districts in region
- Organize meetings of all CSOs once every six months to review best practices and feedback.

## **Annex 1.**

### **Terms of Reference**

---

**USDOL/OCFT TERMS OF REFERENCE**  
**INTERIM EVALUATION OF:**  
**WEKEZA: SUPPORTING LIVELIHOODS AND DEVELOPING QUALITY EDUCATION TO STOP**  
**CHILD LABOR**  
**IMPLEMENTED BY: INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE, TANZANIA**

## **I. Background and Justification**

The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) is an office within the Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL). OCFT activities include research on international child labor; supporting U.S. government policy on international child labor; administering and overseeing cooperative agreements with organizations working to eliminate child labor around the world; and raising awareness about child labor issues.

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated over \$900 million to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects to combat exploitive child labor in more than 90 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL range from targeted action programs in specific sectors of work to more comprehensive programs that support national efforts to eliminate child labor. USDOL-funded child labor elimination projects generally seek to achieve five goals:

1. Reducing exploitative child labor, especially the worst forms through the provision of direct educational services and by addressing root causes of child labor, including innovative strategies to promote sustainable livelihoods of target households;
2. Strengthening policies on child labor, education, and sustainable livelihoods, and the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, address its root causes, and promote formal, non-formal and vocational education opportunities to provide children with alternatives to child labor;
3. Raising awareness of exploitative child labor and its root causes, and the importance of education for all children and mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures;
4. Supporting research, evaluation, and the collection of reliable data on child labor, its root causes, and effective strategies, including educational and vocational alternatives, microfinance and other income generating activities to improve household income; and
5. Ensuring the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

The approach of USDOL child labor elimination projects – decreasing the prevalence of exploitive child labor through increased access to education and improving the livelihoods of vulnerable families – is intended to nurture the development, health, safety, and enhanced future employability of children engaged in or at-risk of entering exploitive labor. USDOL-funded child labor elimination projects are designed to ensure that children in areas with high incidence of child labor are withdrawn and integrated into educational settings, and that they persist in their education once enrolled. In parallel the program seeks to avert at-risk children from leaving school and entering child labor. Projects are based on the notion that elimination of exploitative child labor depends to a large extent on improving access to, quality of, and relevance of education. Without improving educational quality and relevance, children withdrawn/prevented from child labor may not have viable alternatives and could resort to other forms of hazardous work.

In FY2010, Congress provided new authority to ILAB to expand activities related to income generating activities, including microfinance, to help projects expand income generation and address poverty more effectively. The addition of this livelihood focus is based on the premise that if adult family members have sustainable livelihoods, they will be less likely to have their dependent children work and more likely to keep them to school.

The approach of USDOL child labor elimination projects – decreasing the prevalence of exploitive child labor through increased access to education and improving the livelihoods of vulnerable families – is intended to nurture the development, health, safety, and enhanced future employability of children engaged in or at-risk of entering exploitive labor.

## Project Context

In Tanzania, an estimated 20% of children between the ages of 5-17 years are engaged in hazardous child labor, with children in rural areas four times as likely to be engaged in hazardous labor compared to their urban counterparts.<sup>7</sup> The minimum age for employment in Tanzania is 14 years. For hazardous work the minimum age is 18 years and for light work (household chores, etc.) 12 years. According to the Integrated Labor Force Survey (ILFS) (2006), 60% of working Tanzanian children are in the commercial agricultural sector, working in sisal, tobacco and tea plantations and orange farms where they are involved in land tilling, sowing, weeding, and harvesting. In its worst forms, children are engaged in prostitution or unpaid servitude and are trafficked outside Tanzania for employment and other purposes. Many of these children are over-worked, not paid at all or paid very low wages, and in most cases are prone to further risk of sexual exploitation.

Poverty has been identified as the principal cause of households relying on child labor. Although the first poverty reduction strategy, MKUKUTA I (2005), made significant gains in education, delivery of health services, and social safety nets, the benefits were more widely felt by urban households than rural households. The 2008 world economic crisis left vulnerable households even less able to meet their basic needs, leading to increased reliance on child labor to support the family and a reversal of previous gains in-school enrollment and retention.

Parental and cultural attitudes also play a major role in child labor. According to the ILFS (2006), households engage their children in work so that they get a proper upbringing (37.9%), assist in the household enterprise (31.4%) and supplement household income (22.1%). Other factors were the low value families place on girls' education in particular, and lack of money to pay for the associated costs of primary education (i.e. uniforms, scholastic materials, contributions to school maintenance) and school fees at secondary level. Some parents stated that their households would benefit more from the income earned from child labor than from sending their children to school.

The educational achievements of these children are often compromised because they either do not attend school or their schooling suffers from long hours dedicated to long hours of hard work as hawkers, trading assistants, mechanics in garages, assistants in carpentry workshops, domestic servants, house cleaners, cooks and hostesses in restaurants and bars. In addition these children are exposed to HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases, sexual abuse, defilement and rape; teenage pregnancies, health complications particularly chest infections; a myriad of psychosocial effects, mental and physical retardation/stunting. In the worst cases, some children lose their life through engaging in hazardous forms of work that greatly exceeds their ability both in age and physical capacity.

From the scale and numbers alone, it is clear that child labor is a major developmental challenge in Tanzania. Elimination of child labor is an issue high on the agenda of the Government of Tanzania (GoT) which has ratified both Convention 138 (minimum age) and Convention 182 (WFCL). Since ratifying the principal International Labor Organization (ILO) conventions on child labor (1998 and 2001), the GoT has expended considerable effort on child protection policy formulation and legislation on behalf of children and has made strides in recent years to improve support to most vulnerable children (MVC) and broaden the scope of social protection programs available to such children. In addition, Tanzania was one of the first African countries to participate in the ILO's International Time Bound Program (TBP) to eliminate the worst forms of child labor (WFCL). The program, which started in 2001, targeted child labor in agriculture, domestic service, mining, fishing, and prostitution. However the continued prevalence of hazardous child labor in the country indicates a gap between policy initiatives at the national level and direct impact at the regional, district, and community level.

The country's first child labor law in 2004 changed the way Tanzanians perceive child labor, but its full impact was hindered by a number of factors. The more recent Law of the Child Act (2009) harmonizes all mainland laws pertaining to children. The law defines a child's right to work, describes the types of employment from which children are prohibited and defines the penalties associated with breaking the law. However, the regulations presented in this law are not widely known because resources have not been made available to translate the law into Kiswahili or to organize awareness raising campaigns at all levels. While the National Action Plan for Elimination of Child Labor (NAP) (2009) outlines a clear strategy for engaging multiple sectors in combating child labor, complementing the most recent poverty reduction strategy, MKUKUTA II (2010), inadequate resources have been allocated for its implementation. Moreover, child labor data is not widely

---

<sup>7</sup> National Bureau of Statistics, Integrated Labor Force Survey (ILFS) 2006

available at any level of the government. The Child Labor Monitoring System (CLMS), though a priority in the TBP and a component of the NAP (2009), is not operational in most of the country.

