

FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Final Evaluation of the Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Egypt Project (CCLP)

World Food Programme,
in association with UNICEF and ILO
Cooperative Agreement Number: E-9-K-6-0115



2010

ICF MACRO
an ICF International Company

This page intentionally left blank.

**FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

**Final Evaluation of the
Combating Exploitive Child Labor
Through Education in Egypt Project
(CCLP)**

World Food Programme
in association with UNICEF and ILO
Cooperative Agreement Number: E-9-K-6-0115

2010

This page intentionally left blank.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report describes in detail the final evaluation, conducted during October 2010, of the Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Egypt Project. The report was prepared by ICF Macro, according to agreements specified in its contract with the United States Department of Labor (USDOL) Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT). The evaluation of the project was conducted and documented by Susan Schaefer Davis, an independent evaluator in collaboration with USDOL/OCFT staff, the project team, and stakeholders in Egypt. ICF Macro would like to express sincere thanks to all parties involved in this evaluation: the independent evaluator, the World Food Programme and its partners, and USDOL.



Funding for this evaluation was provided by the United States Department of Labor under Task Order number DOLB089K28215. Points of view or opinions in this evaluation report do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Labor, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

THANKS

The consultant would like to thank all the team members of the Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Egypt Project in Cairo, Beni Suef, Assiut, and Sohag for all their assistance and support during the final evaluation. She would also like to thank her interpreter, Rasha El Naggar. All were cheerful in spite of long hours, and they were enjoyable to work with. It is hoped that this report will adequately reflect their efforts and excellent work.

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF ACRONYMS	vii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ix
I EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY	1
1.1 Project Description	2
II RELEVANCE	3
2.1 Findings	3
2.2 Lessons Learned/Good Practices	13
III EFFECTIVENESS	15
3.1 Findings	15
3.2 Lessons Learned/Good Practices	19
IV EFFICIENCY	21
4.1 Findings	21
V IMPACT	23
5.1 Findings	23
5.2 Lessons Learned/Good Practices	42
VI SUSTAINABILITY	45
6.1 Findings	45
6.2 Lessons Learned/Good Practices	47
VII RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	49
7.1 Critical Recommendations	49
7.2 Other Recommendations	51
ANNEXES	
Annex A: Terms of Reference	
Annex B: Question Matrix	
Annex C: Key Informants	
Annex D: Field Itinerary	
Annex E: Stakeholders Meeting—Proposed Agenda and Participants	
Annex F: Child Tracking System Forms	
Annex G: References Cited	

This page intentionally left blank.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CCLP	Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Egypt Project
CCT	Conditional Cash Transfers
CDA	Community Development Association
CEOSS	Coptic Evangelical Organization for Social Services
CLMS	Child Labor Monitoring System
CS	Community School
CTS	Child Tracking System
EGP	Egyptian Pound
GEI	Girls' Education Initiative
GET Ahead	Gender and Entrepreneurship Together
ILO	International Labour Organization
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOALR	Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOFP	Ministry of Family and Planning
MOMM	Ministry of Manpower and Migration
MOSS	Ministry of Social Solidarity
NAP	National Action Plan
NCCM	National Council for Childhood and Motherhood
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
OCFT	Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking
OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
SCDAWCI	Sohag Community Development Association for Women and Children's Improvement
SCREAM	Supporting Children's Rights through Education, the Arts and the Media
SIMPOC	Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour
THR	Take-Home Ration
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labor
WFP	World Food Programme

This page intentionally left blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This final evaluation of the Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Egypt Project (CCLP) includes an overview of goals and describes activities, summarizes findings on their effectiveness, and provides recommendations to enhance them.

CCLP was initially a four-year, US\$5,090,000 project, funded by the United States Department of Labor (USDOL) and implemented by the World Food Programme (WFP), working with the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and the International Labour Organization (ILO). The project was extended for nine months until June 2011 and provided an extra US\$500,000. The associated partners worked with international, national, and local non-governmental organization (NGO) and government partners who carried out work in the field. In Assiut, the lead NGO was *Terre des Hommes*, which worked with community development associations (CDAs); in Beni Suef, the lead NGO was the Coptic Evangelical Organization for Social Services, which also worked with CDAs; and in Sohag, the lead NGO was the Sohag Community Development Association for Women and Children’s Improvement, which worked with local committees. The main government partners were from the Ministry of Family and Planning with the National Council for Childhood and Motherhood (NCCM), the Ministry of Education (MOE), the Ministry of Manpower and Migration (MOMM), and the Ministry of Social Solidarity (MOSS).

CCLP has the overall objective of contributing to the elimination of exploitive child labor in Egypt. The objective will be achieved by withdrawing children from labor into formal and nonformal education, and providing support and effective measures to prevent child labor. The project’s immediate objective is to withdraw 4,300 children already working and to prevent 6,000 children at risk of exploitive child labor. The project will accomplish this through formal and nonformal education in Sohag, Assiut, and Beni Suef governorates in Egypt by—

1. Providing formal and nonformal education programs to children at risk of or engaged in exploitive child labor;
2. Increasing awareness and capacity of national and local government institutions, civil society, and communities to address child labor and education issues; and
3. Enhancing national, regional, and local capacity to carry out data collection and monitor/assess child labor.

The evaluation is organized by five aspects of particular interest to USDOL, and findings are reported in these categories:

1. Relevance

The project design is relevant in the current economic, social, and political climate of Egypt. It fits well with a renewed government focus on the welfare of the child and a willingness to discuss child labor. The project also fits with existing government, United Nations, and international programs related to child protection and health.

Two of the incentives offered by the program—take-home rations (THR) of 10 kilos of rice per month and active learning in classrooms—were especially effective in prevention and withdrawal of children from exploitive labor; active learning was most effective in nonformal schools.

Child protection committees have been legally constituted and have just begun functioning at the governorate and district levels. CCLP supported their implementing partners (NGOs and CDAs) to work with the Government, and the lead NGOs all stressed that this was a fruitful and productive partnership.

2. Effectiveness

Project goals for prevention and withdrawal from child labor were realistic and have now been surpassed, despite initial difficulties withdrawing working children.

As mentioned earlier, an effective intervention in all sectors is the THR of 10 kilos of rice per month per participating child. This provides a clear and immediate benefit to the family, with a value of 30–50 Egyptian pounds per month. The funding for the THR was leveraged by the project from non-USDOL sources.

An effective means to withdraw children from agricultural labor is providing community schools and Girls' Education Initiative (GEI) schools. The schools serve students in rural areas where no educational institutions previously existed, and the one-room class concept accepts students of all ages and levels, taught by trusted local teachers using the active approach to learning.

Despite the success of several interventions, many children's families still live in poverty and this threatens children's ability to remain in school. One way to encourage keeping children in school is training mothers in income generation and the importance of education. This training may alleviate—if not eliminate—family poverty.

The components of vocational and literacy training and provision of occupational safety and health (OSH) tools for apprentices need to be refined. When training and literacy are offered, employers often do not allow time off for these activities. The OSH tools often did not fully fit needs; apprentices and workshop owners should be consulted about their needs before more are purchased.

Active learning is an effective tool for keeping children enrolled and interested in school and learning, but the conditions must be favorable. Effective conditions tend to have one-room schools with small classes, two teachers, and adequate materials (such as paper, markers, and glue). On the other hand, teachers in government schools find conditions difficult with large classes (averaging 50 or more students), only one teacher, and no materials.

While the child tracking system (CTS) for monitoring child labor is working well in the project, it appears that in its present form, it is too labor-intensive and unlikely that MOMM has sufficient staff to utilize the CTS to track all child labor in Egypt (explained

in more detail in the following sections). Before passing the system on to MOMM to implement nationally, the CTS should be reformed to make it condensed and more user-friendly, getting needed input from MOMM, USDOL, and ILO.

The project management style and foci contributed greatly to the success of the CCLP. All partner relations were open and supportive. The team's facilitation of contact between the Government and NGOs led to each appreciating the value of the other in obtaining their own objectives. Because of this cooperation, the project achieved more than it could have on its own.

3. Efficiency

The small staff worked effectively on a large range of topical areas. A large, complex project was implemented within budget.

4. Impact

Students in *formal government schools* valued the active learning approach. They said that their teachers were less punitive and delivered clearer lessons. Students also appreciated the food incentives. Most teachers said active learning was valuable, but many had difficulty applying it in large classes with only one teacher and no special materials.

In *nonformal schools*, both students and facilitators used and appreciated the active learning approach. Their appreciation of this approach can be seen on the walls decorated with children's art, as well as in the enthusiasm of the children. Nonformal schools are effective in withdrawing children from agricultural labor, as evidenced by interviews and progress reports. These schools also received community support in the form of local people donating to classrooms. In both types of schools, the views of stakeholders varied on whether stopping the THR of rice would greatly lower attendance.

The work with *apprentices* demonstrated that signing a contract with their employer is a way to withdraw such children from hazardous working conditions, while allowing children to learn a useful skill and add to their family's income. This was effectively implemented in some areas; others show the need for more work. One area needing attention is working with unregistered workshops, which are smaller and less prosperous. These workshops may have worse conditions, but owners say they fear government fines.

A lasting impact of project services appears to depend more on the type than on the length of that service. Both formal and nonformal students attended school, but there appeared to be a deeper, more lasting impact on the nonformal students, according to interviews with students, parents, and teachers, as well as classroom observations. Additionally, passing a test and receiving a certificate at the end of their training can benefit apprentices in finding jobs well into the future.

While there were no official government decrees of a new policy or structure addressing child labor, the impact of the project has produced some quiet, informal examples.

For instance, labor inspectors have changed their approach to addressing child labor for apprentices. Instead of using a “stick” (in the form of fines), they are using a “carrot” (in the form of kind behavior or offering benefits). Additionally, the government expressed approval of a study on child labor produced by the Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour (SIMPOC). Approval of the SIMPOC study reflects a new openness to the issue of apprentices. Another example is the direct work of the Government with NGOs. The child protection committees are legally decreed and constitute a new government structure.

One potentially important aspect is training mothers to earn an income. Poverty is a basic cause of child labor, and training mothers to become entrepreneurs is one way to alleviate poverty. The training was well done and enthusiastically received, and many women have begun projects.

A major impact of the project was that, in encouraging government and NGO partners to work together, it has accomplished more than any entity could have alone. The partners also learned the benefits that each has to offer. This was demonstrated in effective partnerships like a MOMM labor inspector and an NGO member working with apprentices and workshop owners, or with groups like the child protection committees.

5. Sustainability

Sustainable funding for the nonformal community schools was located through the combined support of government/MOE, NGO support, and NCCM will continue to support GEI schools. Working with the Government to establish credibility and trust in projects can lead to them taking over projects they saw as valuable, which in turn would ensure sustainability. If the Government needed further support, NGOs could provide or locate it.

WFP, ILO, and UNICEF worked together very well in supporting different aspects of the CCLP, and project-supported collaboration between the Government and NGOs enhanced the effectiveness of both parties. Hopefully, this will continue based on such a positive experience.

The sustainability of groups and systems created by the project varies. The CDAs have developed capacities and will continue to work. The child protection committees and the village committees would support rural schools so they can become more sustainable with more support. The CTS would be more sustainable with simplification.

It is possible to leverage non-project resources and make them sustainable. This is illustrated by the example of university education students tutoring weak beneficiaries through the project. The university in Beni Suef was approached by the lead NGO and asked for help to relieve the overburdened teachers, and the university agreed. The university students and faculty found it useful, and a memorandum of understanding was signed with the university. Now, tutoring is a regular part of the curriculum. Through sharing this project experience, the same system was implemented in Assiut and Sohag.

THREE KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Expand the availability of nonformal community and GEI schools.

This was a very successful way to withdraw children, especially girls, from agricultural labor, which is a target in Phase 2 of the project. The schools also made children enthusiastic about education and their teachers, which led them to increased learning, reportedly at the same level as formal school students. If desired, the levels reached by all students could be explored and compared.

2. Continue and expand the training of mothers.

Since poverty lies at the base of much child labor, this project component is essential. It was very successful in the CCLP project. Mothers may need further support in ongoing project management and overcoming the fear many women have of loans. Group loans, in which women guarantee each other, may be especially appropriate to alleviate this fear. Mothers also requested skills training, such as in sewing. For this training, MOSS has a unit that could possibly deliver it. Health training should be expanded to all parents and include a component on family planning, which could also reduce poverty levels.

3. Support and encourage government/NGO collaboration.

This new kind of collaboration has been very fruitful, allowing each party to accomplish more than it could on its own, and contributing greatly to attaining project objectives. One aspect is to support the functioning of child protection committees at the governorate and district levels, on which the entities have worked together. As new government structures, the committees can sustainably help combat child labor; as new entities, assistance can help direct and sustain their activities.

Overall, the WFP team and their implementing partners in the Government and NGOs did an outstanding job of reducing child labor in the target areas, conducting a complex project with many facets. In addition to surpassing numerical targets, building varied capacities, and implementing complex procedures, a collaboration between the Government and NGOs was nurtured and enhanced attainment of project objectives.

This page intentionally left blank.

I EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

This final evaluation reviews and assesses all activities carried out during the Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Egypt Project (CCLP) by the World Food Programme (WFP) under the cooperative agreement signed with the United States Department of Labor (USDOL) from project inception in September 2006 until fieldwork in October 2010. The project was originally scheduled to end on September 30, 2010 but was extended until June 30, 2011, and the budget was increased by US\$500,000. The evaluation examines whether and how the targets and objectives of the project were reached. The evaluation is organized around the five major areas of concern to USDOL: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. It provides lessons learned, good practices, and recommendations for improving similar projects in Egypt (including a projected Phase 2) and in other areas where USDOL works, when applicable. For the complete and detailed terms of reference, please see Annex A.

The evaluation methodology was primarily qualitative, collecting data from various project stakeholders by means of individual and group interviews, but the methodology also included other activities.

Initially, the evaluator conducted a desk review and analysis of documents forwarded from USDOL, which were pertinent to project design and implementation. The evaluator then prepared a question matrix to guide field interviews (Annex B) to ensure all topics requested by USDOL were included.

Before the evaluator's departure, she held a conference call with USDOL managers of the project and ICF Macro staff. On arrival, the evaluator had a briefing with the WFP country director and his deputy. She also held a debriefing just before the final stakeholders meeting on November 1, 2010; see Annex C for an agenda and list of attendees.

Interviews with the WFP team, and the government and UN partner stakeholders were conducted in Cairo; there were usually one to three persons present at these meetings and they are listed in Annex D. Interviews were held in project-targeted areas by the Assiut, Beni Suef, and Sohag governorates. Stakeholders included—

- Government officials;
- Non-governmental organization (NGO) and community development association (CDA) implementing partners;
- Children in formal government and nonformal community schools (CSs) and Girls' Education Initiative (GEI) schools;
- Teachers and facilitators of children in all types of schools;
- Apprentices;

- Workshop owners; and
- Mothers of child beneficiaries, trained in income-generating projects.

Forty-nine individuals and groups—mainly groups—were interviewed during the six days of field visits, two to each governorate.¹ There were 18 group interviews in Assiut, 15 group interviews in Beni Suef, and 16 group interviews in Sohag (see Annex E for details). At the sites visited, children were interviewed in their classrooms and teachers were interviewed in their offices. Two of the mothers' projects and one apprentice training center were also visited. All other interviews were not held at such sites, but at premises arranged by the implementing partners.

The project director or monitoring and evaluation (M&E) officer introduced the evaluator to local groups, but the director was not present during interviews to ensure confidentiality. Sometimes the M&E officer or a program assistant was present to assist with translation. The evaluator was concerned this might limit the frankness of respondents and attended to this possibility, but did not observe any limitations.

While the project document mentions the Red Sea Governorate and visiting the Sharqiya Governorate (targeted in the project extension) (which was discussed with USDOL), neither were included in the evaluation. It seems there were few or no activities in the Red Sea area, and fieldwork that could be evaluated in Sharqiya had not yet begun.

1.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

CCLP has the overall objective of contributing to the elimination of exploitive child labor in Egypt. This USDOL-funded project is implemented by WFP, working closely with the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). The objective is to withdraw child laborers and place them into formal and nonformal education, as well as to provide support and effective measures to prevent child labor. The project's immediate objective is to use formal and nonformal education in Sohag, Assiut, and Beni Suef to withdraw 4,300 children already working and to intercept 6,000 children at risk of exploitive child labor. The project accomplishes this by—

1. Providing formal and nonformal education programs to children at risk of and engaged in exploitive child labor;
2. Increasing awareness and capacity of national and local government institutions, civil society, and communities to address child labor and education issues; and
3. Enhancing national, regional, and local capacity to perform data collection and monitor/assess child labor.

¹ This rather dense schedule meant that sometimes interviews with NGO partners lasted until midnight, but the partners were very gracious and eager to answer questions about their work.

II RELEVANCE

2.1 FINDINGS

2.1.1 The Design Is Appropriate

The project design, with its goal of withdrawing or preventing children from exploitive labor by providing educational services, fit very well with the political, economic, and cultural contexts in Egypt. The political climate gave attention to the needs and risks for children, as evidenced by the amendment of the Child Law in 2008. Economically, conditions for the poor have worsened, especially as the food prices have risen. The troubled economy increased the risk of children being sent to work so that families could survive. In cultural terms, children are highly valued, and education is respected at least in the abstract. Given these conditions, a project to reduce child labor through education is very appropriate.

2.1.2 The Design Supports USDOL Goals

The project design supported the five goals of USDOL in its work to eliminate child labor:

1. A main focus of the project was to provide children with direct educational services in either formal government schools or in nonformal one-room CS or GEI schools. Children above the minimum age who were working as apprentices in appropriate conditions received vocational education under a formal contract, and they were offered further vocational or literacy classes.
2. The project strengthened various aspects of education, including training teachers in the Government, the community, and GEI schools in active education; an approach observed to be effective because of its appeal to children. The project increased the capacity of various national ministries to combat child labor, especially by encouraging the work of committees established to protect children at risk and working to support and implement national policies against child labor.
3. The project worked to expand and improve education infrastructures through establishing, supporting, or renovating the CS and GEI one-room schools. These were located in rural areas, distant from established schools, and served a previously underserved or unserved population, often including children working in agriculture and girls who were not allowed to attend distant schools. Working with these schools involved raising community awareness of the importance of education. In addition, the project worked on the national and governorate levels to (1) publicize the importance of education with children's plays and marches, and (2) develop publicity posters and other materials involving sports figures and First Lady Suzanne Mubarak supporting education (e.g., photographs of the First Lady holding the Red Card, a public symbol used to oppose child labor).

4. A child tracking system (CTS) was developed by the project as a database to track all children in the program, their family status, work, benefits, and education. A shorter form of the system was also implemented; both are fully functional in the three project governorates. This will be turned over to the Ministry of Manpower and Migration (MOMM), which is responsible for data on child labor. MOMM was given computers and the database program at the national and governorate levels, but ministry staff members still need to be training. The system will be shortened and made compatible with the Child Labor Monitoring System (CLMS) used internationally by ILO, before staff training.
5. The sustainability of the aforementioned efforts was built into the program design and, in some cases, elaborated by the project team. The educational benefits were supported by initiatives such as the take-home ration (THR) of 10 kilos of rice per child participant, schoolbooks, supplies and uniforms, and occupational safety and health (OSH) tools for apprentices, all intended to keep children in school. Since school attendance was a condition for receiving THR, children with less than 80% attendance had their THR eliminated. A main cause of child labor is poverty, and an income-generation program began to train mothers in many areas. The program included lessons on the importance of education and creation of income-generating projects. Local and international NGOs took over providing materials for some of the CS and GEI schools. National institutions will continue to fight child labor on the committees legally established to do this, working with NGOs to find solutions.

2.1.3 Project Assumptions Varied in Their Accuracy

Many, but not all of the project assumptions were accurate. One problematic area involved the assumptions linking the purpose of the project to its goal. For instance, it was assumed that there would be no increase in poverty; therefore, poverty would not lead to an increase in child labor. While there is no recorded increase in poverty, food prices have increased dramatically in recent years, making it harder for families to meet basic needs. Because of this demand on families, the assumption about poverty levels proved to be inaccurate. Additionally, it was thought that new economic activities would not increase demand for child labor. However, new economic activities provided new areas in which children could work in order to help their families.

Assumptions linking the project's outputs to its purpose had mixed results. It was correctly assumed that security problems would not block access to the various types of schools, and that the Government would continue the school feeding program. However, other assumptions were false. For example, it was assumed that increased enrollment and attendance in formal schools would not cause overcrowding and negative reactions. Both outcomes were found, and reactions especially of teachers were negative, according to interviews with teachers and project staff. For informal schools, it was valid to assume that favorable conditions and incentives were implemented to retain teachers, but such was not the case for formal government schools. It has been a challenge for the Government to improve formal schools, but the project is not involved with this process.

Assumptions related to activities and outputs were more generally valid. Security and political access were strong in the three target governorates. In addition, the trainers, teachers/facilitators, social workers, and researchers were easy to locate, as were rooms for CS and GEI schools in rural areas, donated by community members. The inadequate space in formal primary schools was a problem, as noted above, with more children squeezed into existing rooms. The funding for National School Feeding and other initiatives continued. MOSS has a pilot project involving conditional cash transfers (CCTs) in the three target provinces, with funds often used by the mothers of children in the project to start small projects to earn income.

2.1.4 The Project Fits Well with Existing Programs

The Egyptian Government, UN agencies, and international donors have programs to combat child labor. CCLP combines efforts with ILO and UNICEF to fight child labor, expanding the rural CS schools and training the teachers—called “facilitators”—supported by UNICEF since 2000. CCLP and ILO work with apprentices; they also work with mothers, training them on the importance of education and health, as well as helping them establish income-generating projects to relieve family poverty.

The project also works with government programs that fight child labor. One major initiative is to provide food incentives to encourage school attendance and discourage working. With the National Council for Childhood and Motherhood (NCCM), part of the newly formed Ministry of Family and Planning (MOFP), the project supports the GEI schools in rural areas. The project works with the Ministry of Education (MOE) to provide children food incentives and often school supplies in government schools and in rural one-room CS schools. With MOMM, the project also provides food incentives and OSH tools to apprentices in workshops. The Ministry of Social Solidarity (MOSS) is responsible as a “safety net” for poor families, and the project is working with MOSS to provide benefits to the families of child participants for which they may be eligible but unaware, such as a monthly supplement for widows. In addition, the project is training staff of MOSS, MOMM, and MOE in ways to work more effectively against child labor (these are detailed later in this report). The project is also supporting the work of child protection committees at the governorate and district levels, and these committees have members from all ministries working with children.

2.1.5 Various Activities Were Used for Withdrawing/Preventing Children from WFCL

The following were the main activities used to withdraw and prevent children from the worst forms of child labor (WFCL):

- Providing food and other school-related incentives
- Training teachers and facilitators to have a more child-friendly and effective learning atmosphere, thus retaining children in education
- Establishing and supporting schools in rural areas—namely the CS and GEI schools—for children who did not attend school previously and often worked instead

These latter schools functioned six days a week during the regular school year and three days a week in the summer to discourage children from working during summer holidays. To reach children working as apprentices and ensure their working conditions are legal, the project sent labor inspectors from MOMM to workshops. The inspectors asked owners and apprentices to sign contracts for those youth of legal age to work, guaranteeing the following:

- Tenure at the workshop
- Health benefits
- A certificate of training, equal to that received through a regular vocational training program, upon the apprentice reaching age 18

The beneficiaries also received food incentives and enjoyed recreational activities and trips. The project also raised awareness of community members, especially among mothers, of the importance of education, and trained many mothers in establishing income-generating projects to replace the money children had been earning.

A major rationale behind these strategies is that children work because of family poverty. The incentive of 10 kilos of rice per student per month was the equivalent of 30–50 Egyptian pounds (EGP) a month (this estimate went up as food prices increased) and was much appreciated by poor families, according to interviews with children and mothers. In addition, children were given nutritionally rich (and locally produced) date bars in class to give them energy for learning. Children in formal schools had school fees paid and were given books, supplies, and uniforms. Children in informal schools had no fees, and books and learning materials were supplied. Providing school uniforms and materials mitigated the price of sending a child to school, reported as 150–300 EGP per year. To encourage attendance, incentives were withheld if a child missed five or more days of school per month.

Another rationale behind these strategies is that school should be easily available and enjoyable so that children continue attending. Training teachers and facilitators on active learning supported this rationale. In addition, supporting rural CS and GEI schools with multilevel classes made school available to children who had never attended in most cases, often girls for whom the government schools were too far to attend (up to 30 minutes away on foot). This support was also a major way to withdraw children from agricultural labor. Most of the rural schoolchildren interviewed had spent long hours peeling corn or onions, digging and cleaning peanuts, or loading boxes of tomatoes in the hot sun.

Finally, training mothers to earn income grows out of the basic assumption that poverty is a major cause of child labor. Encouraging income-generating projects is one way to work against poverty.

Many stakeholder groups interviewed were asked to suggest activities that would be more effective, and none had any to suggest. They were very satisfied with the options provided.

2.1.6 Obstacles to Combating Child Labor Were Addressed with Varying Degrees of Success

CCLP identified several major obstacles to addressing child labor in Egypt:

- Lack of educational infrastructure in some areas
- Lack of demand for education based on the frequently low quality and perceived low value
- Poverty, which prevented families from affording school and required children's labor to meet basic needs

As described in the activities of the project, all these areas were addressed, some with more success than others. Infrastructure problems were mainly dealt with through providing nonformal, one-room CS and GEI schools in areas where school infrastructure was previously absent. There is room for more schools in such areas, and a project extension focusing on children working in agriculture will expand the schools' programming further. The active learning provided in these informal schools has created a demand for education; the evaluator heard from respondents that some children were trying to leave the formal schools and enroll in these rural schools. Infrastructure was not addressed in formal schools, though some teachers were trained in active learning. To make school more affordable, formal schools provided food incentives plus payment of school fees, books, book bags, and uniforms. Poverty was directly addressed toward the end of the project by training mothers to start income-generating activities, which was very enthusiastically received and implemented.

The midterm evaluation provided several very useful recommendations, most of which were acted upon, as follows:

1. Offer appropriate alternatives to raise the standard of living of targeted families.

This was achieved through ILO's Gender and Entrepreneurship Together (GET Ahead) for Women in Enterprise program, which provided income-generation training for mothers of beneficiaries. Nine NGO participants from each of the three governorates received a five-day training session in Cairo. The NGO participants then trained mothers of beneficiaries, many beginning projects of their own to earn income (these are described later).

2. Link families with existing government and non-government services and benefits.

There are many government benefits designed to alleviate poverty (e.g., widow's benefits) often available through MOSS. However, project staff said in interviews that many families are unaware of these benefits. The project, with technical support from UNICEF, facilitates links between families and government benefits. To this end, UNICEF is developing a manual of services available from the Government and NGOs in each of the three project governorates. UNICEF will publish these manuals, which will be available by December 2010. The NGOs and CDAs are helping families to visit

appropriate ministries and fill in the necessary forms. The benefits include one-time cash transfers and registration for ongoing food supplements or cash benefits. The evaluator recommends continuing this assistance for ongoing benefits, and project staff said that any benefits are worth pursuing. When asked about the staff time involved, project found that it was not excessive.

3. Revise the incentive scheme in order to ensure a more effective distribution mechanism with an exit strategy that will offer sustainable alternatives.

Previously, the rice incentive was distributed in formal schools, but the children who did not receive rice felt excluded, so rice is now distributed outside of schools to avoid this. All students in classes now get biscuits as the in-school snack. However, these incentives will stop when the program ends.

4. Increase the number of targeted CS schools in the Assiut and Sohag governorates.

The project director attempted to increase the number of CS schools in Assiut, but the governorate did not have funds for the facilities. The project director met with the First Secretary at MOE, but the ministry could not mitigate this situation. Instead, the project opened more GEI rural schools, supported by the coordinator of NCCM. These schools serve a very similar population to that of CS schools.

Sohag had already reached the target number of CS schools.

5. Develop mechanisms to realistically address the two forms of exploitive child labor encountered during project implementation (agricultural labor and labor in nonregistered workshops).

Agricultural labor has been increasingly targeted since the initial implementation period, especially in the extension of the project. In the Beni Suef GEI schools, most of the students are withdrawn from agriculture. An in-depth study of children working in agriculture is beginning in November 2010 as part of the project extension. Conducting this research will be the Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics, which was identified through a procurement exercise. That information will help the project serve the 200 children to be withdrawn from agricultural labor in the extension, and it will help in planning for the project renewal, which will have a major focus on agricultural child labor.

Child labor in nonregistered workshops is problematic. Those workshops are usually smaller than those that are registered, and registration burdens the owner with fees and taxes not previously paid. There is an effort to facilitate this with legal changes, which are still in progress; MOMM is working at this higher level. Meanwhile, the project does not want to neglect apprentices in unregistered workshops, though it is hard to build trust with owners if they are forced to register. One way MOMM is alleviating this situation is by paying for the health insurance for some of the project's apprentices. In Assiut, nearly all workshops are registered; in Beni Suef, some are not. The project extension until June

2011 will work with 400 more apprentices so the project will learn how to better deal with their situation.

6. Enhance the apprenticeship component through the partnership with ILO's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (ILO-IPEC), MOMM, and the MOSS Vocational Training Center.

The apprenticeship component was slow to start, mainly because of implementation issues in the ILO program. In early 2009, the component gained speed, and target numbers were met by the end of September 2010. The senior skills and employability specialist at ILO Cairo, along with a consultant, conducted research on all the apprentices in the project and developed a model program. The apprentices over age 15 are withdrawn from hazardous work, either by being relocated or by being given OSH tools that alleviate the hazardous aspects. Apprentices also receive food incentives, recreational activities, and the opportunity for more vocational training or literacy classes.

The Government offers vocational training in the Ministry of Industry and Foreign Trade, MOSS, and MOMM; the project works with the latter two. MOMM is the main partner in this area, and MOMM labor inspectors meet with apprentices and workshop owners along with an NGO representative to establish a contract between the apprentice and the owner; some were unaware of this possibility before the project. This is a revolutionary step. In the past, inspectors caught owners with underage children and fined the owners. The new system guarantees that apprentices can work until age 18 and get a certificate; apprentices can stay longer if they wish. Apprentices also get shorter work hours and set vacations, and often an increase in pay. It also helps the owner—when apprentices are encouraged to stay, owners will not have to spend time training new apprentices. Apprentices are offered access to additional vocational training at MOSS, as well as literacy classes; however, relatively few take advantage of these opportunities. The main problem is time; usually they can only take classes on their days off, as the owner needs them in the shop otherwise.

7. Continue capacity building at all levels with a focus on building the capacity of MOMM's child labor unit.

The project built capacity on many levels, including training teachers and facilitators in active learning, and training mothers to start income-generating projects. This was done through training of trainers for the Government of Egypt, NGOs, and CDAs that implemented the project. Their capacities were also developed in other ways (which will be described later).

MOMM's child labor unit consists of labor inspectors and apprentice guides. Through their work during the project to activate apprentice contracts with workshop owners, assisted by NGO partners, the inspectors and guides have developed a process that barely existed before and that benefits young apprentices to improve their working conditions. In addition, in October 2010 WFP held a five-day workshop for 40 inspectors, 10 from each of the project governorates, and 10 from Sharqiya, a governorate that is targeted under the project's extension. The content grew out of needs observed in field visits.

These inspectors will also be trained to collect and use data on child laborers with the CTS. The system will then be shortened and revised so that it will be a CLMS compatible with that used by ILO-IPEC in other countries around the world. This will provide Egypt with an up-to-date database on child labor.

8. Integrate with the child protection mechanism in targeted communities in collaboration with UNICEF and NCCM.

CCLP supported their implementing partners (NGOs and CDAs) to work with the child protection committees at the governorate and district levels (general committees and subcommittees, respectively). These two types of committees are composed of members from various ministries that are involved with children, including MOMM, MOSS, MOFP (with NCCM), the Ministry of Interior, and MOE, plus one or two members from active, child-oriented NGOs. There are general committee representatives in Beni Suef, Assiut, and Sohag; the Governor is also a member. These individuals all serve as advisors and tackle issues that the subcommittees cannot solve. UNICEF is creating a manual, scheduled to be ready in December 2010, on how the subcommittees should operate, and has certified project staff that have begun to train those committees at the district level. Committees have been trained to various degrees in Sohag and Assiut, but not so far in Beni Suef. There is also a legal issue of defining the duties of the subcommittee, but that has not stopped those in the project area from solving problems.

9. Increase coordination between MOMM and the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MOALR) in order to extend labor inspection to the agricultural plantations and improve withdrawal rates.

One benefit of the project extension is more interaction with MOALR. At the stakeholders meeting, an MOALR representative said that the Ministry planned to work with the project extension and in Phase 2 to limit children from hazardous jobs and be sure they go to school. At the same meeting, the Undersecretary of MOMM said that the OSH inspectors visit fields that use machinery, and with Egypt's recent ratification of ILO Convention 182, they will be able to inspect the agricultural sector in general and also conduct awareness campaigns for parents, children, and landowners. Both MOMM and MOALR are on the tripartite committee working on the National Action Plan (NAP) for child protection.

10. Work toward selecting more individuals who could act as “agents of change” in their communities and capitalize on their enthusiasm and positive attitude to turn others around.

In all three governorates, the informal school rooms for the CS and GEI schools have been donated by village members; in some areas there is even a waiting list. The CS schools are donated for fixed periods, often six years, while the GEI schools are given permanently. The facilitators at these schools are local young women who are enthusiastic about their jobs and care about the children they teach; they have won the trust of parents for a new system of education. The Sohag NGO does not work with CDAs but rather forms village committees consisting of the facilitators, the classroom

donor, a parent, a respected village member, and sometimes others. They see to the needs of the rural schools, often paying electric bills or meeting other needs. The recommendation does not say specifically what kinds of change should be encouraged, but these groups encourage children to stay in school and not to work. The mothers with projects are enthusiastic and could perhaps be involved in this aspect too.

11. Expedite the launch of the National Steering Committee and the development of the NAP for the elimination of child labor.

The National Steering Committee was actually launched before the project began, but needs to be made operational again. There has been a National Tripartite Committee since 2008, with the three parts being government employees, workers, and members of civil society. All the ministries participate, and they set the goals for the NAP, which will set priorities and delineate who should deal with each part. MOMM is taking the lead, and WFP is the technical secretariat. They hope to launch the NAP in June 2011 on the World Day Against Child Labor. This represents both opportunity and risk in Egypt. The opportunity is the focus of the national agenda on child protection, and the risk is the elections, which can slow all other processes.

12. Leverage additional resources (local, national, and international) for the extension of the various project interventions.

The NAP will hopefully include a role for the private sector to contribute, working through corporate social responsibility programs; the Ministry of Finance is on the Tripartite Committee preparing the NAP. In Sohag and Assiut, several of the CS schools will be supported by NGOs replacing the project's contribution. MOE has agreed to provide school supplies and facilitator salaries for several of the schools. The Coptic Evangelical Organization for Social Services (CEOSS) will continue to support such schools in Beni Suef. The manuals of services being prepared for each governorate will help families to access benefits that can replace project provision of school fees, uniforms, books, and food supplements. There is also a five-year line in the national budget for children at risk.

13. Continue the awareness-raising activities at all levels.

This has been done, with project children from the three governorates presenting plays at Hurgada, and participating in Supporting Children's Rights Through Education, the Arts, and the Media (SCREAM) activities in greater Cairo. Children in T-shirts saying, "No to child labor, yes to education," participated in the international Walk the World Day. Children also participated in "Sailing the Nile," an activity in which they traveled by boat from Upper Egypt to publicize the Millennium Development Goals to address and eliminate child labor. There have been news stories about the project, and First Lady Suzanne Mubarak and sports celebrities have appeared on posters to combat child labor. Village mothers recently trained in income-generating activities were instructed in the importance of education as part of that training.



The WFP CCLP team poses with one of the child labor awareness publicity posters, which features a well-known athlete.

2.1.7 Extension Activities Are Relevant, Necessary, and the Most Worthwhile to Do

The main focus of the extension activities is on two areas that were underserved in the project: children working in agriculture and as apprentices. A third area is continuing entrepreneurial activities since these started late and are potentially valuable. The second phase will focus largely on children in agriculture, who make up about two-thirds of child workers, so extension work on this topic is very relevant. The study being conducted now will be essential, since there is very little data available on children working in agriculture, and the additional children served can test various approaches. Although the target number of apprentices for the program was met, work with them began rather late and the extension work can incorporate information gained late in the project. Continued work with mothers as entrepreneurs will aid the sustainability of project achievements, allowing children to stay in school rather than work to contribute to the family. These three areas—children in agriculture, child apprentices, and mothers as entrepreneurs—seem like the most worthwhile focus for extension activities.

2.1.8 Partner Agencies Varied in Experience but All Were Qualified to Do the Necessary Work

The project paired with three main partner agencies to implement the work, two well-established NGOs and one that began in 2003, a different one in each governorate. *Terre des Hommes* is an international NGO based in Switzerland, and CEOSS is an Egyptian NGO that works with people of all religions.² Both groups have extensive experience with development work in Egypt, and both worked with local CDAs. The third group, the Sohag Community Development Association for Women and Children's Improvement (SCDAWCI), was less experienced and did not find CDAs to work with, so it established local community committees and collaborated with them. All three performed well; the first two were qualified before beginning the project, and the third learned the necessary skills while working on the project, greatly increasing their capacity.

² CEOSS was founded by a priest in 1950.

2.2 LESSONS LEARNED/GOOD PRACTICES

- Two of the incentives offered by the program (10 kilos of rice per month and active learning in classrooms) were especially effective in prevention and withdrawal of children from exploitive labor; active learning was better implemented and thus more effective in nonformal than in formal schools. The classroom atmosphere and activities that were observed, the students' demeanors and comments, and some teacher and outsider comments illustrated the extent and effectiveness of active learning in the two settings (see details in case studies in Section V: Impact). In addition, teachers in formal schools who had been trained in active learning said they tried to use it, and some evidence was found of this, but they encountered some obstacles because of having large classes, having only one teacher, and lacking special materials.
- The project extension activities (focused on research on child labor in agriculture, supporting more children in agricultural areas and apprentices, and mothers' small projects) are very relevant as they focus on activities that will be central in Phase 2 of the project. This will likely encourage a smooth transition to the second phase of the project.

Good Practice: Work with Child Protection Groups

CCLP supported their implementing partners' (NGOs and CDAs) work with the child protection committees at the governorate and district levels (general committees and subcommittees, respectively). These groups are a new government structure and just beginning to function; project involvement can benefit both them and project objectives. Both NGO and government members of these committees said that they benefited from working together and could accomplish more that way than working separately. In one case, a CDA member told the subcommittee about a problem with garbage dumped near a school, and a government member had it cleaned up.

This page intentionally left blank.

III EFFECTIVENESS

3.1 FINDINGS

3.1.1 Project Targets

The project has surpassed the target numbers for children prevented and withdrawn from labor, as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Children Withdrawn and Prevented from Labor by Project End, October 1, 2010

Characteristic	Male	Female	Targeted	Total
Withdrawn	2,076	2,290	4,300	4,366
Prevented	3,669	3,650	6,000	7,319
Total	5,745	5,940	10,300	11,685

Note: Figures are from the September 2010 Technical Progress Report, page G-27.