### **Project Specific Information**

In December 2012, OCFT awarded a \$10 million cooperative agreement to the International Rescue Committee (IRC) to implement a project entitled WEKEZA (*Wezeshu Ustawi, Endeleva Kiwango cha Elimu Kuzuia Ajira Kwa Watoto*, or, in English: *INVEST: Supporting Livelihoods and Developing Quality Education to Stop Child Labor*). The project is implemented in close collaboration with the Government of Tanzania by a consortium of partners including IRC, World Vision, Kiota Women Health and Development (KIWOHEDE), Tanga Youth Development Association (TAYODEA), the Foundation for Civil Society (FCS) and the University of Dar es Salaam's Institute for Development Studies (IDS).

**Project Objective:** The project is designed to provide services to at-risk and working children and their families to reduce the incidence of child labor in the agriculture and domestic service sectors in two regions of Tanzania: Kigoma and Tanga. Both regions are significant producers of tobacco, sisal and oranges, most of which rely on smallholder family farms and out-grower schemes where child labor is prevalent.

In addition to the agricultural sector, child labor is manifested in the domestic service sector, stone and sand quarries, hotels and bars. Due to its hidden nature, child labor in domestic service is a complex issue to understand, monitor, and regulate. Approximately 31.5% of employed children between the ages of 5-9 are employed in the industry labeled —Private Households with Employed Persons, compared to 7.2% of children 10-14 and 9.1% of youth 15-17, with girls more prevalent in the sector than boys. Without proper protection, young children, especially girls, are susceptible to abuse and exploitation. Tanga has become a prominent source region for child domestic laborers, due in part to its easy access to Dar es Salaam. While not known nationally as a supplier region for domestic workers, Kigoma has a large number of children leaving to seek domestic work in cities as well, due in part to abusive family situations, and contributing to high drop outs rates. WEKEZA supports robust participatory awareness raising efforts on child labor in domestic services, at the village, district, and national levels and also rigorous research, evaluation and data collection on child labor in this sector.

In its target regions, WEKEZA works in six districts 19 wards and 54 villages.

The program also sensitizes families and employers to the problem and invests in social protection mechanisms for children removed from the labor force. Activities include awareness raising, social protection of children, vocational training center support, and strengthening institutional capacity and policies. The project delivers alternative livelihood and income-generating options for families who sent their children into the workforce for their own economic survival. It works with partners to operationalize a database and monitoring system that can track the use of child labor.

### **Projected Impacts**

The project's direct beneficiaries include 8,000 children aged 5-17; 4,200 youth aged 15-24, and their households up to a total of 3,360 households. Of the 8000 children, 4500 will be supported with scholarships and scholastic materials to access primary school; 2000 will be supported with scholarships and scholastic materials to access secondary school; and 1500 will be provided with similar support to access non-formal education via COBET. Of the 4200 youth, 3500 will be provided with enhanced access to vocational training and employment opportunities and another 700 will be linked to companies who will provide them with micro-franchising opportunities. Of the 3360 households, the project targets increased income among 2400 households due to improved agricultural production and marketing and among 960 households due to new, alternative income generating activities.

Direct education services (scholarships and scholastic materials) will be provided to two cohorts of 4000, the first enrolled in formal or non-formal education by December 2013 and the second by December 2014. All other education activities (quality and community support) will continue through project end.

Livelihoods services (value chain analysis, producer group formation, production training, marketing support, micro-finance facilitation) will be provided to 3360 households. Services were initiated in July 2013, and will continue over the life of project.

Youth employment services needs assessment and company mapping began in May 2013. Curriculum development and training implementation and business support services began in July 2013. Business support services will continue through the end of the project.

## II. Purpose and Scope of the Interim Evaluation

**Evaluation Purpose:** The purpose of the WEKEZA Interim Evaluation is to assess and potentially address aspects of the project that are showing challenges in implementation, or that may benefit from a deeper inspection and analysis of how they are contributing to the overall project results. Recommendations as appropriate, synthesized from the evaluation and the evaluator’s expertise will be appreciated.

### Intended Users

The evaluation will provide OCFT, the grantee, other project stakeholders, and stakeholders working to combat child labor more broadly, an assessment of the project’s experience in implementation and its effects on project beneficiaries. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations will serve to inform any project adjustments that may need to be made, and to inform stakeholders in the design and implementation of subsequent phases or future child labor elimination projects as appropriate. The evaluation report will be published on the USDOL website, so the report should be written as a standalone document, providing the necessary background information for readers who are unfamiliar with the details of the project.

### Questions for Tanzania Interim Evaluation:

1. The project supported school inspectors to conduct inspections of the schools that child beneficiaries are attending. In particular, the project noted in the October 2014 TPR that the Kwamzindawa Primary School only had 2 classrooms in good condition, with the rest in poor condition, noting that “the whole building poses serious threat to pupils’ lives.” USDOL would like the evaluator to meet with the school inspectors and/or obtain copies of the inspection reports, assess schools during site visits, and determine if the project has a viable resolution to the problem. Are beneficiary children safe while attending school?
2. In reviewing the October 2014 TPR, it appears that the project is delayed in meeting most of its CMEP targets but is already close to meeting its E1 and L1 targets. Please assess progress made in implementing the project and achieving yearly targets, and estimate if the project is likely to achieve its objectives. Please examine and identify the reasons for the delays in meeting other CMEP targets, and provide recommendations for how to improve the delivery of these services.
3. Please assess the process of collecting the data reported under the CMEP. Are there adjustments that need to be made which would benefit and streamline the data collection process? Please do a spot check on data quality and accuracy.
4. Is the project collecting reliable data on the work and educational status of beneficiary children? How may this be improved?
5. Have the financial services activities (VICOBAs) been successful and why or why not?
6. Please assess the project’s work under IO3 to increase employment among target youth ages 15-24. In particular, please look at the micro-franchising interventions in both Tanga and Kigoma and the entrepreneurship modules based on the *Street Kids International Business Toolkit*. Are the interventions market-relevant? Are they effective in increasing employment among target youth?
7. Please assess the steps the project is taking to address child labor in domestic service. Have community attitudes toward child labor in domestic service changed since the start of the project?
8. If time permits please map CMEP data to the Results Framework.

The evaluation methodology will consist of the following activities and approaches:

#### **A. Approach**

The evaluation approach will be qualitative and participatory in nature, and use project documents including CMEP data to provide quantitative information. Qualitative information will be obtained through field visits, interviews and focus groups as appropriate. Opinions coming from beneficiaries (teachers, parents and children) will improve and clarify the use of quantitative analysis. The participatory nature of the evaluation will contribute to the sense of ownership among beneficiaries.

Quantitative data will be drawn from the CMEP and project reports to the extent that it is available and

incorporated in the analysis. The evaluation approach will be independent in terms of the membership of the evaluation team. Project staff and implementing partners will generally only be present in meetings with stakeholders, communities, and beneficiaries to provide introductions. The following additional principles will be applied during the evaluation process:

1. Methods of data collection and stakeholder perspectives will be triangulated for as many as possible of the evaluation questions.
2. Efforts will be made to include parents' and children's voices and beneficiary participation generally, using child-sensitive approaches to interviewing children following the ILO-IPEC guidelines on research with children on the worst forms of child labor (<http://www.ilo.org/ipecinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=3026>) and UNICEF Principles for Ethical Reporting on Children ([http://www.unicef.org/media/media\\_tools\\_guidelines.html](http://www.unicef.org/media/media_tools_guidelines.html)).
3. Gender and cultural sensitivity will be integrated in the evaluation approach.
4. Consultations will incorporate a degree of flexibility to maintain a sense of ownership of the stakeholders and beneficiaries, allowing additional questions to be posed that are not included in the TOR, whilst ensuring that key information requirements are met.
5. As far as possible, a consistent approach will be followed in each project site, with adjustments made for the different actors involved, activities conducted, and the progress of implementation in each locality.