While the project has experienced strong success in preventing children from working, it had less initial success in withdrawing children. First, the project had limited work with apprentices because this component involved ILO, which was not fully on board until early 2009. At that point, the project engaged and worked with apprentices, withdrawing them from underage labor by enrolling them in vocational training programs or providing older ones with OSH tools so they were not involved in hazardous labor. Second, the project did not directly approach children at work in agriculture, where regulations were vague and child labor inspectors did not work. Rather, the project reached out to these children through the informal CS and GEI schools, located in rural areas accessible to children working in agriculture. Many children—especially girls—attended these schools instead of working. The schools, taught by young women from the community, were accessible to children and offered food incentives.

3.1.2 Accuracy of Rapid Assessment

Data from the rapid assessment was accurate. The information provided by the rapid assessment early in the project provided an accurate basis on which to build the project. In addition, the project director said that the participatory manner (recommended by ILO) in which the rapid assessment was carried out was very helpful in getting the Government and NGOs to buy in and work with the project later.

3.1.3 Direct Action Interventions

The direct action interventions of rural schools, vocational training, OSH tools and school supplies, snacks, and THRs were effective in ensuring that children were enrolled in educational programs. The project ensured that the provisions of material assistance worked as an incentive by stopping the THR and other assistance if a child was absent more than five days each month.

The active learning approach in isolated nonformal schools was also very effective in keeping children attending school by increasing and maintaining children's interest in school.

3.1.4 Effectiveness of Interventions

Most of the interventions effectively but partially met the needs of the children; the children's poverty meant that the THR of rice helped feed the family, and school fees and supplies provided for children in formal schools allowed them to attend even if their families would not have otherwise been able to afford to send the children to school. However, this assistance did not meet all of the children's needs; their families were still poor. The program to train mothers in income-generation activities helped to address this. The OSH tools helped meet some needs, but in some cases the protective clothing and boots were too large or too hot in summer, or girls were provided with trousers that they did not wear. The rural schools with no fees were very effective in meeting the needs of rural children who had never attended school, and the one-room class format and active learning approach allowed children of all ages to attend. A relatively recent attempt to meet the financial needs of beneficiaries is to explore whether they or their families might be eligible for government benefits of which they are unaware. Toward this end, NGO staff often assisted families. The project staff member based in Upper Egypt is compiling a list of benefits available from the Government or NGOs in each of the target governorates, and UNICEF will publish it in December.

3.1.5 Effects of Different Approaches

Different approaches used by the project had different effects. The CS and GEI schools greatly increased educational opportunities for rural children, especially girls who were less likely to go to the rather distant government schools. The fact that the space for these schools was donated by a community member, and that the facilitators were young women from the area, created a degree of community ownership of these schools. In the Sohag Governorate, where community committees were created to support the schools, there was both community ownership and the capacity to solve simple problems. The SCREAM methodology produced plays by children about the problems of child labor and raised awareness among those who saw them. In addition, the child protection mechanisms had committees on the governorate and district levels whose members were both aware of the dangers of child labor and had ideas how to solve them.

3.1.6 Addressing the Worst Forms of Child Labor

Interviewees felt that the project addressed WFCL. The project has identified and targeted children working in agriculture and informal workshops in urban areas, although it has dealt more with formal or registered workshops. This is because unregistered workshops are small and registration would entail the owner paying fees and taxes he cannot afford. In such workshops, apprentices had no insurance; in one area, MOMM solved this by paying for the apprentices' insurance directly.

3.1.7 Challenges of Withdrawal

The challenges of withdrawal varied for the two main target groups: apprentices in workshops and children working in agriculture. Children in agriculture usually worked both for their own families and for others. The apprentices were in more urban areas, so they were easier to locate. A main challenge was that ILO did not fully participate until early 2009; when it did, work started quickly, as seen in the numbers of children withdrawn after that point. On the other hand, child agricultural laborers were spread across the countryside and harder to reach. Instead, CS and GEI schools were set up in rural areas and the child workers were attracted to them, both by the opportunity for education and by the food incentives that were offered.

3.1.8 Variances by Sector

It did not appear that the effectiveness of the services or incentives varied by sector. The most popular incentive in all sectors was the THR of 10 kilos of rice, which was effective in keeping children at formal and nonformal schools and having contracts in workshops. In terms of services provided, there was variation but not by sector. The use of active learning to attract children to school seemed more effective in the nonformal educational system of the CS and GEI schools. The formal system had problems implementing it fully, although the aspects that were implemented, like using nonphysical punishments, were appreciated by the children interviewed.

3.1.9 Child Tracking System

The project developed the CTS to follow the work and educational status of children, aspects of their family situation, and project services for the child. There is an initial form and a follow-up form that is completed every six months after the child is enrolled. In addition, a short form that is more user-friendly in extracting information from the database that is needed for project reports was developed by a *Terre des Hommes* staff member in Assiut and shared with all areas.

The CTS was effective, covering all relevant aspects for project children. It was feasible to the extent that it was fully operational in the governorates of Assiut, Sohag, and Beni Suef. The forms were filled out by the NGO partners and their CDA members, MOE social workers, or sometimes volunteers. The program, orientation, and computers to run the system were given to MOMM staff at the national and governorate level, with the goal of having MOMM's Child Labor Unit use it to take over tracking child labor for all of Egypt. This would eventually be done by modifying the CTS into a CLMS, which is used internationally by ILO with modifications for different countries.

However, it may not be feasible to expect MOMM to use such a rigorous system. While it is easy to *enter* the data collected on the forms, taking about 15 minutes each, *filling* the forms is much more time-consuming. It takes about two hours to administer the first form and the same or more for the follow-up every six months (see Annex F for copies of both forms). Both forms involve talking to the child and parents and investigating the workplace. In addition, the second form requires visits to the school and questioning friends and neighbors about the child's work status to be sure they are withdrawn. It is unlikely that MOMM has the resources to do such intensive work. When MOMM inspectors (who will fill the forms) in Assiut were interviewed about their typical work schedule, each said they visited eight "establishments" (workshops or factories)

over the course of a month. In the same amount of time, one inspector worked with eight youth and another nine children. In addition, while transferring this responsibility to MOMM has been on the project schedule for quite a while, computers and programs have been transferred but no training of MOMM staff on using the CTS has occurred. As a result, there is no direct input from the staff on the process. However, given the time requirements, which were well met in the field by four to eight staff members or volunteers working full time, it is highly unlikely that MOMM inspectors will have time to implement the current CTS.

It is recommended that the CTS and the eventual CLMS be shortened to contain only essential data; this is further explained in Section 3.2: Lessons Learned/Good Practices.

3.1.10 Definitions of “Withdrawn” and “Prevented”

The implementing partners in Assiut, Beni Suef, and Sohag governorates all understood the definitions of “withdrawn” and “prevented” and used the same criteria in reporting data on these indicators. However, there was a problem with the way in which WFP assigned children to cohorts for the calculation of figures, but this was clarified and corrected for all figures in summer 2010. WFP, the lead grantee, said that they received accurate data on withdrawn and prevented children in a timely manner.

3.1.11 Project Management

Project management was effective in a technical sense, bringing together different government and NGO actors to achieve the aims of the project. The child protection committees at the governorate and district level brought together ministries concerned with child labor and NGOs acting in that area (often with the project) so they could learn of one another’s capacities and areas of intervention, and so they could solve child labor issues when necessary. Project management coordinated and encouraged these efforts, which were fruitful. All implementing groups interviewed appreciated the WFP work in this area and spoke very highly of the project team.

3.1.12 Efficiency of Project Operations

In a financial sense, operations usually ran smoothly. One NGO complained that quarterly accounting reports claimed a lot of their time, and requested a change to annual reporting. Most donors requested annual reports. The quarterly reporting is not a USDOL requirement; it may be related to UN requirements or to Egyptian Government requirements; this can be investigated and possibilities for change explored.

An NGO also said that the need to renew their contract with WFP annually resulted in extra work, and they requested a clause in the contract to read that the contract remained valid unless there was a different request from the signatories. This should be explored.

The project grantees shared accounting and purchasing agent services with the rest of WFP. The project used a percentage of the time of the organization’s financial officer. WFP found that sometimes work for them was delayed because of other demands on the time of the officer. They will request a separate financial officer for the extension/renewal of the project.

3.2 LESSONS LEARNED/GOOD PRACTICES

- Since the OSH tools often did not fully fit needs; apprentices and workshop owners should be consulted about needs before more tools are purchased. Therefore, the components of vocational and literacy training and provision of OSH tools for apprentices need to be refined. Additionally, while vocational and literacy training are often offered, employers often do not allow time off for apprentices to take advantage of these opportunities. For the intervention to be effective, workshop owners should be fully aware of expectations.
- While the CTS for tracking child labor is working well in the project, it seems unlikely that MOMM will utilize the system to track all child labor in Egypt. The CTS needs to be modified before it can be developed into a tool like the CLMS (which is used internationally). This finding is based on the level of effort the project invests and the usual level of work of MOMM inspectors (described above). In addition, project staff expressed gratitude that the evaluator said she thought the form should be shorter. The staff had included everything they thought USDOL might need, fearing they would lack data for reporting, but would prefer a shorter form. Before passing it on to MOMM to implement nationally, the CTS should be condensed and made more user-friendly, getting input especially from MOMM (on content and especially on a realistic amount of time they can spend administering it), USDOL, and ILO.
- There were a few issues noted with implementation and design. If these issues are explored and resolved successfully in the manner suggested by project staff, the issues could serve as lessons learned for future projects.
 - Some NGO partners said that it takes one to three months to renew their contracts each year. These partners suggested adding a clause saying that the contract is automatically renewed if agreeable to both parties. This may be a government/NGO requirement, but it should be explored.
 - Some NGO partners said that accounting takes up much of their time. It would be more efficient if accounting was annual rather than quarterly, as required by WFP. This may be a UN requirement, but it should be explored.

Good Practices: CS and GEI Schools

An effective intervention to withdraw children from agricultural labor is providing CS and GEI schools. These schools serve students in areas where there were no schools before, and the one-room class accepts students of all ages and levels. These schools are taught by trusted local teachers using the active approach to learning. The evaluator met students at these schools ranging from ages 7–16 who had never been to school before; some students said the nearest formal school was too far away. These factors, plus the THR rice and lack of school fees, serve to withdraw children—especially girls—from agricultural labor and provide them with an education in a setting that makes them very enthusiastic about learning.

Good Practices: Project Management

The project management style and foci contributed greatly to the success of CCLP. Relations with all government and NGO partners were open and supportive. The project team facilitating contact between the Government and NGOs led to each appreciating the value of the other in obtaining their own objectives. Together, they achieved more than they could on their own. For example, after a joint government/NGO committee discussed the case of a beneficiary (a young woman), an NGO member was delegated to speak to her family about postponing her marriage so she could complete her education; as of this evaluation, she is still in school. This was also effective in partnerships such as the MOMM labor inspector and NGO member working with apprentices and workshop owners. Hosting occasions where the partners could meet and exchange experience deepened this relationship and increased project effectiveness; partners had recently attended a joint meeting in Alexandria, arranged by CCLP staff.

IV EFFICIENCY

4.1 FINDINGS

4.1.1 Financial and Human Resources

The project was efficient in terms of the financial and human resources used in producing the outputs. It was a complex project operating in several areas:

- Keeping or enrolling children in school with direct interventions
- Strengthening the capacity of implementing partners, both civil society and government
- Encouraging and supporting government/NGO collaboration
- Raising awareness of the problems of child labor

The project staff of seven worked in all of these areas, and within their budget. However, the project director said her financial work was sometimes slowed by sharing the organization's financial officer with the entire WFP office, and having a project financial officer would make her work more efficient.

4.1.2 Cost-Efficiency

CCLP was cost-efficient. The project cut costs when possible by sharing necessary items like cars and a financial officer with the larger WFP operation. The project worked with university education students. These students worked as interns doing community service, tutoring children for no cost. The children had returned to school but were weak in their studies.

The project used community volunteers on committees in Sohag to interact with CS schools, both saving costs and enhancing community ownership. Teaching tools for active learning included a kit developed by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID); the kit was reprinted for the project's use. The WFP director said that 82% of the budget went to direct action, and 18% went to overhead or administrative costs. The cost per beneficiary was US\$435.60, derived from dividing the cost of US\$5,090,000 by the 11,685 beneficiaries.

4.1.3 Monitoring System

The monitoring system was designed specifically to meet the needs of the project. The designer felt the data forms were long, but wanted to be sure to include all information needed for USDOL reporting. However, given the two hours or more it takes to administer the initial and follow-up forms, and the fact that a shorter form was developed to extract information needed for reports, it seems unlikely a government office would have the resources to continue with this system. Monitoring could and should be made more efficient.

4.2 Lessons Learned/Good Practices

- A separate financial officer would have prevented financial delays that sometimes occurred because of sharing a financial officer with the WFP office. This will hopefully be resolved in the second phase of the project, for which funding was requested for separate financial officers. This may serve as a lesson for future projects that also face financial delays.

Good Practices: Flexibility in Monitoring Systems

The monitoring system that was developed included all information necessary for the USDOL project closeout report, but the system was unwieldy to use for regular technical progress reports. A staff member from one of the implementing NGOs developed a short form that extracted the required data from the long form in the database. This was shared with the other two governorates.

V IMPACT

5.1 FINDINGS

Concerning the WFP project team and their government and NGO partners, the project director said, “We helped in changing the lives of human beings.” In field visits, the evaluator found this to be true in many ways. The following information and case studies highlight some examples.

5.1.1 Government or Formal Schools and Teachers

Children participating in CCLP in government schools were largely those who stayed because they received 10 kilos of rice per month (given good attendance), nutritional snacks at school, uniforms, supplies, and funds for school fees. In addition, underperforming students were given special tutoring. Some of their teachers were trained in the use of active learning. The approach had been encouraged—if not implemented—by MOE for the last 10 years, and teachers passed some of this information on to colleagues.



Government school in Assiut.



Government school in Beni Suef.

Case Study: Formal Schools and Active Learning

An Assiut school visited by the evaluator might serve as a model for how to use active learning approaches in the formal government schools, and this school should be consulted for the next phase of CCLP. The evaluator found active learning in use there. When visiting other national schools, the evaluator found classrooms that did not seem to be using the active learning approach (e.g., children were not working in groups). In interviews, the teachers at national schools said it was difficult to implement the active learning methodology, citing the following reasons: large class size, limited space, and only one teacher per class. In the first photo, students are grouped into boys and girls, though their tables could be moved apart for smaller groups. In the classroom in the other photo, the teacher broke a large group into smaller ones when asked to demonstrate how one could conduct active learning, but they were seated as one large group when the evaluator arrived. The Assiut class had decorated the walls with light colors and materials appealing to children, while the Sohag class had not.

In interviews with mothers, several cases were found where siblings had left school at a young age to work; 4 of the 16 children ages 9–12 interviewed in Assiut had siblings who had left, and several of the Beni Suef children had returned to school, so these were indeed children at risk.

When asked what they liked about school, the Assiut children listed education, the food they received, and trips. Several mentioned the teacher because “she explains clearly” and “she doesn’t hit us.” When asked if they would continue to attend without the food incentives, one small girl said, “The most important thing isn’t the biscuits, it’s that we get to learn.” Another said, “Education is the most important: Scientists come right after the Prophet” (from the Hadith). All students said they would continue to attend without the rice incentive—though that is also a parental decision. When asked what they disliked about school, they said some of the non-project teachers. They had high aspirations: six wanted to be doctors, four wanted to be teachers, two each wanted to be policemen and soccer players, and one wanted to be an engineer.

Ten Assiut teachers were interviewed. Seven of those teachers had been trained in active learning and three had not, though they said they learned from being in class with their trained colleagues (some classes in the school visited had two teachers per class). They said class size averaged 50 children. The teachers saw changes in both the children and in themselves because of active learning. In the past, students were shy or frightened of the teacher, so they did not participate. Now, with active learning, the students love school and attend more. Education has become a “pleasure for them” because of their participation. Teachers found that teaching was more efficient, and they can convey information more easily. One described how, after a good class, she felt a “joyful atmosphere.” Previously, their knowledge of educational strategies was theoretical, but now they know how to apply them. One teacher described how in the past she got angry at children very easily and screamed at them, but after training, she learned how to control herself. When asked, they felt some students might leave without incentives, but only about three per class, and those students would typically be underperforming. The only negative comment these teachers had was that a lot of documentation was required for class attendance and activities.

Reactions of students and teachers to the project were often similar in Beni Suef and Sohag formal schools. Regarding the state of education before the project, when Beni Suef students ages 10–12 were asked how teaching had changed “before and after you got the rice,” they said they were now beaten less and learning more.³ Six teachers trained at this Beni Suef school, but that is only a few of the teachers (about 48).

Generally, the teachers seemed to view the training positively. Some teachers complained about not getting transportation paid to training sessions, or receiving per diem while there. Yet others said, “Cooperation and participation improves the quality of education.... Previously, children only received [information passively].” Others felt “more comfortable mentally” after learning how to better deal with students, and these teachers felt less pressure because they did not always have to be the one talking. The teachers also seemed to be involved in their training. One teacher said training other teachers was a condition to receive the training, and some of the teachers present had each trained 6–10 teachers for two weeks in their free time. One teacher showed a notebook with his training notes.

Regarding incentives, all of the children interviewed in Sohag said they would come without the incentives: “We all have a goal to achieve; it’s not about biscuits or rice.” Mothers interviewed also said they would keep their children in school if the THR ended; however, these opinions may not be reliable, as mothers and children may exhibit response bias. On the other hand, some teachers felt that many students would leave school without the incentives; again, teachers may not have accurate or full information about students’ household decisionmaking. There is scant reliable data to determine if the THR affects student attendance; one example is a nonformal school in Assiut, in which 25 out of 29 students continued attending school, even though the THR was one to two months late. The evaluator recommends conducting a follow-up study one to two years after the THR has stopped to determine the percentage of project children who are retained in school.

The evaluator also found that there may be a slight negative impact of the THR. Children were asked if children without rice and other incentives were jealous. These children replied, “Yes, they ask us why we get things.” One child tells them, “It’s from God” and another that the CDA people bring it and just choose certain people. The children interviewed did not seem to be upset by this.

In Sohag, the students ages 11–13 also liked learning, and said, “No one can fool us when we grow up,” and “We’ll be able to understand a doctor or a policeman.” They especially liked one teacher who treated them like family, though this teacher did hit students for misbehaving (though “not hard”). When asked whether the students worked in groups, one said, “Groups are only in soccer.” Asked if there was a problem because some children did not get the incentives, especially the rice, one said others told the beneficiaries, “You’re poor; your dad doesn’t get you anything.” But the beneficiaries said, “We’ll deal with them,” and did not seem very upset by such comments. They too had goals for the future: two wanted to be doctors, four wanted to be police, and one each wanted to be a pilot, a driver, a lawyer, and a diver. The seven female teachers had taught between 10 and 27 years, yet all felt they had learned something in the

³ The evaluator sometimes wondered if the children were coached on how to answer questions, but it seems unlikely that they would have answered that they were beaten less.

training on active learning. About 10% of teachers in the school received the training, and some said they taught their colleagues in informal sessions. These teachers felt they had become more active in class, and some used craft approaches with local materials, like gluing beans on paper as letters, which they found helped students retain information; teachers also used flashcards to teach grammar. However, they complained about the lack of materials and of classroom space. According to these teachers, each school only received one teaching kit from the project, and they would prefer one per classroom. The techniques of active learning that they used most were discussions, conversations and role-playing, “maps of understanding” of topics, and a suggestion box of problems that were opened and discussed weekly—all activities that could be done without special materials.

5.1.2 Nonformal CS and GEI schools

Children in nonformal schools were usually those withdrawn from agricultural labor; the one-room schools are located in rural areas and serve students who never attended formal government schools. Under CCLP, children went either to CS schools in Assiut and Sohag governorates or to GEI schools in Beni Suef. The CS schools are operated under MOE, and the GEI schools under NCCM in coordination with MOE. NCCM is exploring handing over these schools to MOE, but this has not yet happened.



A school in Beni Suef that has not been renovated.



A renovated school in Assiut.

Case Study: Community Schools

The evaluator visited five rural nonformal or CS schools in which children were withdrawn from agriculture and other rural work. Although located in poor and isolated rural areas, all these schools were decorated with brightly colored materials on the walls. These materials were handmade, often including the children's writings and drawings. One school had a dirt floor, but it was barely noticeable with the room's cheery atmosphere; another had been renovated by the project and had a new tile floor. Most had tables seating about eight children; since one class contains children of all primary ages, this is a good way to form groups of different skill levels.

In a CS school in Sohag Governorate, most of the 13 students, ages 9–13, who were interviewed had previously worked in agriculture to help their families purchase food. Several had pulled and peeled onions or peanuts, or loaded boxes of tomatoes onto trucks. A boy and a girl had filled bottled gas containers and sold them in the neighborhood streets. The work involved many characteristics that were dangerous to children's health and, therefore, could be considered hazardous child labor. This included carrying heavy loads, working long hours in the hot sun (several had experienced sunstroke), and being beaten if they rested. They earned 10–15 EGP a day, or 50–75 EGP a week. The children said they liked getting an education, writing, and interacting with the facilitators at the school. One child one said, "I can read signs when I walk down the street." They felt they had changed and gone from being ignorant to clever: "I have a value." While they loved school, if the THR of rice were discontinued, all but one said they would leave. Their fathers would take them out, saying, "You're only benefiting yourself; you're not benefiting us." They all aspired to a better future: "I dream of being a facilitator." Of the other children, four wanted to be policemen, seven wanted to be teachers, and one each wanted to be a lawyer and an engineer.

Besides learning, there can be other benefits. A female student, who is now 15, was forced by her father to work, and he was also going to make her marry. He did not want her to go to school, but she went one day without his permission and told her story to the facilitators. They first

convinced the father to send her to school, and later persuaded him to sign a contract they prepared that she did not have to marry until she was 21. He signed with a thumbprint and allowed her to attend school; even though he has since died, her mother still honors the contract. This young woman was very self-confident, and told the evaluator her story during the interview.

The two facilitators were sisters age 22 and 28; one had a university degree and the other a high school education plus a two-year diploma. Each earns 98 EGP a month, and their father donated the classroom and pays for water and electricity. They initially faced difficulties because the children feared them and did not learn well, but this improved after about a month of school. They teach at the CS school because “[we] want to do something for our country, and be proud.” In their teaching, they use puppets and stories, which interests the children “like a series on TV.” The older sister had taught in the government school system and said it was very different: they used low-level methods, not active learning. The children at the CS school have outside exams twice a year, and sometimes they score higher than the children from the government schools.

However, the facilitators worried that some of the children would stop attending school without the incentives. One facilitator said, “To be honest, parents don’t care about educating their children—they care about a source of income.” They felt that the project for mothers to earn income was positive since the women would then have some money, and “it gives them a role besides waiting for their husband.” Although they thought a mother could earn 50 EGP a month, the children would leave school if there was no rice; they said that families, after all, get the 50 EGP worth of rice without getting a loan (often needed to start a business). There is evidence on this that points in both directions. The children received shoes and schoolbags for the first two years, but have gotten none the last two years, yet none have left the CS school. On the other hand, there was a time when the THR of rice arrived late, and four children left, though they returned when the rice arrived.

Village Committee

As the evaluator was leaving the Sohag school, she met some members of the village committee that supports the school. Since SCDAWCI does not work with local CDAs, the NGO has formed committees to help them work with the schools, including following the students. This committee includes the two facilitators, their father who donated the space, and two parents (including a mother of a beneficiary and a local leader). The committee members said they last met about a month before the evaluation, when they discussed if the classroom donor would continue for two more years and if they might approach local businessmen for help buying book bags and shoes for the children since the project has stopped supplying them.

Conditions were similar in Assiut and Beni Suef. Although the Beni Suef nonformal schools are managed by NCCM and are called GEI schools instead of CS schools, all are located in rural areas distant from government schools. The evaluator met 29 children, ages 8–14, in the CS school near Abu Teeg in Assiut. Eighteen of the children had been withdrawn from work, mostly in agriculture; many of them peeled corn, and one sold it on the street. These children earned 4.5–10 EGP a day or 22–50 EGP a week. Some said that when they left work for school,

they were offered higher wages to stay on. When asked how they had changed since coming to school, one said she was more relaxed and another said she was no longer tired. Children have seen their lives changed, and some have noted that they have “gotten cleaner.” They said they would still come to school without incentives, and many had very high aspirations: 14 children wanted to be doctors, 8 wanted to be teachers, and 7 wanted to be policemen.

When teachers were asked why they took the job, one facilitator said she “felt bad for the children working from sunrise to sunset,” and another pointed out girls in this area work just as much as boys in agriculture. Teachers felt the training improved their ability to deliver information and taught them to work with children grouped by level. They also felt more confident and that they learned from each other. As for the children, they learned to express themselves better, and their skill level was “better than that of government schools.” A school donor (and member of the MOE school examination board) monitored exams with children from both formal and nonformal schools, and he also felt that the latter compared favorably against the former. Teachers also pointed out a few problems with the CS schools, or at least theirs. No one has dropped out, and they have about 45 children in each of the two classrooms. Also, there have been no new schools created in four years, but more are needed in more areas. The teachers’ training was far away for them (in Assiut); they would like it to be closer. Also, since MOE has taken over the schools, they have not had any supervisory visits, and the teachers would prefer to have visits.

In Beni Suef, 10 girls, ages 10–16, were interviewed at a GEI nonformal school. None had ever gone to a government school, and eight used to do agricultural work, though they still did the same kind of work in the summer for parents or others and for which they earned 5–10 EGP a day or 25–50 EGP a week. The work was hard, with fluctuating temperatures (sometimes very hot, sometimes cold), and at times they had to do it while fasting for Ramadan. When asked if there was anything they missed about work, one said, “It made us feel exhausted—so what’s to miss?” They said they would still attend school without the THR of rice and that their parents would not force them to work for money. The children liked the school because everything was free, and the teachers treated them nicely and educated them. One said it was better than the government school, because “they beat kids up there.” The children had genuine affection for the school and the facilitators, as witnessed when they showed the evaluator around their classroom.

At one point, there was a ministerial decision that all facilitators must have a university degree, meaning many now teaching would lose their jobs. When the teachers told the students, many of the students left school in sympathy. While an NCCM advisor tried to resolve things with the People’s Assembly, the facilitators took things into their own hands and gathered in Cairo at MOE. Although they did not see the Minister, their plight became known and they kept their jobs, although new facilitators will need a university degree. Once this was settled, students returned to classes.

Ten of the GEI school facilitators attended a meeting in Beni Suef. Three had university degrees, and the rest had high school or two years past a high school education. All of them were trained in active learning, which did not include any practice teaching with children but did include role-playing. From their confidence in their work, and that of other facilitators met, it seems that the training is sufficient and effective. The facilitators felt that the children in their classes could now express themselves better and had better relationships with the facilitators. In terms of teaching,

they felt the children were engaged intellectually and not just writing down what they are told (as they would in formal schools). Now, “the child looks for information herself.” The teachers had also experienced change for the better. High attendance was one factor that led to higher teacher morale: “If the child loves learning and me—that makes me proud.” They felt the incentives led to parental commitment.



A community school classroom donor, in a village near Assiut.

Case Study: Rural School Donors

Both the CS schools and the GEI schools in rural areas are held in classrooms donated by local people or MOE. The gentleman pictured is one of those people.

He donated a room in his house; he lives upstairs, and has no children or grandchildren in the CS school. When asked why he donated the room, he said it was for charity and for the good of society. He added, “The project is giving its help for the sake of God, and I’m doing the same, and that there are many good people doing much good.” He is literate himself and proud that the children were taken from the fields to school.

Two other donors were met in another area. All donors seem to have the following in common: they have reasonable incomes and some spare space that they can donate. The evaluator heard that some areas have waiting lists of potential to be donors.

5.1.3 Apprentices

Children in the apprentice program were already working, often in workshops with hazardous conditions or materials. Signing a contract with their employer, assisted by MOMM and an NGO, is a way for working children to earn an income and help their families improve their working conditions, all while receiving the same certification as if they had attended a vocational school. While the apprentice contract program existed in MOMM, it was rarely used; the CCLP

and ILO activated it and made workshop owners and MOMM labor inspectors better informed about it and more collegial with each other along the way.

Table 2: Total Apprentices Involved in CCLP

Location	Male	Female	Total
Sohag	302	65	367
Assiut	471	294	765
Beni Suef	471	56	527
Total	1,244	415	1,659



Male apprentices at a factory in Assiut.



A female apprentice in Assiut.

Case Study: Apprentices

The evaluator was able to speak to a number of apprentices during the evaluation visit, most working in car workshops or the car industry, and a few as seamstresses. Most were positive about their experiences. Male apprentices were interviewed in all three governorates, but females were interviewed only in Assiut. These 10 young women ranged from ages 14 to 25, and worked in a “factory” sewing shorts. The factory was more like a large house, with sewing machines scattered around a large, airy, well-lit room—a more accurate name for it would be “workshop.” The young women said it was not hard work, except at first when they were just learning. When asked what they liked about work, they said it was physically easy, and liked working as a group and had become friends.

Most had gotten contracts with their employer in February; they did not know such a thing existed until a member of the CDA known as Giving Without Limits told them about it. With the contract they work shorter hours, from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. instead of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.; they get five sick days a month instead of one; and they have health insurance. When they finish the contract they will be tested, and they will get a certificate saying that they are qualified seamstresses, the same one that vocational training schools give after two years. The apprentices said that certification was very useful; if one tries to change jobs, an employer asks for certification, and it can guarantee an immediate job offer. The apprentices also said the CDA helped them and their family members obtain birth certificates and government ID cards, involved them in recreational activities, and said they would help them attend literacy classes.

These young women clearly benefited from the apprentice contracts and CCLP incentives and activities. However, one could question if their work was WFCL, unless it was keeping underage girls out of school. There was not dangerous machinery, and the atmosphere was clean and pleasant.

Conditions were less safe for the 16 male apprentices, ages 14–18, who were interviewed in Assiut. Many worked in car workshops (two with aluminum or manufacturing), and two worked in a tobacco factory. The evaluator did not have time for site visits to these workshops, but car workshops in particular were found in the rapid assessment to often have hazardous conditions.

Eleven of the males had left school. A few had failed, but most had other reasons: feeling that the fees being too high, disliking education or seeing no use for it, and being hit by teachers. One said, “I hated the teachers. I felt they pushed us toward failure.” They did not mention many difficult working conditions, though one said he had to lift heavy things before the CDA person spoke to his boss. Others said that when you like a skill, it’s not difficult; they may have been unaware of some hazards.

They received help in getting a contract with the head of their workshops, and that led to shorter hours, so they can go home earlier. Some stopped running household errands for the boss, and most got a raise in pay. Their salaries before ranged from 35 to 60 EGP a week; afterward salaries were raised from 60 to 80 EGP; this was an increase of nearly 30 to 50%. Like the girls working as seamstresses, their

contracts will culminate in a certificate of skill equal to that from a vocational training school.

These young men also benefited from other programs offered during the project. They received the food incentives, and were taken on fieldtrips and went to camp. One trip involved the SCREAM project, where they produced stories and went to Fayoum; one man said the activity made him happy because he could express himself. Many received OSH tools that protect them from materials like gas or allergy-producing products, and some said the OSH clothing keeps them warm in the winter. There was an arrangement with MOSS, which has a vocational training program, for the males to study there one day a week to learn new skills. Although they had to attend on their one day off, 13 of these young men did so. They were also offered literacy classes and all took the classes. One young man had gotten as far as seventh grade in a formal school and was not literate, but after the class he could write his name and read simple things.

The evaluator also spoke to nine workshop owners in Beni Suef. Many had car workshops, and some worked with welding or electricity. Some said they did not do the contracts because of the MOSS social insurance payments. Although the fee is low for apprentices (3 EGP a month), payments are retroactive so it could add up to a significant sum initially. Others were not sure the workers would stay. It seems once an employer starts paying the insurance, he must continue, even if an apprentice leaves; MOSS probably assumes the apprentice is replaced. However, owners said they benefit if an apprentice stays, since they've invested in teaching him, so for that reason the contract is attractive because it encourages youth to stay, as do the project food incentives and OSH supplies. The contract also protects the owners from arrests of young workers and from fines. Apprentices were supposed to get extra training from MOSS vocational programs in Beni Suef, but this had not started yet.

Three owners had gone to project-run awareness sessions and found them useful. Others said they were prevented by their work, they did not know about the sessions and wished they were better publicized, or they were too far away. Many said they had good relations with the MOMM inspector, and because of this some wished MOMM would take over the insurance issues that are presently dealt with by MOSS. The owners had some other interesting suggestions that CCLP might want to consider:

- Provide apprentices with an ID card. The card would protect the children and owners in the event that the children get arrested. According to anecdotal evidence, police sometimes do arrest working children, detaining the child for a day without telling them why.
- Take owners and apprentices to factories related to their work so that they can learn about new practices.
- Ensure that there is a clinic to treat apprentices in an industrial area.
- Enable owners to receive help in registering or licensing workshops.

The evaluator suggests that MOSS drop their requirement of retroactive payment when an employer first obtains health insurance for a child, and that they look into stopping the owner's payments for insurance once the apprentice leaves his employ.

The final group of actors in the apprentice program consists of the labor inspectors and apprentice guides from MOMM. Their job is to inspect workshops to be sure apprentices are of legal age and that working conditions are safe; only the labor inspectors can issue fines. The Undersecretary of MOMM in Beni Suef was very proud of having 532 apprentice contracts signed during the project. He said he had a yearly plan for inspectors, and they could not previously reach those numbers. He reported that the number of contracts signed before the project was 176 in 2005, 103 in 2006, and 114 through June 2007, for a total of 393 over the three years. Then, from the project beginning in June 2007 to October 2010, 532 contracts were signed (139 more contracts over the three years). A woman from MOMM said she wanted to thank USDOL “for highlighting weak areas, like child labor,” which “got them started on the right road.”

A very important effect of CCLP was improving relations between the workshop owners and the MOMM labor inspectors. In the past, this relationship was adversarial and punitive, with the inspectors issuing fines for young workers or bad conditions, so owners dreaded their visits and hid young workers. One owner said, “We couldn’t even sit down and talk to each other,” while an NGO member who accompanied MOMM to workshops said at first he “was afraid they would throw stones at us.” When the approach became more positive, with the inspector often assisted by the NGO with a contract for the child that protected the owner from fines, the relationships became more positive. NGOs also offered awareness classes for workshop owners about contracts and dangers in child labor. MOMM worked on contracts in four districts in Beni Suef, but now plan to expand it to all districts.

Among those interviewed, the evaluator determined that the apprentices from Assiut benefited most from CCLP, because they had access to all the benefits. Those interviewed in Beni Suef and Sohag liked the program and did get contracts. One beneficiary said that this meant being secure against injuries, and others said that this meant protection from being fired. None of the eight beneficiaries interviewed in Sohag had gotten vocational training from MOSS, and the three in Beni Suef did not mention it. All beneficiaries mentioned and enjoyed the fieldtrips. The three beneficiaries in Beni Suef and one in Sohag were starting literacy classes. Many apprentices were illiterate, despite attending formal school for several years. This was true for two of the three beneficiaries in Beni Suef who had reached grades 7, 8, and 10, and for four of the eight in Sohag who had reached grades 3, 6, and 7.

Three workshop owners in Sohag were less positive than those mentioned before. They felt the contracts benefited the apprentices, linking them to the shop and to project incentives and improving earnings, but were less beneficial for the owners. One owner said he saw one benefit for him in that the bond was closer between him and his apprentices. Another said he didn’t have apprentice contracts because MOMM can close workshops that are not licensed, and MOSS can take action against businesses that do not have insurance. These are both legal functions of the ministries, but owners are wary because these requirements can impinge on their profits. One owner said MOMM could report workshop owners for any infraction, and another said that the owner could go to prison if MOMM finds a worker under 18 with no contract. The evaluator could not confirm this fact, but if the owners believe it, it influences their attitudes. They said none of their apprentices had gotten literacy classes and that they needed the workers during the day, so they could only attend at night, or perhaps during a break if the classes were held at the workshop.

One area needing attention is children working in unregistered workshops, which are smaller and less prosperous. Many children working in such places do so under worse conditions. Owners fear government fines and avoid labor inspectors.



Entrepreneurial mothers in
Akhmim, Sohag Governorate.

5.1.4 Entrepreneurial Training for Mothers

To deal with the poverty at the base of child labor, CCLP worked with ILO to provide GET Ahead training to mothers of children in the project. This training included business ideas, production, marketing, and management, all presented in a way accessible to and enjoyable for illiterate women. ILO trained young women from NGOs or schools in each governorate, and these women trained the mothers. Although this aspect began near the end of the project, it was well received by the mothers, and many are now earning income with their projects.

5.1.5 “Everything Is Honey”

Groups of mothers who had been trained were interviewed in each of the three governorates. All groups were lively and enthusiastic about what they learned and how they applied it. When asked “What did you dislike about the project?” one woman replied, “Everything is honey.” Colloquially, this means, “Everything is wonderful.”

Ten women attended a meeting with the evaluator in Akhmim, Sohag. When asked about the most important thing they learned in training, most said how to earn money with a project. A few others said how important it is to educate children. One woman said, “It enlightened my thinking. We didn’t understand what we or our children wanted. The instructor sat with us, we felt like she was our sister. Now we each have an aim and a clear vision. I never thought of a project on my own. Thanks to her, after God, now I can afford private tutoring.” She is sewing and wants tutoring for a daughter who she would like to see become a doctor.

The women said their children do not work now, though several had worked before. These children worked in car repair shops, in construction, and in a restaurant, and many worked in agriculture. Children earned about 2 EGP a day or 14 EGP a week. The mothers said that now

the children go to school, and the women say that they want the children to stay in school, even if the project stops. They plan to support school fees with their own earnings.

The evaluator has seen many income-generating projects for women in other contexts and countries, and has seen many flounder on marketing. This project did not have that problem. The women were trained in marketing, and they understood it well. For example, one woman wanted to make soap, but she had a local competitor. So she looked at the market more closely and found there was a demand for smaller bars and for liquid soap, so she made both.

Nine of the 10 women had income-generating projects. Three had begun their projects before training and had expanded after the training, and six were new. Many sold food, including chickens, eggs, vegetables, snack seeds, and groceries; a few were raising rabbits, pigeons, ducks, or goats. Their profits included 2 EGP per day from seed sales, 2–4 EGP per day for sewing, or 20 EGP per day for selling groceries or vegetables. One woman made 500 EGP in two months selling chickens. The women pictured were not at the group interview, but they made paper bags from used cement bags that they bought. Their bags were sold to vegetable and merchandise dealers for 25 EGP for 600 bags. The glue being used is from dough recycled from the floor of a bread factory.

Although they learned about loans in training, none of these women had “official” loans. Several feared they could not pay back the installments. Even the woman who had made the most income, 500 EGP selling chickens, shared this sentiment. She said the project had succeeded once, but there was another time when all the chicks died and she still had to repay the loan. One woman sold gold earrings to get started, and another borrowed 70 EGP from friends. Not all women were fearful about funds because four women had applied for loans from MOSS about three months ago. However, none had received a loan by the time of the interview.

When asked what else the CDA could do for them, the women requested more training. They wanted advanced training in production, training in sewing, and literacy classes.

The 12 mothers met in Assiut, and the 15 in Beni Suf were similar in many ways. One woman said the program “taught us how to think and plan” and another that they had learned to rely on themselves so their children would not leave school and go to work. Many mothers had begun projects, often selling food or clothing. Mothers earned 35 EGP per week selling vegetables, 100 EGP per month selling eggs, or 150–200 EGP per month selling clothing.