## **B. Evaluation Team**

The evaluation team will consist of:

1. International evaluator- Deborah Orsini
2. As appropriate an interpreter fluent in necessary languages will travel with the evaluator

One member of the project staff may travel with the team to make introductions. This person is not involved in the evaluation process.

Ms. Orsini will be responsible for refining the methodology in consultation with USDOL, and the project staff; assigning the tasks of the interpreter for the field work; directly conducting interviews and facilitating other data collection processes; analysis of the evaluation material gathered; presenting feedback on the initial findings of the evaluation to the national stakeholder meeting and preparing the evaluation report.

The responsibility of the interpreter in each provincial locality is to ensure that the evaluator is understood by the stakeholders as far as possible, and that the information gathered is relayed accurately to the evaluator.

## **C. Data Collection Methodology**

1. Document Review
  - Pre-field visit preparation includes extensive review of relevant documents
  - During fieldwork, documentation will be verified and additional documents may be collected
  - Documents may include:
    - CMEP documents
    - Baseline survey reports
    - Project document and revisions,
    - Cooperative Agreement,
    - Technical Progress and Status Reports,
    - Project Results Frameworks and Monitoring Plans,
    - Work plans,
    - Correspondence related to Technical Progress Reports,
    - Management Procedures and Guidelines,
    - Research or other reports undertaken (baseline studies, etc.), and
    - Project files (including school records) as appropriate.

2. Question Matrix

Before beginning fieldwork, the evaluator will create a question matrix, which outlines the source of data from where the evaluator plans to collect information for each TOR question. This will help the evaluator make decisions as to how they are going to allocate their time in the field. It will also help the evaluator to ensure that

she is exploring all possible avenues for data triangulation and to clearly note where evaluation findings are coming from.

### 3. Interviews with stakeholders

Informational interviews will be held with as many project stakeholders as possible. The evaluator will solicit the opinions of children, community members in areas where awareness-raising activities occurred, parents of beneficiaries, teachers, government representatives, legal authorities, union and NGO officials, the action program implementers, and program staff regarding the project's accomplishments, program design, sustainability, and the working relationship between project staff and their partners, where appropriate. Depending on the circumstances, these meetings will be one-on-one or group interviews. Technically, stakeholders are all those who have an interest in a project, for example, as implementers, direct and indirect beneficiaries, community leaders, donors, and government officials. Thus, it is anticipated that meetings will be held with:

- OCFT staff responsible for this evaluation and project prior to the commencement of the field work
- Implementers at all levels, including child labor monitors involved in assessing whether children have been effectively prevented or withdrawn from child labor situations
- Headquarters, Country Director, Project Managers, and Field Staff of Grantee and Partner Organizations
- Government Ministry Officials and Local Government Officials who have been involved in or are knowledgeable about the project
- Community leaders, members, and volunteers
- School teachers, assistants, school directors, education personnel
- Project beneficiaries (children withdrawn and prevented and their parents)
- International NGOs and multilateral agencies working in the area
- Other child protection or education organizations, committees and experts in the area
- U.S. Embassy staff member

### 4. Field Visits

The evaluator will visit a selection of project sites. The final selection of field sites to be visited will be made by the evaluator. Every effort should be made to include some sites where the project experienced successes and others that encountered challenges, as well as a good cross section of sites across targeted CL sectors. During the visits, the evaluator will observe the activities and outputs developed by the project. Focus groups with children and parents will be held, and interviews will be conducted with representatives from local governments, NGOs, community leaders and teachers.

### **D. Ethical Considerations and Confidentiality**

The evaluator will observe utmost confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. To mitigate bias during the data collection process and ensure a maximum freedom of expression of the implementing partners, stakeholders, communities, and beneficiaries, implementing partner staff will generally not be present during interviews. However, implementing partner staff may accompany the evaluator to make introductions whenever necessary, to facilitate the evaluation process, make respondents feel comfortable, and to allow the evaluator to observe the interaction between the implementing partner staff and the interviewees.

### **E. Stakeholder Meeting**

Following the field visits, a stakeholders meeting will be conducted by the evaluator that brings together a wide range of stakeholders, including the implementing partners and other interested parties. The list of participants to be invited will be drafted prior to the evaluator's visit and confirmed in consultation with project staff during fieldwork.

The meeting will be used to present the major preliminary findings and emerging issues, solicit recommendations, and obtain clarification or additional information from stakeholders, including those not interviewed earlier. The agenda of the meeting will be determined by the evaluator in consultation with project staff. Some specific questions for stakeholders may be prepared to guide the discussion and possibly a brief written feedback form.

As appropriate, the agenda will include the following items:

1. Presentation by the evaluator of the preliminary main findings



2. Feedback and questions from stakeholders on the findings
3. Opportunity for implementing partners not met to present their views on progress and challenges in their locality
4. Possible Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) exercise on the project's performance
5. Discussion of recommendations to improve the implementation and ensure sustainability.  
Consideration will be given to the value of distributing a feedback form for participants to nominate their "action priorities" for the remainder of the project.

A debrief call will be held with the evaluator and USDOL after the stakeholder workshop to provide USDOL with preliminary findings and solicit feedback if necessary.

#### **F. Limitations**

Fieldwork for the evaluation will last two weeks, on average, and the evaluator will not have enough time to visit all project sites. As a result, the evaluator will not be able to take all sites into consideration when formulating their findings. All efforts will be made to ensure that the evaluator is visiting a representative sample of sites, including some that have performed well and some that have experienced challenges.

This is not a formal impact assessment. Findings for the evaluation will be based on information collected from background documents and in interviews with stakeholders, project staff, and beneficiaries. The accuracy of the evaluation findings will be determined by the integrity of information provided to the evaluator from these sources.

Furthermore, the ability of the evaluator to determine efficiency will be limited by the amount of financial data available. A cost-efficiency analysis is not included because it would require impact data which is not available.

#### **G. Timetable**

The tentative timetable is as follows. Actual dates may be adjusted as needs arise.