However, circumstances were different. All the mothers in Beni Suf had loans of 1,000 EGP from the CDA. No one reported problems repaying them, but at the time of the interview they had only had the loans for 21 days. In Assiut, some had loans, but 5 of the 12 feared getting them. The mothers in Beni Suf said they would send their children to school even if the incentives like rice stopped; they would use their project income. However, mothers in Assiut said they would be angry if incentives stopped, saying, “If there is no project, the children will continue working.” They said their work would not be sufficient to keep the children in school, but if they expanded, then they could afford it. One woman complained that she could only pay for three of her four children with her earnings. The Beni Suf mothers would like to learn more skills, like sewing, life skills, and other types of education. Those from Assiut wanted to know more about health. While ILO training only focused on entrepreneurship, it seems some local

classes included lessons on health, nutrition, pregnancy, and other topics; Assiut seemed to have the most of this type, and the women felt it was useful.

Educational Services for Children

Children received varying amounts of educational services with the project, and the impact of these services varied. The apprentices received little in the way of educational services with the project. Apprentices could receive additional vocational training, which was beneficial.

It was difficult to assess if a lasting impact was produced in the public school students. Their attendance was more regular, but the evaluator did not hear about a generalized lasting impact. The evaluator interviewed a group of students working with other students to try to keep them in school, part of the Child to Child Program. That group seemed very interested in preventing child labor and in making others aware of it.

The CS and GEI students did demonstrate a lasting impact from the three to four years they have been in school. For nearly all, those schools were the only ones they had ever attended. In the schools visited, they seemed very bright and active in a way that their public school counterparts did not. For instance, while public school students usually stood and welcomed the evaluator in unison, the CS and GEI students had a spokesperson (the system is to have a class leader who changes each week) who had to recite prewritten, memorized greeting paragraphs, and then all students usually sang or recited something—often including some English words. In one school, a girl of about three or four years of age sang a long welcome song on her own. Facilitators spoke of the way active learning brought out the talents of each student, so each excelled in some way, and said the children became more self-confident. That was apparent in the classes that the evaluator visited. One of the classroom donors (a member of the examination board at the formal school) made the following comparison between the two kinds of schools: students from the formal schools looked around the room during exams as if they sought answers on the walls or had nothing to write; meanwhile, CS students were busy answering questions. He also said the CS students scored well; they are examined with the same tests as children from the formal school.

Quality of Education

Project activities have improved the quality of education to some extent, and communities and the Government seem to appreciate this. One focus of CCLP was to improve the quality of education through active learning in order to make it more attractive to families to educate their children rather than sending them to work.

Anecdotal evidence from interviews with students and teachers gives some ideas on the quality of education. The facilitators in nonformal schools talked about developing a bond with students, and students said that the facilitators were like part of the family. Students also talked about lessons being explained clearly and in a way they could understand, and how different approaches were used (e.g., puppet shows) to help them understand.

Almost none of this occurs in formal government schools, where teachers lack the materials to use in this way, and where they have large classes of about a 50:1 student to teacher ratio. Still, there was a bit of evidence from students that some active learning was used, and that helped them feel better about school. The midterm evaluation found that one reason students disliked school was teachers hitting them. In interviews, some students mentioned teachers who did not hit them or who hit them less hard. Teachers said that involving students in discussions took some of the pressure off them, indicating they tried the approach to some degree.

The evaluator wondered if this focus on quality in education might be resented by the Government, especially MOE, but when asked about this in interviews, their representatives and others said that this was not at all the case. They said they appreciated efforts to improve quality and to reach more rural children. One MOE official said, “The project is helping me [by] reaching children I cannot reach.” MOE allowed teachers time to be trained in active learning, some of whom received training-of-trainers sessions. MOE encouraged those teachers to train their colleagues. However, probably related to the lack of resources, when asked about doing such training, teachers said they were encouraged to do it informally, over coffee; the evaluator did not hear about special sessions set up at schools.

The evaluator has limited information on how community members felt about the quality of education. However, some of the mothers interviewed said school had improved with the project. One mother said the fact that the NGO asks about the children (for the CTS) shows that they care about them. Another mother said that some children who have repeated grades in the past have now advanced. One woman said she has a daughter in preparatory school and a younger one in the project, and the latter is “more clever” than the elder, saying the younger daughter reads better and reads the newspaper. The man who was a school donor and examiner felt that the quality of education in the CS school was better than the formal school, based on the way students acted during exams.

5.1.6 Government/NGO Cooperation

Impact on Groups Working Against Child Labor

The project has had a tremendous impact on groups working against child labor in Egypt. Thanks to the project, these groups now work together. Working together, the groups have improved their methods and increased their capacity.

One NGO member said that, through this project, relations have improved between NGOs and the Government of Egypt. The project has built trust between the Government, foreign organizations, and international NGOs. An NGO member from Beni Suef said that a main positive point of CCLP was the networking between the Government and NGOs. A Beni Suef CDA member agreed, saying the most important lesson of the project was that group work was more important than one NGO working alone; it is better to partner with the Government and others. Another CDA member said the lesson learned was “better use of available resources to accomplish our goals.” This CDA member gave the example of using MOSS loans to help mothers fund income-generating projects. Government officials from Beni Suef supported this. An MOE representative said that the partnership of ministries, NGOs, and WPF made the project progress well. The Undersecretary from MOSS agreed, saying their work with CEOS helped

them reach out to children and “gave a vision of how to benefit from working with NGOs.” He also said that NGO staffers teach children about volunteerism and supporting community solidarity.

The UN agencies mediate relations between the NGOs and the Government of Egypt, given their technical support and acceptance by both parties.

This positive attitude of the Government and NGOs about working with one another is a major accomplishment of this project. They acknowledge that they can do more together than they can alone, and have done so.

There are many examples of this new cooperation. In Assiut, MOSS used an NGO and CDA help to locate the neediest families to work with, and MOMM allowed an NGO person to join field inspections of workshops and apprentices, which was not previously allowed. In Beni Suef, MOSS gave CEOSS, the lead NGO, a check for 4,000 EGP to be distributed to poor families for food in Ramadan. In Sohag, the lead NGO SCDAWCI conducted workshops for MOMM labor inspectors on how to prepare and sign a contract between apprentices and workshop owners, and how to follow up on the apprentices.

This atmosphere of cooperation extended to government agencies cooperating with each other. Examples include Assiut, where MOMM had information on working children that they shared with MOSS, which would follow up on each family to see if it was entitled to additional benefits. On the national level, NCCM trained MOALR extension agents about legal aspects of child labor, which will be useful for new work focused on children working in agriculture.

Another excellent example of the new government/NGO cooperation is seen in the attitude toward and work of the child protection committees. These committees exist at the governorate level (in the form of general committees) and at the directorate level (in the form of subcommittees). These committees are now required by amendments to the Child Law in 2008, but they are just starting to operate. Their mandate is to protect children in general, and combating WFCL falls within that. Members come from ministries that deal with children, including MOE, MOMM, MOSS, NCCM, MOFP, and the Ministry of Health. In Assiut, Beni Suef, and Sohag, there is an NGO member at each level. The evaluator was told by one of the NGOs that WFP’s credibility enabled the NGO’s presence on the committees. At the governorate level, the general committee is headed by the Governor and it should deal with policy, strategy, and the implementation of each. At the district level, the subcommittee includes local members from the same ministries, and their role is to identify children with problems and refer them to the appropriate service. One member said that, if they cannot solve something locally, they refer it to the general committee. The subcommittees have begun functioning in Assiut and Sohag, but not in Beni Suef.

The head of each lead NGO was a member of his governorate’s general committee. All heads spoke highly of the group, one saying that they feel they are partners and that they solve problems together. Another said that, in his committee, he “works hand in hand with government partners”—they are all friends, and their dealings are transparent. A MOSS official was also positive, saying the committees were successful and had done a lot, and they should be extended to other districts of the governorate.

The work done by these committees does not always fit within the guidelines above. In one case, a trash dump was located in front of a school, and the general committee contacted the proper authorities to have it cleaned up. In another case, it was learned that a young woman was being pressured by her mother to marry at a very young age. This case was sent to the general committee, which decided to send the female head of one of the NGO field teams to speak with the mother, who then allowed her daughter to delay marriage until she was 18; her daughter is currently finishing her studies. A case that came before a subcommittee was the problem of young boys driving three-wheeled *tuk-tuk* vehicles. The subcommittee worked with traffic police to license the drivers. While an individual case of underage marriage is not necessarily a matter of policy or strategy, and while the licensing of *tuk-tuk* drivers is, these committees are new and adapting to these situations. The positive regard among their members and the cross-ministry cooperation make the committees promising allies in the fight against child labor.

5.1.7 Capacity Building

Capacity of Government, NGOs, and CDAs

Government, NGOs, and CDAs have increased their capacity through working on CCLP. In Assiut and Beni Suef, CCLP worked with well-established NGOs, internationally based *Terre des Hommes*, and CEOSS, respectively. However, in Sohag, SCDAWCI was a new local NGO. While there were some challenges at first, the NGO grew with these challenges, and the leader of the NGO noted their increased capacity. They learned to use the CTS database for CCLP, and now they could use it for other projects as well. Previously, the NGO's main focus had been on women's issues, but with this work on children, the group "expanded their resume." Perhaps the most enthusiastic view of a CDA's new capacity was one Assiut member. She was very doubtful, especially as a woman, that she could convince tough workshop owners to deal differently with their apprentices. However, she was successful and learned that "There is no impossible!" *Terre des Hommes* said their CDAs had built capacity, including being able to write project proposals. This was validated when the CDA known as Giving Without Limits won a contract from Save the Children to work on a project for USAID.

Government groups also increased in capacity. One CDA staff said they found MOMM labor inspectors and workshop owners had little knowledge about the apprentice contracts, but now contracts are used by both and are even sought. MOE teachers and CS and GEI facilitators all learned the active learning approach, and all felt it was useful in their teaching and beneficial to students, although the formal school teachers faced constraints of space and class size and materials in using the approach. MOSS and MOE representatives in Sohag said working with CCLP helped them accomplish their goals (e.g., it extended their capacity).

An important element for increasing capacity is the meetings WFP hosts for their three implementing NGO teams and their government partners. The last meeting was in Alexandria in summer 2009. There, the partners share successes so others can benefit, such as using the university students as tutors in the project.

Communities were involved in the project through attending awareness sessions about the importance of education and by serving on committees to support CS schools. Social workers at MOE said there were parent committees at the formal schools. Before CCLP, only 5 of the 190 parents would attend a meeting, but after the program, 60 attended.

Policy Change

There is limited but looming impact of the project on government structures in terms of systemwide change related to education and child labor, but policy change—if not formal—is apparent in the way some ministries are functioning.

The child protection committees described above are one example of a change in government structure. They did not exist until legally decreed in the 2008 amendments to the Child Law. There is now an official structure for dealing with children’s problems. The structure is just beginning to be implemented, with the three CCLP governorates taking an active role.

The NAP for the elimination of child labor is an instance of a looming impact on government structures. A National Strategy for the elimination of child labor has been drafted by MOFP, MOMM, and NCCM, with ILO and UNICEF involved and WFP acting as the secretariat. The NAP outlines what should be done, but it has not been endorsed by the Government and stakeholders say it has been difficult to schedule a second meeting to discuss the strategy. WFP hoped to do so in December, after the Egyptian elections and, by June 2011, WFP plans to have a draft NAP that ILO-IPEC will revise, get feedback on, and have it decreed as a national policy paper. When signed, it will include the obligations of each ministry with regard to children, and it will also hopefully include a child fund budget line.

The 2010 Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour (SIMPOC) study of child labor in Egypt, the first conducted in nine years, is not itself a policy change, but a demonstration of a change in the stance of the Government of Egypt on the topic of child labor. In the past, child labor was rarely discussed, while now it is discussed in many venues, and the First Lady has taken a public stand against it. The SIMPOC study was cleared by the Minister of MOMM during a 2009 CCLP steering committee meeting, which supports the idea that this activity would not have taken place before the work of CCLP and the trust it built through its work on child labor with various ministries. There has been a delay in publication of the results, but they will hopefully become available in coming months. A U.S. Embassy official noted the Government’s willingness to talk about and work on child labor.

Although there were no official policy changes, the project changed the way some ministries work or changed the target population with whom they work. A person working in MOALR and another in MOE both said that working with CCLP allowed them to reach out to the poorest parts of the population. One person said, “They reach where I can’t—to social levels that don’t have an opportunity for education.” One added that the Government did not usually target those people, so this can be seen as a change. An MOMM official made a similar comment, saying that policy had not changed, but they had increased their efforts.

In discussing the cooperation of the Government with NGOs, it was noted that NGOs are allowed to work directly with some offices (e.g., accompanying a labor inspector on official visits or using MOE statistics). While not an official change in policy, this kind of interaction was not seen in the past. Allowing—and encouraging—these interactions illustrates a de facto change in policy.

An NGO official said that the impact he saw on the Government was that NGOs “activated” certain aspects of the Government, such as the apprentice contract or the NGO department of MOE. Another NGO official felt that “MOMM reevaluated its policies” and changed its relations with the labor inspectors, who did not previously pursue apprentice contracts. In fact, a national MOMM official said that labor inspectors should not punish workshop owners; they should help set up contracts. An MOMM official at the governorate level said they had not changed policy, but had “changed our way of working,” citing the good relations between inspectors and workshop owners. Two inspectors present agreed with him, and noted that MOMM is conducting awareness sessions twice a month for 20–40 workshop owners. The inspectors felt it was a good sign that the owners left work for two hours to attend. A CDA staff member noted that inspectors visited more often since working with CCLP—not to punish people, but to be sure the children are being treated in a just manner.

5.2 LESSONS LEARNED/GOOD PRACTICES

- Working with apprentices demonstrated that signing contracts with employers is a way to withdraw children from hazardous working conditions while allowing them to work, to learn a useful skill, to become certified, and to add to their family’s income.
- While active learning was appreciated in both formal and nonformal schools, it was found difficult to implement with large classes and without adequate staff or materials, such as paper and colored markers, which are found in many formal schools. This must be taken into account when a project plans to use active learning.

Good Practices: Entrepreneurial Training for Mothers

Poverty is a basic cause of child labor, and training mothers to become entrepreneurs is one way to alleviate this poverty. The training was well done and enthusiastically received, and 856 of the 2,081 mothers who were trained (41%) have begun projects. Those interviewed earned 80–250 EGP a month. The higher amount was almost on par with salaries for primary school teachers. The training can incorporate topics like health and survival skills. The training covers loans as well, which many women fear but need in order to start a business. Women need more support for loans.

Good Practices: Active Learning Methodology

The active learning methodology was observed to be a good practice in both formal and nonformal educational settings. Students in formal government schools valued the *active learning approach*, as seen in less punitive teachers and clearer lessons. Teachers using this approach in an Assiut school saw relative success. Exploring their success could lead to implementing active learning more effectively in formal schools, despite limitations. In nonformal schools, both students and facilitators

use and appreciate the active learning approach. Their appreciation of this approach can be seen on the walls decorated with children's art, as well as in the enthusiasm of the children.

Good Practices: Relationship with MOMM on Apprentices

The project's work with MOMM on apprentices has involved the opportunity to change the ways in which inspectors do their jobs, from being punitive and disliked to being supportive of apprentices and their bosses.

This page intentionally left blank.

VI SUSTAINABILITY

6.1 FINDINGS

6.1.1 Exit Strategy and Sustainability Plan

The project document integrated an exit strategy and sustainability plan into the project design. This involved “(1) the identification and allocation of national resources to ensure support after the project ends, (2) the transfer of responsibility to national, regional, and local partners through strengthened systems and procedures, and (3) the political will to take action in the field of education and child labor, supported by increased national awareness about the detriments of child labor, to ensure the issue is high on the national agenda (Project Document Draft 4, p. 46).”

The project has worked toward all three goals. The national resources included MOE taking over their CS schools, and NCCM supporting the GEI schools. A national and international NGO are providing further support to the nonformal schools. When the NAP is signed, it should have a governmental budget line. Partners have been trained to use project systems and procedures. There is political will to deal with child labor, and the project has had activities to raise national awareness.

6.1.2 Non-Project Resources and Funding

The project has leveraged non-project resources, and has located some sustainable funding. USDOL could not directly fund the THR of rice, and when supplies were short at one point, WFP supplied them. In the most successful example, the project relied on university education students to tutor remedial student beneficiaries in the project as part of their educational program. This has become regulated and is ongoing, and the project has used this approach in Assiut and Sohag as well. University students work with the project for a year, paying their own transportation to the schools to do so. The Beni Suef coordinator who requested the arrangement with the faculty feared the students would refuse this agreement, but instead they were enthusiastic.

Another instance of sustainability is that the rural schools that have been instrumental in withdrawing children, mainly girls, from agricultural labor, will continue. The CS schools will be taken over by MOE, which will continue to pay facilitators and supply books, and NCCM will continue to support the GEI schools. A protocol was signed with the NGO known as Plan International for the Assiut CS school in May 2010. The Sohag CS educational activities and materials will be taken over by the Masr El Kheir Association in Sohag.

In response to a specific question about whether WFP could leverage resources through other donors such as USAID and the European Union to encourage sustainability, the CCLP director said sustainability does not come from external funding, but from linking to national mechanisms like an activated NAP for child protection with its own budget line.

6.1.3 Challenges and Successes

CCLP has encountered challenges and successes in its work with various agencies. In working with its UN partners (ILO and UNICEF), there was an initial challenge in signing the contract to work with ILO's Cairo office. WFP had done so with UNICEF in the past, but this was its first contract with ILO, and there were some difficulties with the financial arrangements. With the arrival of a new ILO director in February 2010, this situation was resolved, and work on the apprentice program, which had been delayed, speeded up. Otherwise, there have been successes in the association between the three agencies; ILO has supported the apprenticeships and income-generation for mothers' aspects of the project, and UNICEF (the education aspect) provided training in active learning and supported the establishment of the child protection mechanism. An ILO official said that CCLP was "a model project. You couldn't ask for more."

A challenge in working with the Government of Egypt was encountered in Beni Suef, where there have been ongoing negotiations between the project and several governors, because of turnover, over capacity building and training.

There have been many opportunities in working with government agencies concerned with child labor. Probably the most important have been the dual-level child protection committees at the governorate and district levels, which provide an official structure for dealing with children's problems.

Working with National NGOs

There were a few challenges and mostly opportunities in working with national NGOs. Although initially it was a bit of a challenge working with SCDAWCI (the local implementing NGO in Sohag) because they were a new group with limited experience, the NGO developed rapidly and well, providing a good example of how quickly capacity can develop. The ways in which the three lead NGOs and their CDAs interacted was an opportunity. Each NGO learned from the others to benefit the project. For example, CEOSS in Beni Suef came up with the idea of using students from the Faculty of Education to tutor underperforming students, and now all three governorates have these memorandums of understanding with MOE. SCDAWCI in Sohag instructed the others on how to get CS schools cleared with MOE. There are team meetings where such knowledge is shared, and government officials attend as well. Such open sharing of information is one of the strengths of the project.

Sustainability

The sustainability of groups and systems created by the project varies. The CDAs have developed capacities in several areas and will continue working if they find projects to become involved with. The village committees to support rural schools and the committees at formal schools have potential, but they will need more training and support before they can be expected to stand alone. The dual-level child protection committees were not created by the project, but project support in their early days of functioning will help them to become more fully institutionalized and to be a service to Egypt's children. The collaboration of the Government and NGOs to combat child labor, encouraged by the project, was very fruitful and appreciated by

both parties, which will help it to be sustained. The CTS needs to be simplified, as described earlier, in order to be sustained and useful to MOMM.

Areas for Improvement

The project has basically done well in making their interventions sustainable, but there are some areas for improvement. The CS and GEI schools are a major means of withdrawing children from labor, and they will be sustained by government and NGO support. The curriculum of university education students in the three governorates has been modified to include tutoring underperforming students in the project. Activities of these students could be expanded to assist classroom teachers with active learning (see recommendations). These sustainable actions depend on working with the Government to formalize relationships. NGO and CDA capacities have been developed, making them available to work on any projects to combat child labor, so there is a sustainable workforce.