TASK	DATE
Background project documents sent to Contractor	12-11-14
ToR Template submitted to Contractor	12-15-14
Draft TOR sent to OCFT	12-18-14
Logistics call-Discuss logistics and field itinerary	12-19-14
Identify a list of stakeholders	12-19-14
Cable clearance information submitted to USDOL	12-19-14
Finalize field itinerary and stakeholder list for workshop	12-26-14
Question matrix submitted by evaluator	12-26-14
Finalize TOR with USDOL and submit to Grantee	12-29-14
Fieldwork	1-19-15 to 1-30-15
Post-fieldwork debrief call	2-6-15
Draft report to MSI for Quality Control review	2-13-15
Draft report to USDOL for 48 hour review	2-20-15
Draft report to DOL and grantee for comments	2-24-15
Comments due from DOL and grantee	3-10-15
Report revised and sent to MSI for quality review	3-16-15
Revised report to USDOL	3-18-15
USDOL approval to finalize report	3-25-15
Final report to USDOL	4-8-15

### **III. Expected Outputs/Deliverables**

Ten working days following the evaluator's return from fieldwork, a first draft evaluation report will be submitted to MSI for quality review. The report should have the following structure and content:

- I. Table of Contents
- II. List of Acronyms
- III. Executive Summary (providing an overview of the evaluation, summary of main findings/lessons learned/good practices, and key recommendations)
- IV. Evaluation Objectives and Methodology
- V. Project Description
- VI. Evaluation Questions
  - A. Answers to each of the evaluation questions, with supporting evidence included
- VII. Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations
  - A. Findings – the facts, with supporting evidence
  - B. Conclusions – interpretation of the facts, including criteria for judgments
  - C. Key Recommendations - critical for successfully meeting project objectives – judgments on what changes need to be made for future programming
  - D. Other Recommendations – as needed
  - E. Lessons Learned and Best Practices
- VIII. Annexes - including list of documents reviewed; interviews/meetings/site visits; stakeholder workshop agenda and participants; TOR; etc.

The total length of the report should be approximately 30 pages for the main report, excluding the executive summary and annexes.

The first draft of the report will be circulated to OCFT and key stakeholders individually for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated and incorporated into the final reports as appropriate, and the evaluator will provide a response to OCFT, in the form of a comment matrix, as to why any comments might not have been incorporated.

While the substantive content of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report shall be determined by the evaluator, the report is subject to final approval by ILAB/OCFT in terms of whether or not the report meets the conditions of the TOR.

#### **IV. Evaluation Management and Support**

MSI senior evaluator Deborah Orsini will carry out this evaluation. Ms. Orsini has 30 years of experience in development evaluation and has been responsible for facilitating two OCFT Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plans (CMEP). Ms. Orsini has worked for over 25 years in Africa, with 8 years of short term technical experience on projects in Tanzania.

The evaluator will work with OCFT, International Rescue Committee and its local partners to evaluate this project.

MSI will provide all logistical and administrative support for its evaluator, including travel arrangements (plane and hotel reservations, purchasing plane tickets, providing per diem) and all materials needed to produce all deliverables. MSI will also be responsible for the management and technical oversight necessary to ensure consistency of methods and technical standards and to provide complete copy editing and formatting of the final report.

## **Annex 2.**

### **Questions Matrix**

---

**QUESTIONS MATRIX- WEKEZA- FINAL 1-16-15**

Question	Data sources	
	Interviews/Site Visits	Documents
<b>DESIGN</b>		
<p><b>To what extent did the project design (6 components, area-based approach and two-tier local partners) support the achievement of project objectives and related targets?</b> Which components were most effective in relation to their objectives and why (best practices)? What lessons can be learned from implementation? Which aspects appear to offer potential for sustainability?</p>		<p>CMEP Technical Progress Reports (TPR) ProDoc Work Plan</p>
<b>IMPLEMENTATION – IO-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS</b>		
<p><b>IO1- Education: Are beneficiary children safe while attending school?</b> The project supported school inspectors to inspect schools that child beneficiaries are attending. The October 2014 TPR noted that the Kwamzindawa Primary School only had two classrooms in good condition, with the rest in poor condition, adding “the whole building poses serious threat to pupils’ lives.” Please meet with school inspectors and/or obtain copies of inspection reports, <u>assess schools during site visits</u>, and determine if the project has a viable resolution to the problem.</p>		<p>TPRs School inspection reports School inspection checklist</p>
<p><b>IO2- Livelihoods: Have financial services activities (savings through VICOBAs) been successful?</b> Why or why not?</p>		<p>TPRs</p>
<p><b>IO2- Livelihoods: What evidence exists of increase in income among target HHs?</b></p>		<p>TPRs Description of agric training materials</p>
<p><b>IO3- Youth Employment: How effective have the youth employment components (micro-franchising and vocational training) been in increasing beneficiary incomes? Are the micro-franchising interventions and the entrepreneurship modules market-relevant?</b> Please assess project work under IO3 to increase employment among target youth ages 15-24. In particular, please look at the micro-franchising interventions in Tanga and Kigoma and the entrepreneurship modules based on the <i>Street Kids International Business Toolkit</i>.</p>		<p>TPRs Copies of curriculum for entrepreneurship modules</p>
<p><b>6. IO6- Awareness raising: Have community attitudes toward child labor, notably in domestic service, changed since the start of the project? What has been the role of SC and SB in community level awareness raising?</b> Please assess the steps the project is taking to address child labor in domestic service.</p>		<p>TPRs Report on CL in domestic service Copies of awareness building materials (posters, brochures, stickers, banners)</p>

**QUESTIONS MATRIX- WEKEZA- FINAL 1-16-15**

Question	Data sources	
	Interviews/Site Visits	Documents
<b>DATA COLLECTION</b>		
<p>7. What process is used to <b>collect data</b> reported under the CMEP? What adjustments might be made to improve and streamline the data collection process? Please do a spot check on data quality and accuracy, notably as concerns the work and educational status of children.</p>		<p>TPRs Data Collection Instruments Data collection protocols DBMS</p>
<p>8. Per the October 2014 TPR, the Project appears <b>delayed in meeting most of its CMEP targets</b> but is already <b>close to meeting its E1 and L1 targets</b>. What progress has been made in implementing the project and achieving yearly targets? Is the project is likely to achieve its objectives? What are the reasons for delays in meeting other CMEP targets? Provide recommendations for how to improve the delivery of these services, including consideration of the role of the private sector in child labor elimination. Please map CMEP data to the <b>Results Framework</b></p>		<p>CMEP TPRs DBMS</p>
<p><b>9. What if any unexpected results have occurred?</b> Consider: COBETs, peer mentorship, expanded inclusion of CL issues in social protection programs</p>		<p>TPRs</p>

## **Annex 3.**

### **Persons Interviewed**

---

This page intentionally blank in accordance with Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) of 2002, Public Law 107-347

## **Annex 4.**

### **Evaluation Schedule**

---



This page intentionally blank in accordance with Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) of 2002, Public Law 107-347

## **Annex 5.**

### **National Stakeholders Meeting Agenda and Attendees**

**Interim Evaluation: National Stakeholders Feedback Workshop**  
**January 30<sup>th</sup> 2015 Serena Hotel, Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania**

TIME	ACTIVITY	FACILITATOR
8:00 - 8:30 a.m.	Registration	
8:30 - 9:00	Opening Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome and opening remarks –IRC Country Director</li> <li>• Introduction of participants</li> <li>• Overview of the Program and objectives</li> </ul>	
9:00 – 9:15	Introduction of the Interim Evaluation Overview of the program for the day	
9:15 – 10:30	<b>Group Discussion: Achievements and Challenges</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Education</li> <li>2. Livelihoods</li> <li>3. Youth</li> <li>4. Awareness-Raising</li> <li>5. Social Protection/Policy/CLMS</li> <li>6. Sustainability</li> <li>7. M&amp;E/Data Collection</li> </ol>	
10:30 -10:45	Refreshment Break	
10:45-12:00	Group Presentations	
12:00– 12:45	Presentation/discussion of preliminary findings of the Interim Evaluation	
12:00 – 12:45	<b>Group Discussion: Looking forward</b> Question: What are your recommendations for the remaining two years of project life to strengthen results? What more needs to be done and by whom?	
12:45-1:30	Each group present its recommendations Plenary discussion following presentations.	
1:30-2:00	Closing remarks	
2:00-2:15	Launch of Yellow Card Campaign against Domestic Work	
2:15 – 3:00	Lunch and Departure	

This page intentionally blank in accordance with Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) of 2002, Public Law 107-347

## **Annex 6.**

### **Stakeholder Feedback**

---

## STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK

Results	Challenges	Best Practices	Recommendations
<b>EDUCATION TEAM</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased enrollment of pupils in schools (76% -98%)</li> <li>Increased attendance</li> <li>Active school committees and schools boards in WEKEZA target schools</li> <li>Increased pass rate among pupils</li> <li>Strengthened COBET Centres and facilitators</li> <li>Increased awareness among parents with regard to Child labor issues</li> </ul> <p><b>Unexpected Result:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High level of collaboration among different stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient infrastructure in schools (desks, classrooms, latrines)</li> <li>Lack of school quality assurance (school inspection)</li> <li>Shortage of teachers in most schools</li> <li>Irresponsible parents/guardians</li> <li>Inactive guidance and counseling teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Child Rights Clubs</li> <li>Advocacy on school feeding program</li> <li>Integration of education sector and livelihood sector for sustainability purposes</li> <li>Increased networking among education stakeholders</li> <li>Increased interactive training among teachers via in-service training on methodology</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvement of school infrastructure (latrines, teacher houses, classrooms, water points, desks)</li> <li>Continued community sensitization on need for School Improvement Plan</li> <li>Work with LGAs to establish education fund to support needy/CL children</li> <li>Mainstream child labor issues in education system</li> <li>More training of teachers on CL issues</li> <li>Two additional education facilitators per region so one per district</li> <li>Add vehicle for education in Kigoma</li> <li>Advocate for inclusion of CL issues in the LGAs plans</li> <li>Facilitate CSO mobility to reach target areas</li> <li>Provide equipment to teachers (laptops for data collection)</li> <li>Strengthen school counselors to provide psychosocial services</li> <li>Support school inspectorate to conduct inspection in project schools</li> <li>Roundtable meeting with District Education Officials.</li> <li>Establish bylaws</li> <li>Train WEKEZA teachers on Healing Classroom Model</li> </ul>
<b>LIVELIHOODS TEAM</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased awareness of effect of CL</li> <li>Increased HH access to savings/loans</li> <li>Increased production/ unit area (Demo)</li> <li>Increased household income</li> <li>Increased farming techniques</li> <li>Improved beekeeping techniques</li> <li>Increased understanding of importance of education</li> <li>Increased work ethic</li> <li>Increased responsibility for children</li> <li>Increased employment for youth</li> </ul> <p><b>Unexpected Result:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VICOBA loans for school fees/materials, health, home improvement, business starts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distance for children to go to schools</li> <li>Dispersion of project villages – only a few HHs reached by WEKEZA</li> <li>Some vulnerable HHs with children were not in target households</li> <li>Distance to market</li> <li>Lack of farm implements (tech. gap)</li> <li>Some HHs not willing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishment of VICOBA</li> <li>Increased commitment to engage in entrepreneurship activities</li> <li>Engaging in beekeeping that promote livelihoods diversification</li> <li>Promote environmental conservation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale up acquired improved techniques (farming, entrepreneurship, financial management skills – margin analysis skills/ record keeping)</li> <li>Exchange learning visits among better performing groups</li> <li>Focus on market linkages- promote bulk production</li> <li>Mobilize input suppliers forum with CPGs to buy and use improved inputs</li> <li>Train model farmers (ToT) for regular follow up</li> <li>Increase Livelihood Facilitators (1 per district)</li> <li>Scale down number of value chains supported to reach an optimal number for measuring project success/results</li> <li>Scale up IGA interventions and increase options for those who are not attracted to agric activities</li> <li>Move out of demo plots and to on-farm support for beneficiaries.</li> </ul>

## STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK

	to participate in groups		
<b>YOUTH TEAM</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2369 youth trained in Vocational, Micro business, linked to micro-franchise</li> <li>• 50% supported with inputs including start-up capital and in-kind/materials</li> <li>• Youth are self-employed and earning income</li> <li>• Unexpected Results:</li> <li>• Many 18-24yrs interested in VTC</li> <li>• Literacy increased among trainees.</li> <li>• Improved hygiene among youth in Kigoma.</li> <li>• Youth increasingly motivated to continue studying</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inability to meet youth expectations for seed money or equipment</li> <li>• Budget constraints to cover all VTC expenses</li> <li>• Low contribution from Parents (e.g. transport)</li> <li>• Community mindset (Free Masons)</li> <li>• Low literacy levels</li> <li>• Cheating on age for VTC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained youth have started own businesses.</li> <li>• Supportive companies on micro franchises initiatives.</li> <li>• Vocational training/courses offer youth opportunity to select their focus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase WEKEZA budget to top up capital support to youth in micro enterprise and micro franchises.</li> <li>• Increase Wekeza budget to cover all basic VTC costs, including transport</li> <li>• Regular stakeholders meetings at local/village level with LGAs</li> <li>• CSOs increase awareness-raising to dismantle wrongly perceived notion and limited understanding about the project.</li> <li>• Provide guidance and mentorship support</li> <li>• Raise awareness to dismantle wrongly perceived, pre-mature thinking and limited understanding.</li> </ul>
<b>SOCIAL PROTECTION/POLICY/CLMS TEAM</b>			
<i>Social Protection</i>			
<p>Mapping study on available social protection in the project areas;            Study on the impact of CCT in combating CL;            Community mobilization through DCLCs            National Stakeholder Dialogue on SP            CLC structures through which SP is disseminated to the community;            Working with the Government Task Force on SP to mainstream CL into SP Framework</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ToT approach may not work well in our context;</li> <li>• CHF services are confined;</li> <li>• SP services coverage is very limited</li> <li>• SP challenges are national concern</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CLCS/MVCC are the best conduit for SP message to the community;</li> <li>• Training to CLCs on SP issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WEKEZA should collaborate with relevant institutions on mobilizing community to access SP services, such as CHF, District Education Fund, Youth Development Fund, Women Development Fund, and others;</li> <li>• Wekeza should continue to collaborate with the Government Task Force, which is finalizing the pending draft to ensure that CL issues are integrated into the National SP Framework;</li> <li>• Wekeza should carry out advocacy on available SP services in the community;</li> <li>• WEKEZA should directly support its beneficiaries to access some of the existing SP services, such as CHF and TASAF/TIKA.</li> </ul>
<i>Child Labor Monitoring System</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ToT on CLMS</li> <li>• Provision of computers to DCLCS;</li> <li>• Organized stakeholders meeting on CLMS;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate coordination among CL actors;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CL actors in collaboration with MoLE have agreed to harmonize CLMS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WEKEZA should collaborate with MoLE and other actors to ensure CLMS is harmonized, tested, validated, piloted, up scaled</li> <li>• The Project should build the capacity of Child Labor Unit at MoLE in managing and overseeing implementation of CLMS (<i>Capacity</i>)</li> </ul>

STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working with MoLE and other CL actors to harmonize CLMS</li> </ul>			<i>building interms trained and equipment).</i>
<i>Policy</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WEKEZA is working with MoVT toward mainstreaming CL in Education sector;</li> <li>WEKEZA in collaboration with MoAFS is working toward mainstreaming CL into Agriculture Sector Development Strategy II;</li> <li>WEKEZA in collaboration with PMO is working toward mainstreaming CL into SP draft, being finalized by the GoT Task Force</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GoT only changes policy</li> <li>Process for reviewing/ proposing policy is done through task forces/ working groups, which have cost implications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Involvement of stakeholders is essential in lobbying for policy review;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WEKEZA should continue to collaborate with GoT and LGAs to enact new bylaws and enforce existing laws prohibiting child labor</li> <li>Wekeza should continue lobbying GoT to ensure child labor issues are featured in key policies, plans and strategies (e.g. <i>Education Policy, Agric. Sector Dev. Strategy II &amp; Agric. Sector Dev. Plan II, National Social Protection Framework, Vision 2025, Big Results Now, etc;</i></li> <li>WEKEZA should support GoT to evaluate National Action Plan (NAP) for Elimination of Child Labor implementation, and to review/develop NAP II.</li> </ul>
AWARENESS RAISING TEAM			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visibility of child labor issues at national and local level e.g. WDAFL, DAC</li> <li>Creation of workable structures which help in child labor advocacy (CRC)</li> <li>Increased community awareness on CL issues (use of drama, community meetings)</li> <li>Integration of CL into existing LGA plans</li> <li>Increase opportunity to access education</li> <li>WEKEZA has supported trade unions to identify children working in mining</li> <li>Awareness raising to parents/guardians helps school attendance hence reduced child labor</li> <li>Unexpected Results:</li> <li>Other forms of child labor outside agriculture/domestic service have high magnitude (fishing, brick making, mining)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multiple existing structures hinder efforts for service delivery to children</li> <li>Difficulties in reaching peripheral areas due to budget constrains</li> <li>Language barriers,</li> <li>Transport problem for the awareness raising component</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community involvement in implementation</li> <li>Inclusion of project activities in village plan and activities through VCLC</li> <li>WEKEZA partners reach out to community greatly intensifies fight vs. child labor</li> <li>Use of existing structures such as MVCC, VCLC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct more awareness raising campaigns through community dialogue, community media, radio listeners clubs, targeting local people, employers, investors, law enforcers, children, teachers,</li> <li>Strengthen activities of child rights clubs to raise awareness of the community on CL</li> <li>Collaborate with children councils existing in the areas for awareness raising campaign</li> <li>Refresher training for focal teachers working with children for awareness raising in schools</li> <li>Conduct more village/street meetings for awareness raising</li> <li>Carry out awareness raising campaign through mobile vans</li> <li>Train behavioral change agents for awareness raising at village level</li> <li>Develop and produce IEC materials</li> <li>Identify strategy partners in awareness raising such as Radio, TV, communication networks etc.</li> </ul>



STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK			
<b>M&amp;E TEAM</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of DCIs which collect data and specific information from target beneficiaries for reporting on project indicators</li> <li>Verification of data collected and entered into the DBMS</li> <li>Audit of project data in the DBMS</li> <li>Training VCLC Monitors on data collection</li> <li>Development of TMIS – under construction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low monitoring capacity of some VCLC Monitors</li> <li>Few human resources</li> <li>Data quality issues</li> <li>Delayed baseline survey delayed M&amp;E processes</li> <li>DBMS unable to generate indicator-based reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of trained VCLCs to support in data collection</li> <li>Field verification of data accuracy and completeness</li> <li>Regular DBMS data audit</li> <li>Use of CSO M&amp;E officers in data collection/entry</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthen CSO M&amp;E officers and data clerks re data quality</li> <li>Continue to mentor/coach VCLCs on data collection</li> <li>Ensure a functional DBMS to report on project indicators</li> <li>Strengthen capacity of LGAs on data management ( CLMS)</li> <li>Reallocation of funds to accommodate additional responsibilities</li> <li>Frequent data audit</li> <li>Speed up implementation to catch up</li> <li>DBMS review ongoing</li> </ul>
<b>WEKEZA- SUSTAINABILITY TEAM</b>			
<p>COBET: Reestablish COBET Centres, Provision of Scholastic materials to COBET Pupils, Desks, - consistent attendance</p> <p><b>Unexpected Result:</b> Education COBET- in Kigoma – surpassed the target by half</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low facilitator honorarium</li> <li>Lack of uniforms= stigma</li> <li>Lack of teaching materials</li> <li>Lack of class rooms – wait for others to finish.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent attendance</li> <li>Presence of para-professionals who are teaching pupils</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for policy to support COBET existence/continuation</li> <li>Ministries should put a budget for COBET classes in annual plan</li> <li>CL issues included in curriculum from the primary education level</li> <li>CSOs should be empowered to takeover after WEKEZA</li> </ul>
<b>Education Primary &amp; Secondary Schools</b>			
School attendance has increased	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of teaching materials</li> <li>Poor school infrastructure</li> <li>Unprofessional teachers</li> <li>Distance home to school</li> <li>Hidden SS contributions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community supports schools (school feeding)</li> <li>Bylaws to ensure school attendance</li> <li>ToT for teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government to remove school contributions for vulnerable children</li> <li>Parents to take full responsibilities in education</li> <li>CL issues to be included in education policies and curriculum</li> </ul>
<b>Livelihoods</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VICOBA creation, high female participation</li> <li>Beneficiaries are accessing loans and are using the same to support children in school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge transfer from demo plots to own farm</li> <li>Transport problems due to large</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VICOBA spill over to non target beneficiaries</li> <li>Beneficiary parents take loans to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More local animators / Community Based Trainers to train VICOBA.</li> <li>Work closely with relevant LGAs departments</li> <li>Use local CSOs to support livelihood</li> <li>CPGs to be capacitated on advocacy, fund allocation and access</li> </ul>

STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adaptation of modern agric practices</li> <li>Establishment of Groups</li> </ul> <p><b>Unexpected Result:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VICOBA loans to support education</li> </ul>	geographical area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set target group</li> <li>Multiple unrelated value chains</li> </ul>	support youth in investment/education	
<i>Youth</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Youth acquire skills for increased income</li> <li>Increased income and are using the same to support their young children in school</li> <li>Increased CSO capacity to serve youth</li> </ul> <p><b>Unexpected Result:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Youth paid for school from own income</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited WEKEZA staff</li> <li>Limited budget</li> <li>Some HH cannot pay extra VTC costs</li> <li>Some poor attendance due to family responsibilities</li> <li>Youth avoid agriculture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beneficiary parents are taking loans to support beneficiary Youth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use local CSOs and empower them to support youth</li> <li>Use self selecting activities in their interest vs selecting for them</li> <li>Involvement of government officials in implementation</li> <li>Youth to establish their own VICOBA</li> </ul>
<i>Awareness Raising</i>			
Good awareness raising strategy in place Beneficiaries, parents, community, GoT awareness of Child Labor enhanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited budget to do full fledged national CL awareness raising</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Child labor has become a topic for discussion in the project areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DCLC to disseminate CL bylaws to lower levels</li> <li>MoLE to appoint a CL Focal Person to all relevant sector Ministries and at LGAs level meetings at the district level</li> </ul>