Ongoing Efforts for Sustainability

Several aspects are not yet fully sustainable. Teachers at formal schools were trained in active learning, but many said it was difficult to implement. Further assistance to these teachers is probably needed to make it sustainable. The apprenticeship aspect of the project is complex, and informal workshops have only been included to a limited extent. These areas need more support. Mothers are enthusiastic about starting projects to earn income and many have, but others fear getting loans and need support. The CTS is too complex for MOMM to use regularly at the government level and needs to be simplified.

6.2 LESSONS LEARNED/GOOD PRACTICES

- Working with the Government to establish credibility and trust in projects can lead to ensuring sustainability. For instance, the Government can take over projects they see as valuable, and NGOs can give or locate further support. An example of this is that sustainable funding for the CS and GEI nonformal schools was located through a combination of Government of Egypt/MOE and NGO support, and NCCM will continue to support GEI schools.
- Given that many aspects of the project are not fully sustainable, a lesson learned is that sustainability depends on having fully implemented an aspect of the project, on noting when further support is needed, or on assessing government capacity. In some of these cases (such as teacher training, apprentices, and mothers' projects) implementation is recent and programming will be more fully developed. In other cases (village committees to support rural schools, child protection committees), implementation is recent and needs further support. For the CTS, the system should be simplified for regular MOMM use.

Good Practices: Leveraging Non-project Resources

It is possible to leverage non-project resources and make them sustainable. This is illustrated by the example of university education students tutoring underperforming student beneficiaries in the project. The university in Beni Suef was approached and asked for help to relieve the overburdened teachers, and they agreed. The students and faculty found it useful and a memorandum of understanding was signed with the university. Now, such tutoring is a regular part of the curriculum. Through sharing project experience, the same system was implemented in Assiut and Sohag.

Good Practices: Information Sharing Among Project NGOs

Open sharing of information and regular team meetings among the three lead NGOs and their CDAs is one of the strengths of the project. These groups shared and expanded innovative ideas such as having university students tutor weaker students, and signing memorandums of understanding with MOE to facilitate this partnership.

VII RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

CCLP, implemented by WFP and funded by USDOL, did an excellent job of reducing child labor in its target areas in Egypt. It did this through providing incentives and good educational alternatives to working, increasing national awareness of and capacity to deal with child labor, and strengthening capacity to collect data to monitor child labor. Some aspects were dealt with more fully than others, mainly because some implementation (e.g., apprentices, training mothers on income-generation) began relatively late in the project.

7.1 CRITICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The key recommendations below may refer either to actions to be done for this project, or to actions completed that would make Phase 2 or a similar project successful.

1. Continue and expand the training of mothers.

Given that poverty lies at the core of much child labor, this project component is essential. In CCLP, training had focused on income-generating projects that could support children in school and it was very successful. Mothers may need further support in ongoing project management. In interviews, many said they feared getting loans. They could receive support on this aspect, and group loans in which women guarantee each other may be especially appropriate to alleviate this fear. Mothers also requested skills training, such as in sewing. MOSS has a unit that could perhaps deliver this. Some of the trainings included information on health, and this should be expanded to all and include a component on family planning, which could also reduce poverty levels. The evaluator also recommends gathering data on the earnings of each child's mother and comparing them to retention rates to see how much they support children staying in school or apprentice programs.

2. Expand the availability of nonformal CS and GEI schools.

These schools were a successful way to withdraw children, especially girls, from agricultural labor, and this is an important aspect of Phase 2 of the project. The children reportedly performed at the same level as formal school students. Their teachers encouraged the children to be enthusiastic about education, improving attendance and performance. If desired, the levels reached by all students could be explored and compared.

3. Expand and enhance work with apprentices and unregistered workshops.

Apprentices and agricultural labor were the most common forms of child labor in the project area, yet relatively few apprentices were successfully reached (about 15% of beneficiaries). While partly because of their late inclusion in CCLP, other reasons for this included the complexity of working with these beneficiaries. It was difficult to locate apprentices in workshops and to deal with their employers. Yet there were many successes, and these should be built on and include more awareness training and

incentives for employers. First aid lessons were appreciated, and some employers mentioned needing fire extinguishers. Unregistered workshops were numerous but difficult to work with. Training on how to set up one's own project, similar to that offered to mothers, could be given to the apprentices, many of whom said they wanted to have their own workshop.

4. Support and encourage government/NGO collaboration.

This new kind of collaboration has been very fruitful, allowing each party to accomplish more than they could on their own and contributing greatly to attaining project objectives. One aspect of this is to support the functioning of child protection committees at the governorate and district levels. As new government structures, they can sustainably help combat child labor; as new entities, assistance can help direct and sustain their activities. For example, positions at the directorate level are held by the highest local officials, who may be very busy and unable to attend all meetings. The officials could be supplemented by ministry staff with technical capacity. Another way of supporting this relationship of the Government and NGOs is to sponsor periodic meetings at which they can share their successes and ideas.

5. Experiment with facilitating active learning in project area government schools.

Although it was supported by the Government, teachers in formal schools were often frustrated that it was difficult to apply active learning in crowded classrooms with only one teacher and no special learning materials. However, the most student beneficiaries were located in government schools, and problems with teachers or effective learning were often cited as reasons for leaving school. It would be worthwhile to experiment to see if this aspect could be improved and then generalized.

The experiment should involve one urban and one rural school per target governorate. Teachers could receive a refresher course on active learning that includes lessons specific to local conditions of crowding and other problems, and information on how to use locally available materials like clay. Teaching assistance could be requested from the education schools that have supplied tutors to the project, which would be good training for students. Alternatively, perhaps a project mother could be trained as a teacher's aide and assist in a class once or twice a week. MOE teachers interviewed in Assiut had incorporated several aspects of active learning and could be used as resource persons.

After one full year of experimentation, an evaluation could examine the results (pass, fail, and dropout rates, as well as grades) compared with six similar nearby schools without these services. If they are found to be successful, the evaluation should look for the best practices and try expanding to six more schools the next year. Two years of good results could encourage the Government to introduce these innovations in applying active learning into teacher training nationwide.

6. Conduct a study one year after incentives have ended.

The study should include a sample of government, CS schools, GEI schools, and apprentices to see the effect of stopping incentives. If only the incentives keep children in educational activities, major adjustments will need to be made in project strategy or actions. Data on family earnings, including mothers' earnings, should be included to investigate its effect on staying in school or participation in apprentice programs as well (see first recommendation).

7. Shorten and simplify the CTS.

While very complete, the current form takes too long for the Government to adopt, which is the final goal. This should be done in collaboration with ILO and their CLMS format, with USDOL (to be sure their requirements are met), and with MOMM (who will implement it with the Government). Explore whether the currently available shortened form could be modified. Once adjusted, the improved form(s) can be transferred to MOMM for national use.

7.2 OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Relevance

Continue raising public awareness about child labor.

The project was relevant in light of the current attention to protecting children in Egypt. Project children acted in a play about the dangers of child labor, which was performed in many urban areas and is on CD. This could be broadcast on national TV with a short introduction by the project director and others working in the area. Other project activities could be publicized. This has been done in the past.

2. Effectiveness

A major incentive was 10 kilos of rice given to each child's family monthly. The type of incentive could be modified.

Although only a few people mentioned they were tired of rice, other WFP programs have given families vouchers that can be used at certain shops for a limited variety of healthy food products. This option could be explored.

3. Efficiency

The manual of government and NGO services available to children at risk and their parents should be posted on the internet and its use monitored.

This manual is being prepared for each of the three governorates in the project, and should be finished in early December. In paper form, only government offices and NGOs will have the manual. On the Internet, the manual will be available to everyone, making its use much more widespread and efficient. It can also easily be updated as needed.

A tracking device should be put on the web page to see how much it is used. Low use would indicate that a more effective means of information dissemination should be found. If the person compiling the information has time, he could answer questions online. Free websites are available.

4. Impact

The project team should have a website on which they highlight their successes and obstacles and how they were overcome.

Creating a newsletter was suggested at the stakeholders meeting, but a website is much easier to access once set up, and it is continuously available. There are free websites, and one or two team members with technology skills could set one up for the project and perhaps moderate content. It would allow the geographically disparate teams to see what others are doing, and offer suggestions, enhancing the impact of good solutions. The implementation teams could be listed if they wish, and this might encourage them to search for themselves online (via Google) to show friends and relatives, thus widening awareness as well.

The project should explore whether children attending CS and GEI schools could receive the same government supplement that needy children in formal schools do while attending school.

Families of needy children in formal schools receive 40 EGP a month, but the nonformal students do not. However, all are in school and not earning money to help the family, so all could use it. A memorandum of understanding between MOSS and MOE on this topic could be explored. If the memorandum succeeded, it would be a great help to the CS and GEI students, who often work in agriculture—a main focus in Phase 2 of the project. Given the current success and credibility of WFP and the project, this would be a good time to explore a memorandum of understanding.

The project extension and Phase 2 should continue to help families obtain the benefits available to them from the Government.

Often families are qualified for benefits from MOSS or other government offices (reduced food prices, a widow's pension, or cash support) but are not aware of them. Near the end of the project, this aspect was implemented and it should be continued. Since poverty underlies child labor, receiving benefits can reduce the need of children to work and enhance the project impact.

5. Sustainability

Provide more support to village-level committees, and involve children when appropriate.

Many village-level committees have been formed to support the project, especially in Sohag, which could be particularly active there. The committees have received varied degrees of training, and some may need more to be sustainable. For committees that

support schools, invite them and all parents to the school periodically and have children perform or sing. Perhaps give special students awards at the end of the year. The committee can be present and announce their accomplishments and/or needs. Many parents love to see their children highlighted, so this will enhance community involvement.

This page intentionally left blank.

ANNEXES

This page intentionally left blank.

ANNEX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terms of Reference for the Independent Final Evaluation of Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Egypt

Cooperative Agreement Number:	E-9-K-6-0115
Financing Agency:	U.S. Department of Labor
Grantee Organization:	World Food Programme
Dates of Project Implementation:	September 30, 2006–June 30, 2011
Type of Evaluation:	Independent Final Evaluation
Evaluation Field Work Dates:	October 10–30, 2010
Preparation Date of TOR:	July 20, 2010
Total Project Funds from USDOL Based on Cooperative Agreement:	\$5,590,000
Vendor for Evaluation Contract:	ICF Macro Headquarters, 11785 Beltsville Drive Calverton, MD 20705 Tel: (301) 572-0200 Fax: (301) 572-0999

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 \$780 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 80 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 the worst forms of child labor as defined by ILO Convention 182. USDOL-funded child labor elimination projects generally seek to achieve five major goals:

1. Withdrawing or preventing children from involvement in exploitive child labor through the provision of direct educational services.
2. Strengthening policies on child labor and education, the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, and formal and transitional education systems that encourage children engaged in or at risk of engaging in exploitive labor to attend school.

3. Raising awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures.
4. Supporting research and the collection of reliable data on child labor.
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—is intended to nurture the development, health, safety, and enhanced future employability of children engaged in or at-risk of entering exploitive labor.

USDOL reports annually to Congress on a number of indicators. As these programs have developed, an increasing emphasis has been placed on ensuring that the data collected by grantees is accurate and reported according to USDOL definitions.

In the appropriations to USDOL for international child labor technical cooperation, the U.S. Congress directed the majority of the funds to support the two following programs:⁴

- 1. International Labour Organization’s International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO-IPEC)**

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has earmarked some \$450 million to support the International Labor Organization’s International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO-IPEC), making the U.S. Government the leading donor to the program. USDOL-funded ILO-IPEC projects to combat child labor generally fall into one of several categories: comprehensive, national Timebound Programs (TBP) to eliminate the worst forms of child labor in a set time frame; less comprehensive Country Programs; sector-specific projects; data collection and research projects; and international awareness raising projects. In general, most projects include “direct action” components that are interventions to remove or prevent children from involvement in exploitive and hazardous work. One of the major strategies used by IPEC projects is to increase children’s access to and participation in formal and nonformal education. Most IPEC projects also have a capacity-building component to assist in building a sustainable base for long-term elimination of exploitive child labor.

- 2. Child Labor Education Initiative**

Since 2001, the U.S. Congress has provided some \$269 million to USDOL to support the Child Labor Education Initiative (EI), which focuses on the elimination of the worst forms of child labor through the provision of education opportunities. These projects are being implemented by a wide range of international and non-governmental organizations as well as for-profit firms. USDOL typically awards EI cooperative agreements through a competitive bid process.

⁴ In 2007, the U.S. Congress did not direct USDOL’s appropriations for child labor elimination projects to either of these two programs. That year, USDOL allocated \$60 million for child labor elimination projects through a competitive process.

EI projects are designed to ensure that children in areas with a 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. The EI is based on the notion that the elimination of exploitive 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. EI projects may focus on providing educational services to children removed from specific sectors of work and/or a specific region(s) or support a national Timebound Program that aims to eliminate the worst forms of child labor in multiple sectors of work specific to a given country.

Other Initiatives

Finally, USDOL has supported \$2.5 million for awareness-raising and research activities not associated with the ILO-IPEC program or the EI.

Project Context

In Egypt, children work in the agricultural sector, often for the cotton harvest, and in a number of sectors deemed hazardous by the Government of Egypt, including leather tanning, fishing, glassworks, blacksmithing, working metal and copper, construction, carpentry, mining, auto repair, textile manufacturing, and brick making. Children also work in limestone quarrying, a hazardous form of labor, where they face serious health risks. Additionally, UNICEF estimates that there are some 1 million street children in Egypt; street children, primarily boys, work collecting garbage, begging, and vending, and are also vulnerable to becoming involved in illicit activities, including commercial sexual exploitation.⁵

In addition to the USDOL-funded project implemented by the World Food Programme (WFP), the Government of Egypt has participated in a US\$168,280 ILO-IPEC child labor project funded by the Government of Italy.⁶

The Government of Egypt has implemented policy and legal frameworks to address the problem of exploitive child labor. The minimum age of employment in the country is 15, though this does not apply to children working in agriculture, small family enterprises, or domestic service. Laws do establish certain limitations with regard to the number of hours and times during the day when children can work. The law also prohibits children under age 18 from working in 44 hazardous industries, including cotton compressing, leather tanning, working with explosives, and agricultural activities involving the use of pesticides. The law penalizes those who break the child labor laws with fines that double if violations are repeated. The Child Labor Unit within the Ministry of Manpower and Migration (MOMM) coordinates investigations of child labor violations and enforces child labor laws. The U.S. Department of State reports that enforcement in state-owned businesses is adequate, though enforcement in the informal sectors is lacking.⁷

⁵ USDOL, "U.S. Department of Labor's 2008 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor," p. 122.

⁶ USDOL, p. 124.

⁷ USDOL, p. 123.

The Government's National Council for Childhood and Motherhood (NCCM) implements the First National Strategy for the Progressive Elimination of Child Labor. The NCCM collaborates with WFP, along with MOMM, the Egyptian Trade Union Federation (ETUF), ILO, UNICEF, and the Ministries of Social Affairs, Agriculture, Education, Health, and Interior, to implement action programs to reduce child labor, provide alternative sources of income to families, and provide services to street children.⁸

Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Egypt

On September 30, 2006, World Food Programme received a 4-year Cooperative Agreement worth \$5.09 million from USDOL to implement an EI project in Egypt, aimed at withdrawing and preventing children from exploitive child labor by expanding access to and improving the quality of basic education and supporting the five goals of the USDOL project as outlined above. WFP was awarded the project through a competitive bid process and is working in association with UNICEF, ILO and other non-governmental and community-based organizations. As stipulated in the Cooperative Agreement, the project targets 4,300 children for withdrawal and 6,000 for prevention from the worst forms of child labor, including hazardous work in agriculture and the informal sector. Project activities take place in the Governorates of Sohag, Assiut, and Beni Sweif.

A project extension was recently approved by USDOL and will be under implementation before this Final Evaluation is conducted. The modification to the project will extend the end date by nine months to June 30, 2011, and add an additional \$500,000 to the budget. With these additional funds, the project will conduct research on child labor in agriculture in Egypt and will expand the project targets and geographic scope to 200 child laborers in agriculture in the governorate of Sharqya. In addition, the project will provide services to 400 new beneficiaries through its apprenticeship activities and 1,432 households will receive services to contribute to improving their livelihoods.

The project goal is to contribute to the elimination of exploitive child labor in Egypt. The intermediate objectives are to: provide effective formal and nonformal education programs to children at risk of and engaged in exploitive child labor; strengthen awareness and capacity of national and local government institutions, civil society, and communities to address child labor and education issues; and improve national, regional, and local capacity to perform data collection and monitor and assess child labor.

The strategies and approaches with regard to direct interventions, capacity building and awareness raising include—

- Expanding and enhancing formal and nonformal education, including transitional and vocational education, for targeted children;
- Establishing new community and girls education initiative schools in targeted governorates;

⁸ USDOL, p. 124.

- Offering incentives and economic support to working and at-risk children and their families to reduce barriers to education; providing technical support, advocacy, and capacity-building initiatives to governmental institutions and NGOs to improve policies and legislation, including the National Strategy for the Elimination of Child Labor in Egypt, and ensuring their effective enforcement;
- Providing support to governmental institutions to build a comprehensive database on child labor, monitor trends, and improve the inspection process to assess the conditions of working children; and
- Providing training to the labor inspection unit in order to enhance local capacity to identify and refer children at risk of exploitive labor.

Midterm Evaluation

A midterm evaluation was conducted in February 2009 by Miranda Beshara, an independent international consultant. The evaluation consisted of document review; individual and group interviews with project staff, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders; site visits (observation) in the Governorates of Sohag, Assiut, and Beni Sweif; and a stakeholder workshop.

The evaluation found that the project had succeeded in preventing and withdrawing a considerable number of children at risk for child labor and providing support to their families, though the project was lagging on its withdrawal target. The evaluator found that the project had experienced only a few successful withdrawals in the formal system and that two forms of child labor remained especially challenging to tackle: children working in nonregistered workshops and children working in agriculture. These sectors both represented a large portion of working children, and are in the informal sector, and thus beyond any sort of regulation.

The midterm evaluation further found that the incentive scheme used by the project was very effective in enticing working children back to school, in preventing at-risk children from working, and in providing a safer and healthier occupational environment for children of working age. Nevertheless, the field visits showed that the distribution of some incentives has been problematic, particularly snacks in the primary schools and OSH tools in workshops. With regard to partnership and management, the evaluator found that the project has been implemented with a high level of partnership and coordination with the respective governmental counterparts. The project also provided capacity building for teachers and social specialists in schools, facilitators in community schools, labor inspectors, community committees, and partner NGOs and CDAs.

The evaluation report's key recommendations were—

- Offer appropriate alternatives to raise the standard of living of targeted families;
- Link families with existing services and benefits;
- Revise the incentive scheme to ensure a more effective distribution mechanism with an exit strategy that will offer sustainable alternatives;

- Increase the number of targeted community schools in Assiut and Sohag;
- Develop mechanisms to realistically address the two abovementioned forms of exploitive child labor (agricultural labor and laborers in nonregistered workshops);
- Enhance the apprenticeship component through partnership with ILO-IPEC, the Ministry of Manpower and Migration (MOMM), and the Ministry of Social Solidarity (MOSS) vocational training unit;
- Continue capacity building at all levels with a focus on MOMM’s Child Labor Unit;
- Integrate with the child protection mechanism in targeted communities in collaboration with UNICEF and NCCM;
- Increase coordination between MOMM and the Ministry of Agriculture to extend labor inspection to the agricultural plantations and improve withdrawal rates;
- Work towards selecting more individuals to act as “agents of change” in their communities and utilize them to turn others around;
- Expedite the launch of the National Steering Committee and the development of the National Action Plan for the Elimination of Child Labor;
- Leverage additional resources (local, national, and international) for the extension of the various project interventions; and
- Continue the awareness-raising activities at all levels.

II PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION

OCFT-funded projects are subject to midterm and final evaluations. The field work for final evaluations is generally scheduled three months before the end of the project. The Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education project in Egypt went into implementation in September 2006 and is due for final evaluation in 2010.

Scope of Evaluation

The scope of the evaluation includes a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL Cooperative Agreement with the World Food Programme. All activities that have been implemented from project launch through time of evaluation fieldwork should be considered. The evaluation should assess the achievements of the project in reaching its targets and objectives as outlined in the cooperative agreement and project document.

The evaluation should address issues of project design, implementation, management, lessons learned, replicability and provide recommendations for current and future projects. The questions to be addressed in the evaluation (provided below) are organized to provide an assessment of the

relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and (to the extent possible) impact on the target population.

Final Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of the final evaluation is to—

1. Assess whether the project has met its objectives and identify the challenges encountered in doing so;
2. Assess the relevance of the project in the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host country government and USDOL;
3. Assess the intended and unintended outcomes and impacts of the project;
4. Provide lessons learned from the project design and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future child labor projects in the country and in projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors; and
5. Assess whether project activities can be deemed sustainable at the local and national level and among implementing organizations.

The evaluation should also provide documented lessons learned, good practices, and models of intervention that will serve to inform future child labor projects and policies in Egypt and elsewhere, as appropriate. It will also serve as an important accountability function for USDOL and WFP. Recommendations should focus around lessons learned and good practices from which future projects can glean when developing their strategies toward combating exploitive child labor.

Intended Users

This final evaluation should provide USDOL, WFP, UNICEF, the ILO, and other project specific stakeholders, and stakeholders working to combat child labor more broadly, an assessment of the project's experience in implementation and its impact on project beneficiaries. Lessons learned and good practices should be used by stakeholders in the design and implementation of subsequent phases or future child labor projects in the country and elsewhere as appropriate. The final 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.

Evaluation Questions

Specific questions that the evaluation should seek to answer are found below, according to five categories of issue. Evaluators may add, remove, or shift evaluation questions, but the final list will be subject to approval by USDOL and ICF Macro.

Relevance

The evaluation should consider the relevance of the project to the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host country government and USDOL. Specifically, it should address the following questions:

1. Does the project design seem to be adequately supporting the five USDOL goals, as specified above? If not, which ones are not being supported and why not?
2. Have the project assumptions been accurate?
3. Please assess the relevance of the questions asked to key informants at the inception of the project.
4. What are the main project strategies/activities designed toward meeting objectives in withdrawing/preventing children from WFCL? What is the rationale behind using these strategies?
5. What are the main obstacles or barriers that the project has identified as important to addressing child labor in this country? (i.e. poverty, lack of educational infrastructure, lack of demand for education, etc.) Has the project been successful in addressing these obstacles?
6. Is the project design appropriate for the cultural, economic, and political context in which it works?
7. How has the project fit within existing programs to combat child labor and trafficking, especially government initiatives?
8. Did the project adjust implementation and/or strategy based on the findings and recommendations of the midterm evaluation? How?
9. Are the additional extension/cost increase activities relevant and necessary based on lessons learned from the project since its inception? Are there other activities that would have been more worthwhile?
10. What other major design and/or implementation issues should be brought to the attention of the grantee and USDOL?
11. Were the selected partner agencies and implementers qualified and well experienced to do the work that they were contracted to do?

Effectiveness

The evaluation should assess whether the project has reached its objectives, and the effectiveness of project activities in contributing toward those objectives. Specifically, the evaluation should address—

1. Please assess the effectiveness of the data collected during the baseline study. Did it provide an accurate base to build the project and develop a solid monitoring system?
2. Has the project achieved its targets and objectives as stated in the project document? What factors contributed to the success and/or underachievement of each of the objectives?
3. Assess the effectiveness of the “direct action” interventions, including the education interventions provided to children (i.e. transitional and vocational training, community and girls education initiatives, provision of occupational safety and health tools, and provision of in-school snacks and take home rations). Did the provision of these services results in children being withdrawn/prevented from exploitive child labor/trafficking and ensure that they were involved in relevant educational programs?
4. Assess the effectiveness of the services in meeting the needs of the target population identified in the project document including children *prevented* and *withdrawn* from labor/trafficking.
5. Assess the effectiveness of the specific models (girl-friendly and community schools, ILO’s SCREAM methodology, and Child Protection Mechanisms) on increasing educational opportunities, creating community ownership, increasing the capacity of communities, and increasing awareness/understanding of the dangers of child labor.
6. Please assess the effectiveness of the school ration (snack) as an incentive to draw children into schools and contribute to their attendance on a daily basis.
7. Has the project accurately identified and targeted children engaged in, or at risk of working in, the target sectors identified in the project strategy (agriculture and informal work in urban areas)? In a larger sense, did they accurately identify the worst forms of child labor in the country?
8. Assess the project’s challenges in withdrawing beneficiaries. What was done differently to withdraw students in FY 2010 to bring the project to meet its targets?
9. Are there any sector specific lessons learned regarding the types and effectiveness of the services provided?
10. Assess the effectiveness of the beneficiary monitoring and reporting processes. What monitoring systems does the project use for tracking the work status and education status of children? Were they feasible and effective? Why or why not?

11. Did implementing partners in the field all have a common understanding of the definitions of “withdrawn” and “prevented” and did they use the same set of criteria to categorize children as such?
12. Was the information on children withdrawn and prevented transferred in a timely and accurate manner from the community level to the lead grantee?
13. What are the management strengths, including technical and financial, of this project?

Efficiency

The evaluation should provide analysis as to whether the strategies employed by the project were efficient in terms of the resources used (inputs) as compared to its qualitative and quantitative impact (outputs). Specifically, the evaluation should address—

1. Is the project cost-efficient?
2. Were the project strategies efficient in terms of the financial and human resources used, as compared to its outputs? What alternatives are there?
3. Was the monitoring system designed efficiently to meet the needs and requirements of the project?

Impact

The evaluation should assess the positive and negative changes produced by the project—intended and unintended, direct and indirect, as well as any changes in the social and economic environment in the country—as reported by respondents. Specifically, it should address—

1. What appears to be the project’s impact, if any, on individual beneficiaries (children, parents, teachers, siblings, households, etc.)?
2. Please assess if the amount of time that child beneficiaries received educational services as a result of the project was sufficient to produce some sort of lasting impact.
3. Assess the impact, to the extent possible, of project activities/strategies on education quality (both formal and nonformal interventions). How has the education quality improvement component been received by the government and the communities?
4. What appears to be the project’s impact, if any, on partners or other organizations working on child labor in the country (NGOs, community groups, schools, national child labor committee, etc.)?
5. What appears to be the project’s impact, if any, on government and policy structures in terms of system-wide change on education and child labor issues?

Sustainability

The evaluation should assess whether the project has taken steps to ensure the continuation of project activities after the completion of the program, including sources of funding and partnerships with other organizations and/or the government, and identify areas where this may be strengthened. Specifically, it should address—

1. Were the exit strategy and sustainability plan integrated into the project design? Will it likely be effective?
2. How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources? Are there prospects for sustainable funding?
3. What have been the major challenges and successes in maintaining partnerships in support of the project, including with other USDOL-funded projects?
4. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of maintaining coordination with the host country government, particularly the Ministry of Manpower and Migration (MOMM), the Ministry of Social Solidarity (MOSS), the Ministry of Agriculture, and the National Council for Childhood and Motherhood (NCCM), as well as other government agencies active in addressing related children's issues?
5. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of implementing coordination with UNICEF and ILO-IPEC?
6. Are there ways that the grantee could better leverage resources through other donors such as USAID and EU donors to have a better impact on sustainability?
7. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with international and/or multilateral organizations?
8. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with other national NGOs and/or community-based organizations present in the country?
9. Will the National Steering Committee, the partnering Community Development Associations (CDAs) monitoring systems, and other committees/groups and systems created by the project be sustainable?
10. What lessons can be learned of the project's accomplishments and weaknesses in terms of sustainability of interventions?
11. Based on lessons learned from this project, what recommendations does the evaluator have regarding future projects to combat exploitive child labor in Egypt?

III EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME

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

A Approach

The evaluation approach will be primarily qualitative in terms of the data collection methods used as the timeframe does not allow for quantitative surveys to be conducted. Quantitative data will be drawn from 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/ipeinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=3026>) and UNICEF Principles for Ethical Reporting on Children (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 to be made for the different actors involved and activities conducted and the progress of implementation in each locality.

B Final Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will consist of—

1. The international evaluator; and
2. An interpreter fluent in Egyptian Arabic and English who 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.

The international evaluator is Susan Schaefer Davis. She will be responsible for developing the methodology in consultation with ICF Macro 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/s in each provincial locality is to ensure that the evaluation team 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—
 - Project document and revisions;
 - Cooperative Agreement;
 - Technical Progress and Status Reports;
 - Project Logical 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 they are exploring all possible avenues for data triangulation and to clearly note where their evaluation findings are coming from.

3. Interviews with stakeholders

Informational interviews will be held with as many project stakeholders as possible. 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—

- ILAB/OCFT Staff;
- Headquarters, Country Director, Project Managers, and Field Staff of Grantee and Partner Organizations (UNICEF, ILO, *Terre des Hommes*, etc.);
- Government Ministry Officials and Local Government Officials;
- Community leaders, members, and volunteers;
- School teachers, assistants, school directors, education personnel;
- Project beneficiaries (children withdrawn and prevented and their parents);
- International Organizations, NGOs and multilateral agencies working in the area;
- Other child protection and/or education organizations, committees and experts in the area; and
- Labor Reporting Officer at U.S. Embassy and USAID representative.

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 evaluation mission 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 finding 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 will be prepared to guide the discussion and possibly a brief written feedback.

The agenda is expected to include some of 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 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.

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 and Work Plan

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

Activity	Responsible Party	Proposed Date(s)
Phone interview with DOL and Grantee Staff/Headquarters	ICF Macro, DOL, Grantee, Evaluator	August
Desk Review	Evaluator	August–September
Question Matrix and Instruments due to ICF Macro/DOL	Evaluator	October 1
Finalize TOR and submit to Grantee and DOL	DOL/ICF Macro/ Evaluator	September 17
International Travel	N/A	October 16
Introductory Meetings with Project Staff and National Stakeholders	Evaluator	October 17
Field Site Visits	Evaluator	October 18–28
National Stakeholder Meeting	N/A	November 1
International Travel	N/A	November 2
Post-evaluation debrief call with DOL	N/A	November 9
Draft report to ICF Macro for QC review	Evaluator	November 16
Draft report to DOL & Grantee for 48 hour review	ICF Macro	November 22
Draft report released to stakeholders	ICF Macro	November 23
Comments due to ICF Macro	DOL/Grantee & Stakeholders	December 7
Report revised and sent to ICF Macro	Evaluator	December 14
Revised report sent to DOL	ICF Macro	December 15
Final approval of report	DOL	December 29
Finalization & distribution of report	ICF Macro	January 19, 2011

IV EXPECTED OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES

Ten working days following the evaluator’s return from fieldwork, a first draft evaluation report will be submitted to ICF Macro. 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 three key recommendations)

- IV. Evaluation Objectives and Methodology
- V. Project Description
- VI. Relevance
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- VII. Effectiveness
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- VIII. Efficiency
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- IX. Impact
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- X. Sustainability
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- XI. Recommendations and Conclusions
 - A. Key Recommendations—critical for successfully meeting project objectives
 - B. Other Recommendations—as needed
 - 1. Relevance
 - 2. Effectiveness
 - 3. Efficiency
 - 4. Impact
 - 5. Sustainability

XII. 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 a minimum of 30 pages and a maximum of 45 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.

After returning from fieldwork, the first draft evaluation report is due to ICF Macro on November 16, 2010, as indicated in the above timetable. A final draft is due one week after receipt of comments from ILAB/OCFT and stakeholders and is anticipated to be due on December 14, 2010, as indicated in the above timetable. All reports including drafts will be written in English.

V EVALUATION MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT

ICF Macro has contracted with Susan Schaefer-Davis to conduct this evaluation. Dr. Schaefer-Davis has a PhD in Anthropology from the University of Michigan and has focused her work on North Africa and the Middle East on issues such as gender in water management, literacy, income-generation, rural agriculture, microcredit and education. She also has a strong background in small business development, particularly for crafts. Dr. Schaefer-Davis has held teaching or research positions at Haverford College, the University of Pennsylvania, Rutgers University, Trenton State College and Al Akhawayn University in Morocco, and done academic research on women, adolescence, and changing gender roles in Morocco. She speaks French, fluent Moroccan Arabic, and some literary Arabic. The contractor/evaluator will work with OCFT, ICF Macro, and relevant WFP staff to evaluate this project.

ICF Macro will provide all logistical and administrative support for their staff and sub-contractors, including travel arrangements (e.g., plane and hotel reservations, purchasing plane tickets, providing *per diem*) and all materials needed to provide all deliverables. ICF Macro will also be responsible for providing the management and technical oversight necessary to ensure consistency of methods and technical standards.

ICF Macro or its subcontractors should contact Nevine Osman (Nivine.osman@wfp.org or 20-2-2528-1730), the primary point of contact for the project, to initiate contact with field staff.

ANNEX B: QUESTION MATRIX

TOR Question	Data	Data Source						Methodology
		DOL	Project Staff	Partner Staff	Gov & NGO	Beneficiaries	Other	
Relevance								
Is project design appropriate for cultural, economic, & political context?	Interviews, documents (TPRs and problems/ challenges), own knowledge of culture	N/A	Director of M&E, Education Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	UNICEF, ILO	Interviews, documents
Does project design adequately support five USDOL goals ⁹	Interviews, documents	DOL mgr	Dir, M&E, education officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Interviews, documents
How does project fit with existing programs to combat child labor, especially gov. initiatives?	Interviews, documents including project document, TPRs	N/A	Dir	Directors	MOMM, Min of Ed,	N/A	UNICEF, ILO	Interviews, documents
Were partner agencies qualified & experienced to do their work?	Interviews, TPRs, challenges	N/A	Dir, M&E, Education Officer	Directors & staff	N/A	Teachers, children, parents	Employers	Interviews, documents
Did project adjust based on findings & recdns of midterm evaluation? How?	Interviews, documents like TPR after midterm evaluation	DOL mgr	Dir	Of groups which should apply them	Of groups which should apply them	Of groups which should be affected	N/A	Interviews, documents like TPR
Have project assumptions [__, __,] been accurate	Documents for assumptions, interviews	DOL mgr	Dir	Directors	Relevant ministries	Teachers, children, parents	Employers	Interviews, documents

⁹ The five USDOL goals are (1) withdrawing or preventing children from involvement in exploitive child labor through the provision of direct educational services; (2) strengthening policies on child labor and education, the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, and formal and transitional education systems that encourage children engaged in or at risk of engaging in exploitive labor to attend school; (3) raising awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures; (4) supporting research and the collection of reliable data on child labor; and (5) ensuring the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

TOR Question	Data	Data Source						Methodology
		DOL	Project Staff	Partner Staff	Gov & NGO	Beneficiaries	Other	
What are main activities used toward meeting objectives in withdrawing/preventing children from WFCL? What is rationale behind using these activities or strategies?	Documents including project document, TPRs on activities and rationale, interviews on activities	N/A	Dir	Dir and staff	N/A	Teachers, children, parents	N/A	Interviews, documents
<u>Main obstacles</u> or barriers that project has identified as important to addressing child labor in Egypt? (i.e. poverty, lack of educational infrastructure, lack of demand for education, etc) Has project been <i>successful</i> in addressing them?	Documents, interviews	N/A	Dir, staff	Dir	Ministries involved	Teachers, parents, children	UNICEF, ILO	Documents, interviews
Are additional extension/ cost increase activities relevant & necessary based on lessons learned from the project since its inception? Are there other activities that would have been more worthwhile?	interviews	DOL mgr	Dir	Ask re suggested activs	Ask re suggested activs	Ask re suggested activs	N/A	Interviews
Other major design and/or implementation issues to bring to attention of grantee & USDOL?	Documents, interviews	Dir	Dir, staff	Dir, staff	Ministries involved	Teachers, parents, children	Employers, UNICEF, ILO	Documents, interviews
Effectiveness								
Of data collected in baseline study. provide accurate base to build the project & develop a solid monitoring system?	Baseline document data, interviews	N/A	Dir, M&E	N/A	N/A	N/A	Base-line docmt= rapid _	Read interviews
Has project achieved targets and objectives as in project document? What contributed to success and/or underachievement of each of the objectives?	Interviews, documents including TPR and midterm evaluation, logframe	DOL mgr	Dir	Dir re relevant objectives	Dir re relevant objectives	Those affected re relevant objectives	UNICEF, ILO	Interviews, documents

TOR Question	Data	Data Source						Methodology
		DOL	Project Staff	Partner Staff	Gov & NGO	Beneficiaries	Other	
Of the “direct action” interventions, including education interventions provided to kids (i.e. transitional and vocational training, community & girls education initiatives, provision of occupational safety & health tools, & provision of in-school snacks and take home rations). Did these services result in children being withdrawn/prevented from exploitive child labor/trafficking AND ensure that they were involved in relevant educational programs?	Interviews, different approaches and percentage of effectiveness for each	N/A	Dir, M&E, education officer	Dir, staff	Ministries involved	Teachers, parents, children	N/A	Interviews, doc review
Of the services in meeting needs of target population in the project document including children <i>prevented</i> and <i>withdrawn</i> from labor/trafficking.	Interviews, ask about needs	N/A	Dir, M&E, education officer	Dir, staff	Ministries involved	Teachers, parents, children	ILO, UNICEF	Interviews
Of the specific models (girl-friendly & community schools, ILO’s SCREAM methodology, & Child Protection Mechanisms) on increasing educational opportunities, creating community ownership, increasing the capacity of communities, and increasing awareness/understanding of the dangers of child labor.	Interviews	N/A	Dir, M&E, educn officer	ILO proj dir, UNICEF RE comnty schools, implem partners	Ministries involved	parents, kids, ? tchers	Comnty members, ILO, UNICEF	Interviews

TOR Question	Data	Data Source						Methodology
		DOL	Project Staff	Partner Staff	Gov & NGO	Beneficiaries	Other	
Has the project accurately identified & targeted kids engaged in, or at risk of working in, the target sectors in project strategy (agric & informal work in urban areas)? In a larger sense, did they accurately identify the <i>worst</i> forms of child labor in the country? DOL Q	Interviews, possibly WFP data files on children	N/A	Dir, M&E, education officer	Dir, staff	Ministries involved	N/A	ILO, UNICEF	Interviews
Assess project's challenges in withdrawing beneficiaries. How done differently to withdraw students in FY 2010 to bring the project to meet its targets? [e.g. more withdrawn]	Documents, interviews	N/A	Dir, M&E, education officer	Dir, staff	Ministries involved	Parents, children, teachers	Employers	Documents, interviews
Any sector-specific lessons learned [e.g. ag?] regarding types & effectiveness of services provided?	Interviews, documents	N/A	Dir of M&E and Education officer	Dir, staff	Relevant Ministries	Parents, kids, teachers	UNICEF, ILO	Documents, interviews
Of the beneficiary monitoring and reporting processes. What monitoring systems does the project use for tracking the work status and education status of children? Were they feasible and effective? Why or why not?	Project documents, interviews	Project officer—did she find data she wanted? If not, what missing?	Dir, M&E	Dir, staff	Relevant Ministries	Ask children	UNICEF, ILO	Documents, interviews
Did implementing partners in field all have a common understanding of the definitions of "withdrawn" and "prevented" and did they use the same criteria to categorize children as such?	Interviews	N/A	Dir of M&E	M&E staff – ask about definition used	N/A	N/A	N/A	Interviews