## **Annex 7.**

### **Wekeza Indicator Analysis**

---

WEKEZA INDICATOR STATUS					
AREA	Indicator	Status in the DBMS	How it reads in the DBMS	Action	Means of Verification
POC. 1	% of project beneficiary children in child labour	Not generated	NOT in the DBMS	Revise to include this indicator	Child Intake form
POC. 2	% of project beneficiary children engaged in hazardous child labor	Not generated	NOT in the DBMS	Revise to include this indicator	Child Intake form
POH. 1	% of target HH with child laborers below legal working age	Not generated	NOT in the DBMS	Revise to include this indicator	Child Intake form and HH intake form
POH. 2	% of target HH with children in hazardous labor	Not generated	NOT in the DBMS	Revise to include this indicator	Child Intake form and HH intake form
POH. 4	% of target households with all children of compulsory school age attending school	Not generated	NOT in the DBMS	Revise to include this indicator	Child follow up form
USDOL COMMON INDICATORS	E1: Number of children engaged in or at high-risk of entering child labor	Generated	Same as the Result Framework	Revise formula	Child Intake form
	E2: Number of children engaged in or at high-risk of entering child labor enrolled in formal education services	Generated	Same as the Result Framework	Revise formula	Child Intake form
	E3: Number of children engaged in or at high-risk of entering child labor enrolled in non-formal education services	Generated	Same as the Result Framework	Revise formula	Child Intake form
	E4: Number of children engaged in or at high-risk of entering child labor enrolled in vocational services	Generated	Same as the Result Framework	Revise formula	Youth intake form
	L1: Number of households receiving livelihood services	Generated	Same as the Result Framework	Revise formula	HH Follow up Form
	L2: Number of adults provided with employment services	Generated	Same as the Result Framework	Revise formula	HH follow up form
	L3: Number of children provided with employment services	Generated	Same as the Result Framework	Revise formula	Youth follow up form
	L4: Number of individuals provided with economic strengthening services	Generated	Same as the Result Framework	Revise formula	HH follow up form
L5: Number of individuals provided with services other than employment and economic strengthening	Not generated	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

WEKEZA INDICATOR STATUS					
EDUCATION INDICATORS	IO 1: School attendance among target children increased				
	% of target children of compulsory school age attending school	Generated	% of beneficiary children initially identified as engaged in CL who are no longer engaged in CL	Revise to read as in Column C	Child follow up form
	% of children attending 75% of Formal PS Classes	Not generated	Number of children attending 75% of F PS classes	Revise to read as in Column C, Revise formula	Child follow up form
	% of children attending 75% of Formal SS classes	Not generated	Number of children attending 75% of F SSclasses	Revise to read as in Column C, Revise formula	Child follow up form
	% of children attending 75% of Non-Formal COBET Classes	Not generated	Number of children attending 75% of NF classes	Revise to read as in Column C, Revise formula	Child follow up form
	% of children persisting in F/NF programs (annual)	Generated	Same as the Result Framework	Revise formula	Child follow up form
	% of children persisting in F/PS programs (annual)	Not generated	% of children persisting F/NF programs (annual)	Revise to read as in Column C, Revise formula	Child follow up form
	% of children persisting in F/SS programs (annual)	Not generated	% of children persisting F/NF programs (annual)	Revise to read as in Column C, Revise formula	Child follow up form
	% of children persisting in NF COBET Programs (annual)	Not generated	% of children persisting F/NF programs (annual)	Revise to read as in Column C, Revise formula	Child follow up form
	% of eligible children completing assigned program of studies	Generated	Same as the Result Framework	OK	Child follow up form
	IO1.1 Economic obstacles to school attendance reduced				
	# children receiving financial assistance financed by the project	Generated	Same as the Result Framework	Revise formula	Child follow up form
	IO1.2 Quality of education increased				
	% of target schools meeting quality standards (teachers, materials, safety and health)	Not Generated	Same as the Result Framework	Revise formula	School Inspection Checklist
IO1.2.1 Teachers' skills improved					
% of teachers using improved teaching techniques in classroom	Generated	Same as the Result Framework	Revise formula	Head Teachers Follow up form	

<b>WEKEZA INDICATOR STATUS</b>						
	<b>IO1.2.2 Safety and health of environment improved</b>					
	% of target schools meeting basic required minimum health and safety standards	<b>Generated</b>	Same as the Result Framework	Revise formula	<b>School Inspection Checklist</b>	
	<b>IO1.2.3 Use of teaching/learning aids increased</b>					
	% of schools using project-provided set of teaching/learning aids	<b>Generated</b>	Same as the Result Framework	Revise formula	<b>Head Teachers Follow up form</b>	
	<b>IO1.3 Community support for education increased</b>					
	% of schools with active school committees or boards	<b>Generated</b>	Same as the Result Framework	Revise formula	<b>Head Teachers Follow up form</b>	
	% of schools with SB/SCs that raise community awareness on child labor and importance of education	<b>Generated</b>	Same as the Result Framework	Revise formula	<b>Head Teachers Follow up form</b>	
<b>LIVELIHOODS</b>	<b>IO2 . Incomes in target HH increased</b>					
	% of target HH with increase in income	<b>Generated</b>	Number of target HHs with increase in income	Revise to read as in Column C and revise the formula, see indicator calculation	<b>HH follow up form</b>	
	% of target HH with increase in assets	<b>Generated</b>	Number of target HHs with increase in assets	Revise to read as in Column C and revise the formula, see indicator calculation	<b>HH follow up form</b>	
	<b>IO2.1 Access to markets increased</b>					
	% change in volume of products sold	<b>Generated</b>	Number change of volume of products sold	Revise to read as in Column C and revise the formula, see indicator calculation	<b>HH follow up form</b>	
	<b>IO2.2 Producer group collective bargaining power increased</b>					
	% change in unit price of products sold	<b>Generated</b>	Number of change in unit price of products sold	Revise to read as in Column C and revise the formula, see indicator calculation	<b>HH follow up form</b>	

<b>WEKEZA INDICATOR STATUS</b>					
	# of linkages created with buyers	Not generated	NA	NA	Commercial village follow up form
	<b>IO2.3. Production of marketable products and services increased</b>				
	% change in volume per unit area	Generated	Number of change in volume per unit area	Revise to read as in Column C and revise the formula, see indicator calculation	HH follow up form
	% change in volume of marketable products produced: <b>Change to:</b> % of target HH reporting increase in volume of marketable products produced	Generated	Number of change in volume of marketable products produced	Revise to read as in Column C and revise the formula, see indicator calculation	HH follow up form
	<b>IO2.4. Use of improved production techniques increased</b>				
	% of target HH using new production techniques	Generated	Number of target HH using new production techniques	Revise to read as in Column C and revise the formula, see indicator calculation	HH follow up form
	<b>IO2.5. Provision of micro-finance increased</b>				
	% of target HH accessing loans	Generated	Number of target HH accessing loans	Revise to read as in Column C and revise the formula, see indicator calculation	HH follow up form
	% of target HH belonging to VICOBA	Generated	Number of target HH belonging to VICOBA	Revise to read as in Column C and revise the formula, see indicator calculation	HH follow up form
	# of VICOBA established /strengthened in target villages	Not generated	NA	NA	Sector semi annual reports
	<b>IO2.6 Producer knowledge and skills increased</b>				

WEKEZA INDICATOR STATUS					
	% of producers demonstrating increased knowledge or skills	Generated	Number of producers demonstrating increased knowledge or skills	Revise to read as in Column C and revise the formula, see indicator calculation	HH follow up form
	IO2.7 Active local producer groups operating				
	# of active producer groups Remove "registered"	Generated	#/% of active producer groups	Revise to read as in Column C and revise the formula, see indicator calculation	Sector semi annual reports
YOUTH INDICATORS	IO3: Employment among target youth 15-24 increased				
	% of target youth employed	Generated	Number of target youth employed	Revise to read as in Column C and revise the formula, see indicator calculation	Youth follow up form
	IO3.1 Target youth access to business opportunities increased				
	% of youth accessing business opportunities (target 3500 apprentices + 700 micro-franchisees)	Generated	Number of youth accessing business opportunities (target 3500 apprentices + 700 micro-franchisees)	Revise to read as in Column C and revise the formula, see indicator calculation	Youth follow up form
	# of providers of business opportunities (# master artisans + #micro-franchisors)	Generated	# of providers of business opportunities (# master artisans + #micro-franchisors)	NA	Sector semi annual reports
	L4- # of youth 18-24 receiving economic strengthening services	Not generated	NOT in the DBMS	Revise to include this indicator	Youth follow up form
	IO3.2 Target youth business/life/entrepreneurial skills increased				
	% of youth demonstrating increased knowledge/skills (target 4200)	Generated	# of youth demonstrating increased knowledge/skills (target 4200)	Revise to read as in Column C and revise the formula, see indicator calculation	Youth follow up form
	E4- # of youth enrolled in vocational training (target: 3500)	Generated	# of youth enrolled in vocational training	Revise formula	Youth intake form/Youth follow up form (PMP)



<b>WEKEZA INDICATOR STATUS</b>					
	L3- # of children of legal working age 14-17 provided with employment services (target: 3500)	Generated	# of children of legal working age 14-17 provided with employment services	Revise formula	Youth follow up form
	<b>103.3 Improved market-relevant training</b>				
	# of market-relevant vocational training programs designed with project support	Not generated	NA	NA	Sector semi annual reports
<b>SOCIAL PROTECTION</b>	<b>IO4 Beneficiaries receive benefits from national social protection programs</b>				
	% of target HHs receiving benefits from any of the 3 core programs existing social protection program	Generated	% of target HHs receiving benefits from any of the 3 core programs existing social protection program	Revise formula	HH follow up form
	<b>IO4.1. Target CLC capacity to assist beneficiaries HHs or group to access SP servise increased</b>				
	% of CLCs who assist target HHs or groups of HHs to submit proposal or application for SP services	Generated	% of CLCs who assist target HHs or groups of HHs to submit proposal or application for SP services	Revise formula	CLC follow up form (old form)
	<b>IO4.2 Knowledge of type, benefits, sponsor and means of accessing key SP increased</b>				
	% of CLCs who demonstrate increased knowledge of type, benefits, sponsors and means of accessing services by educating target HHs	Generated	% of CLCs who demonstrate increased knowledge of type, benefits, sponsors and means of accessing services by educating target HHs	Revise formula	CLC follow up form (old form)
<b>INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY</b>	<b>IO5 Child labor issues included in relevant development/education/anti-poverty and other social policies and programs at local and national level</b>				

WEKEZA INDICATOR STATUS					
	IO5.1 CLMS data informs LGA by laws and ordinances				
	# of LGA who develop new by laws and ordinances to combat child labor with technical support of the project and using CLMS data	Generated	# of LGA who develop new by laws and ordinances to combat child labor with technical support of the project and using CLMS data	Revise formula	CLC follow up form (old form)
	# of functional CLCs operating	Generated	# of functional CLCs operating	Revise formula	CLC follow up form (old form)
	IO5.2 Increased capacity of local government actors to collect, analyze and disseminate CL data				
	% of LGA actors demonstrating increased capacity to collect, analyze and disseminate CL data	Generated	% of LGA actors demonstrating increased capacity to collect, analyze and disseminate CL data	Revise formula	CLC follow up form (old form)
	# of LGAs with operational CLMS	Generated	# of LGAs with operational CLMS	Revise formula	CLC follow up form (old form)
AWARENESS RAISING	IO6: Community attitudes and practices toward child labor, especially in domestic service, changed				
	IO6.1 Strengthened delivery of CL message				
	# of persons receiving message	Not generated	NOT in the DBMS	Revise to include this indicator	Awareness Raising form
	% of effective awareness raising campaigns	Not generated	NOT in the DBMS	Revise to include this indicator	Awareness Raising form
	IO6.2 Improved Child Labor awareness raising products developed				
	# of child labor awareness raising products developed in line with project awareness raising strategy	Not generated	NOT in the DBMS	Revise to include this indicator	Awareness Raising form
	IO6.3 Improved child labor awareness raising strategy developed				

<b>WEKEZA INDICATOR STATUS</b>					
	<b>WEKEZA awareness raising communications strategy developed, shared with partners and updated annually</b>	<b>Not generated</b>	NOT in the DBMS	Revise to include this indicator	<b>Awareness Raising form</b>

## **Annex 8.**

### **Youth Income Tracking Table**

---

## Tracking Table: Evidence of increase in income of youth involved in businesses.

Name of Youth	Region	Gender	Business Type	Business category	Average Profit per month for the year 2014 in Tanzanian shillings								Average Total income	Average monthly gain	Comment
					June	July	August	September	Oct	November	December				
	Tanga	Male	Solar Lamps	Micro Franchise	50,000.00	80,000.00	100,000.00	50,000.00	60,000.00	-	60,000.00	400,000.00	57,142.86	To Teachers College	
	Tanga	Male	Solar Lamps	Micro Franchise	80,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	30,000.00	40,000.00	10,000.00	60,000.00	320,000.00	45,714.29	Went back to SS	
	Tanga	Male	Solar Lamps	Micro Franchise	52,000.00	-	80,000.00	-	-	-	-	132,000.00	18,857.14	Went back to school	
	Tanga	Male	Solar Lamps	Micro Franchise	52,000.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	52,000.00	7,428.57	Relocated to another district	
	Tanga	Male	Solar Lumps	Micro Franchise	30,000.00	52,000.00	48,000.00	100,000.00	52,000.00	-	-	282,000.00	40,285.71	Became apprentice with local provider	
	Tanga	Male	Solar Lumps	Micro Franchise	75,000.00	104,000.00	35,000.00	52,000.00	104,000.00	78,000.00	-	448,000.00	64,000.00	Created another business	
	Tanga	Male	Solar Lumps	Micro Franchise	-	-	50,000.00	70,000.00	100,000.00	110,000.00	30,000.00	360,000.00	51,428.57	Joined VETA-paid fee from profit	
	Tanga	Female	Solar Lumps	Micro Franchise	-	-	30,000.00	30,000.00	-	30,000.00	-	90,000.00	12,857.14		