TOR Question	Data	Data Source						Methodology
		DOL	Project Staff	Partner Staff	Gov & NGO	Beneficiaries	Other	
Was information on children withdrawn and prevented transferred in a <i>timely and accurate</i> manner from community level to the lead grantee?	Project documents, interviews	N/A	M&E	M&E person	N/A	N/A	N/A	Documents, interviews
What are the management strengths, including technical and financial, of this project? Weaknesses?	Interviews, DOL comments in documents & DOL mgr	DOL mgr	Dir of M&E	Implementing groups	Some of Govmt agencies involved	N/A	ILO, UNICEF	Documents, interviews
Efficiency								
Were the project strategies efficient in terms of the financial and human resources used, as compared to its outputs? What alternatives are there? [e.g. if gave each kid a share of TL spent?	Interviews, documents	N/A	Dir	Dir, staff	Ministries most involved	N/A	ILO, UNICEF	Documents, interviews
Is the project cost-efficient? E.g. <i>qualitative</i> judgments re efficiency of project. Incls factors like, do they have too many resources or not enough? (e.g. some projects have too many cars, or not enough copy paper.) What portion of the budget is used for direct action vs for overhead? Did project use vols or interns effectively to keep costs down? Some evaluators also do a cost per beneficiary analysis. [are exs]	Include percentage if in project documents, interviews, email guidance from Macro	N/A	Dir, staff	Dir, staff	N/A	N/A	N/A	Email, documents, interviews
Was monitoring system designed efficiently to meet the needs and requirements of the project?	Interviews	N/A	M&E, dir	Data colexn & submissn person/s	N/A	N/A	N/A	Interviews

TOR Question	Data	Data Source						Methodology
		DOL	Project Staff	Partner Staff	Gov & NGO	Beneficiaries	Other	
Impact								
What appears to be the project's impact, if any, on individual beneficiaries (children, parents, teachers, siblings, households, etc)?	Interviews, school performance records	N/A	Dir, staff	Appropriate staff of partner groups	MOE, NCCM	children, parents, teachers, siblings,	N/A	Group interviews with children, parents, teachers, siblings; examination of records or project files
Assess if the amount of time that child beneficiaries received educational services with project was sufficient to produce some sort of lasting impact	Interviews, documents if available at project	N/A	Dir, staff	Dir, staff	N/A	Teachers, parents, kids	N/A	Interviews, documents if available
Assess the impact, to the extent possible, of project activities/strategies on education quality (both formal and nonformal interventions).	Interviews	N/A	N/A	Partners	MOE	Parents, kids, teachers	N/A	Interviews, data on kids, including grades or other changes
How has the education quality improvement component been received by the government and the communities?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	ILO, UNICEF	N/A
Impact, if any, on partners or other organizations working on child labor in the country (NGOs, community groups, schools, national child labor committee, etc)?	Interviews	N/A	Dir	Dir	Relevant ministries	Teachers in schools	ILO, UNICEF	Interviews
Impact, if any, on government and policy structures in terms of system-wide change on education and child labor issues?	Documents, interviews	N/A	Dir	Dir	N/A	Teachers	ILO, UNICEF	Documents, interviews

TOR Question	Data	Data Source						Methodology
		DOL	Project Staff	Partner Staff	Gov & NGO	Beneficiaries	Other	
Sustainability								
Were the exit strategy and sustainability plan integrated into the project design? Will it likely be effective?	Documents, interviews	N/A	Dir	Dir	Relevant ministries	Teachers, kids	ILO, UNICEF	Documents, interviews
How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources? Are there prospects for sustainable funding?	Interviews, midterm documents	DOL mgr	Dir	Dir,	Dir	N/A	N/A	Interviews
Are there ways that the grantee could better leverage resources through other donors such as USAID and EU donors to have a better impact on sustainability?	Interviews, my opinion	N/A	Dir	N/A	N/A	N/A	ILO, UNICEF	Interviews, my opinion
What have been major challenges and successes in maintaining partnerships in support of the project, including with other USDOL-funded projects?	Interview, documents	DOL mgr	Dir, M&E, Education officers	Dir	N/A	N/A	ILO, UNICEF	Interview, documents
What have been major challenges and opportunities, if any, of maintaining coordination with the host country government, particularly the Ministry of Manpower and Migration (MOMM), the Ministry of Social Solidarity (MOSS), the Ministry of Agriculture, and the National Council for Childhood and Motherhood (NCCM), as well as other government agencies active in addressing related children's issues?	Interviews, documents, especially TPR challenges	N/A	Dir	N/A	Involved ministries: MOMM, MOSS, NCCM, ag, others	N/A	ILO, UNICEF	Interviews, documents

TOR Question	Data	Data Source						Methodology
		DOL	Project Staff	Partner Staff	Gov & NGO	Beneficiaries	Other	
<p>What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of implementing coordination with UNICEF and ILO-IPEC?</p> <p>What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with international and/or multilateral organizations? – the above and other</p>	Interviews, documents	N/A	Dir	N/A	N/A	N/A	UNICEF and ILO-IPEC	Interviews, documents
<p>What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with other national NGOs and/or community-based organizations present in the country?</p>	Documents, interviews	N/A	Dir	N/A	N/A	Commty orgzn staff	Natnl NGO's sfaff	Documents, interviews
<p>Will the National Steering Committee, the partnering Community Development Associations (CDAs) monitoring systems, and other committees/groups and systems created by the project be sustainable?</p>	Interviews	DOL mgr or Mary Anne re mng of Q	Dir, M&E, Education officer	Dir	Dir	N/A	ILO, UNICEF	Interviews
<p>What lessons can be learned of the project's accomplishments and weaknesses in terms of sustainability of interventions?</p>	Interviews, documents	N/A	Dir, M&E, Education officer	Dir	Dir	Parents, teachers, kids	N/A	Interviews, documents
<p>Based on lessons learned from this project, what recommendations does the evaluator have regarding future projects to combat exploitive child labor in Egypt?</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

ANNEX C: KEY INFORMANTS

Title	Organization/Ministry/Association
Representative and Country Director	WFP
Deputy Country Director	WFP
CCLP Director	WFP
M&E Officer	WFP
Senior Program Assistant	WFP
Programme Assistant	WFP
Programme Assistant	WFP
Programme Assistant	WFP
CTSD Coordinator	WFP
Undersecretary	MOMM
Head of Apprenticeship Department	MOMM
Head of the Child Protection Department	MOMM
Undersecretary	MOMM, Assiut
Senior Program Officer	ILO
Senior Enterprise Development Specialist	ILO
Senior Skills and Employability Specialist	ILO
Education Specialist	UNICEF
Child Protection Officer	UNICEF
Education Officer	UNICEF
Deputy Representative	UNICEF
Undersecretary	MOSS
Economic Advisor to the Minister	MOSS
Office of Economic and Political Affairs	U.S. Embassy
Consultant	NCCM
Secretary General	NCCM
Child Labor Program Coordinator	NCCM
Director of RA	Consultant
General Coordinator	MOALR
Coordinator for International Cooperation	MOE

Title	Organization/Ministry/Association
Beni Suef	
Project Manager, CCLP	CEOSS
Child Labour programs Manager	CEOSS
Team Leader, CCLP	CEOSS
Facilitator, CCLP	Family Development and Welfare Association
Board Member	Apprentices Association
Board Member	Coptic Development Association, Beba
Board Member	Afak Association, El Fashn
Assiut	
Field Representative in Upper Egypt	<i>Terre des Hommes</i>
Project Manager, CCLP	<i>Terre des Hommes</i>
Project supervisor	Giving Without Limits Association
Sohag	
Project Manager, CCLP	SCDAWCI
Project supervisor	SCDAWCI

ANNEX D: FIELD ITINERARY

Field Itinerary for Susan Schaefer Davis, October 2010

Date	Location	Groups or Individuals Interviewed
October 20	Assiut	<i>Terre des Hommes</i> (TDH) staff, initial presentation
October 20	Assiut	MoSS staff
October 20	Assiut	MoMM manager and labor inspectors
October 20	Assiut	Female apprentices (10, sewing factory)
October 20	Assiut	Mothers (12) trained in income-generating projects
October 20	Assiut	Child-to-child participants (4) and teacher
October 20	Assiut	Male apprentices (16)
October 20	Assiut	2 CDAs, Giving Without Limits and Dweina (11)
October 20	Assiut	Donor of school room
October 20	Assiut	President and accountant of Giving Without Limits
October 20	Assiut	<i>Terre des Hommes</i> staff, group interview
October 21	Assiut	Children (16) in government school Ahmed Orabi
October 21	Assiut	Teachers (10) in government school Ahmed Orabi
October 21	Assiut	MoSS vocational training center with literacy class
October 21	Abou Teeg	Children (29) at Buhagir Dukran community school (CS)
October 21	Abou Teeg	Facilitators (5) at Buhagir Dukran community school (CS)
October 21	Abou Teeg	Two men who gave rooms for Buhagir Dukran community school (CS)
October 21	Abou Teeg area	Woman with project raising ducks in Had Hamadla
October 21	Assiut	TDH staff, finish group interview
October 24	Beni Suef	Coptic Evangelical Organization for Social Services (CEOSS), initial presentation
October 24	Beni Suef	MOE
October 24	Beni Suef	MOSS
October 24	Beni Suef	MOMM
October 24	Beni Suef	Staff from 4 implementing CDAs (10)
October 24	Beni Suef , Ahnasia	Children (10) at GEI school
October 24	Beni Suef	Male apprentices (3)
October 24	Beni Suef	Mothers (15) trained in income-generating projects
October 24	Beni Suef	Workshop owners (9)
October 24	Beni Suef	CEOSS staff, group interview
October 25	Beni Suef, Fashn	Children (15) at Beni Salah Government School

Date	Location	Groups or Individuals Interviewed
October 25	Beni Suef, Fashn	Teachers (14) at Beni Salah Government School
October 25	Car	Remon on MOSS benefits
October 25	Beni Suef	Facilitators (10) from GEI schools
October 25	Beni Suef	Hend Hassan, NCCM Director of facilitators
October 26	Sohag	Sohag Community Development Association for Women and Children's Improvement (SCDAWCI), initial presentation
October 26	Sohag, Gehena	Children (13) at Amal Community School (CS)
October 26	Sohag, Gehena	Facilitators (2) at Amal Community School (CS)
October 26	Sohag, Gehena	Local Committee
October 26	Sohag	Apprentices (8)
October 26	Sohag	Workshop Owners (3)
October 26	Sohag	Social Workers (5), MOE
October 26	Sohag	MOMM, MOE, MOSS
October 26	Sohag	SCDAWCI NGO, group interview
October 27	Sohag, driving	SCDAWCI Field Coordinator
October 27	Sohag, Akhmim	Children (10) at Abar El Wakf Government School
October 27	Sohag	Teachers (7) at Abar El Wakf Government School
October 27	Sohag	Mother with sewing project
October 27	Sohag	SCDAWCI Field Coordinator
October 27	Sohag	Mothers (3) with paper bag project
October 27	Sohag	Mothers (10) trained in income-generating projects

ANNEX F: CHILD TRACKING SYSTEM FORMS

BASELINE FORM MONITORING TOOL (BFMT)

QUESTIONNAIRE/FORM NUMBER: _____

Governorate: _____

City/center (child): _____

Village (child): _____

Name of NGO: _____

Name of data collector: _____

Date the survey is conducted: _____ / _____ / _____

SECTION A: CHILD'S PERSONAL AND FAMILY STATUS (this part should be administered to the adult responsible for child at home)

A.1: Full name of child:

A.2: Gender of child:

Male

Female

A.3: Date of birth of child:

_____ / _____ / _____

A.4: Age of child:

_____ years

A.5: Does child hold an Identity Document (ID)?

- Health insurance card
- Birth certificate
- School ID
- None
- Other (specify) _____

A.6: Current address of child:

A.7: Nearest telephone to child:

A.8: Numbers of brothers/sisters and child's number among his siblings:

Males: _____

Females: _____

Child number: _____

A.9: Type of Home:

- Apartment
- Individual house
- Other (specify) _____

A.10: Number of rooms other than the bathroom and kitchen:

A.11: Status of House:

- Family ownership
- Owned by a relative
- Rent
- Owned by a friend
- Other (specify) _____

A.12: With whom does child live?

- Both parents → A.14
- Father alone
- Mother alone
- Adult responsible for child
- Relative
- Friends
- Lives alone
- Other (specify) _____

A.13: If not living with both parents, why?

- Divorce
- Separation
- Father deceased → A.18
- Parent is working abroad
- Mother deceased
- Both parents deceased → A.18
- Other (specify) _____

A.14: If father still alive, what is his profession?

A.15: Father's workplace:

A.16: Is father's work full-time or part-time or seasonal?

Full-time

Part-time

Seasonal

Other (specify) _____

A.17: Father highest education level:

Illiterate

Elementary

Preparatory

Secondary

Reads and writes

Vocational diploma

University

Do not know

A.18: If father deceased, age of child when father deceased?

A.19: What was his profession?

A.20: Father highest education level before death:

- Illiterate
- Elementary
- Preparatory
- Secondary
- Reads and writes
- Vocational diploma
- University
- Do not know

A.21: If mother still alive, is she working?

- Yes, she works outside home
- Yes, she works at home → A.24
- No → A.26

A.22: If mother works outside, specify type of work:

A.23: If mother works outside, what is the number of hours worked daily?

A.24: If mother works at home and contributes to family income, specify type of work:

A.25: If mother works at home, what is the number of hours worked daily?

A.26: Mother highest education level:

- Illiterate
- Elementary
- Preparatory
- Secondary
- Reads and writes
- Vocational diploma
- University
- Do not know

A.27: If mother deceased, age of child when mother deceased:

A.28: Was your mother working?

- Yes
- No

A.29: Mother's highest education level before death:

- Illiterate
- Elementary
- Preparatory
- Secondary
- Reads and writes
- Vocational diploma
- University
- Do not know

A.30: Who provides for most of the child's needs? (multiple answers allowed)

- Both parents
- Father alone
- Mother alone
- Adult responsible for child
- Relative
- Friends
- Self
- Other (specify) _____

SECTION B: ADULT BENEFICIARY PROFILE (this part should be administered to the adult responsible for the child, whether father or mother or other inside the house. The adult responsible for the child must be met personally)

B.1: Full name of adult:

B.2: Relationship to child beneficiary:

- Father
- Mother
- Brother
- Sister
- Uncle
- Aunt
- Grandmother
- Grandfather
- Other (specify) _____

B.3: Age of adult:

B.4: Date of birth:

B.5: Civil status:

Married

Single

Divorced

Widowed

Separated

B.6: Do you hold an Identity Document (ID)?

Yes, Indicate details _____

No

B.7: Is the beneficiary child living with you?

Yes

No

B.8: Number of family members, including child:

B.9: Current address of adult:

Town/village:

B.10: Telephone number:

B.11: If the responsible for the child someone other than father or mother, what is his/her profession?

B.12: What is your educational status?

- Illiterate
- Elementary
- Preparatory
- Secondary
- Reads and writes
- Vocational diploma
- University

B.13: Have you had any vocational skills training before?

- Yes
- No → B.15

B.14: If yes to B.13, please specify:

B.15: Is there another adult family member of the household?

- Yes
- No → B.17

B.16: If the answer to B.15 is yes, what is his/her name?

B.17: Number of children living with you under the age of 17:

B.18: Number of children living with you under the age of 17 currently in education:

B.19: Number of children living with you under the age of 17 who dropped out from school:

B.20: Number of children living with you under the age of 17 who have not been enrolled in school (they must be over 6 years of age):

B.21: Number of children living with you under the age of 17 who are working:

B.22: In your opinion, please indicate whether each of the following is considered a hazardous or non-hazardous occupation:

Occupation	Hazardous	Not Hazardous	Do Not Know
Underground work in mines and quarries			
Manufacture of explosions			
Glass melting and forming			
All types of soldering			
Agriculture			
Auto-repairs			
Auto-repairs if it includes operation or supervision of big machinery or the use of paints manufactured with organic solvents			
Work in tanneries			
Working in Textile factories			
Working in Textile factories if it involves bleaching and dyeing of textiles due to the dangers these chemicals may pose on children's skin.			
Blacksmithing			
Blacksmithing if it involves carrying heavy weights			
Construction works			
Construction works if it involves hazardous heights			

B.23: Monthly income of adult:

_____ L.E.

B.24: Total monthly income of the whole household:

_____ L.E.

B.25: What is the average monthly food expenditure of the family?

_____ L.E.

SECTION C: CHILD'S EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION (the first part until C.1–C.15 to be administered to the adult responsible for the child; second part from C.16–C.43 to be administered to child. Education info is that of his/her current school if he/she is enrolled, prior to project intervention)

C.1: Has child ever been to school?

Yes

No → Section D

C.2: Name of school:

C.3: Address of school:

Town/village:

C.4: Is child currently enrolled in school or has he dropped out?

Currently enrolled → C.9

Dropped out (ask C.5–C.8 only)

C.5: If the child has dropped out, which stage?

Elementary

Preparatory

C.6: Reasons for dropout:

- School fees
- Distance to school
- Hate school
- Need to work
- Other (specify) _____

C.7: Highest level attained prior to dropout:

- Nursery/KG
- Elementary
- Preparatory
- Other (specify) _____

C.8: Number of years spent in education prior to drop-out:

_____ (Please go to section D)

For the child already enrolled in school.

C.9: If child goes to school (enrolled), what is the enrollment date?

____/____/_____

C.10: Who pays the school fees?

C.11: Type of Education:

- Formal school
- Community school → C.13
- GEI school → C.13
- Vocational → C.13
- Literacy → C.13
- Other (specify) _____ → C.13

C.12: If formal education, current class:

- Nursery/KG
- Elementary 1
- Elementary 2
- Elementary 3
- Elementary 4
- Elementary 5
- Elementary 6
- Preparatory 1
- Preparatory 2
- Preparatory 3
- Secondary 1
- Secondary 2
- Secondary 3

C.13: If currently enrolled, how often does child go to school?

- Regularly
- Irregularly
- Rarely

C.14: Are you satisfied with the education your child is getting?

- Yes
- No

C.15: Explain your choice of C.14:

This part to be administered to Child him/herself.

C.16: How many times have you been absent from school this year?

- 1 day
- Less than 1 week
- 1–2 weeks
- 2–4 weeks
- More than 1 month
- Other (specify) _____

C.17: Specify reasons for absence:

- Illness
- Support family in work → C.20
- Culture/traditions → C.20
- Other (specify) _____ → C.20

C.18: Specify type of illness:

C.19: Have you sought help for the illness?

- Yes, visited hospital
- Yes, visited doctor
- Yes, doctor visited me
- No
- Other, specify _____

C.20: What are the activities available in your school?

- Sports
- Theatre
- Drawing
- Music
- Other (specify) _____

C.21: Do you like your school?

- Yes → C.23
- No
- Somehow

C.22: Please indicate reason(s) for choice of C.21:

C.23: Do you currently face learning difficulties?

- In all courses
- In some courses, specify _____
- In learning methods, specify _____
- In school schedule, specify _____
- Because working while studying
- Other (specify) _____

C.24: Have you previously failed in school?

- Yes
- No → C.26

C.25: If the answer to C.24 is yes, how many times?

C.26: How do you find school homework?

- Numerous
- Not numerous
- Easy
- Difficult

C.27: If you have experienced difficulty at school, have you resorted to...?

- Teachers
- Social workers at school
- Parents
- Friends
- Other (specify) _____

C.28: Do you find your teachers supportive?

- Yes
- No
- Somehow

C.29: Have you been subjected to violence at school?

- Yes
- No → C.32

C.30: Kind of violence:

- Beating
- Swearing
- Timeout

C.31: In case you have been subjected to violence, have you resorted to...?

- Teachers
- Social workers at school
- Parents
- Friends
- Child hotline
- Other (specify) _____

C.32: Average daily time for doing homework?

_____ hours

C.33: What do you do when you finish school?

- Go home to support parents
- Go to work
- Go to play with friends
- Finish homework
- Other (specify) _____

C.34: Do you take a meal (biscuits included) from your school?

- Yes (specify kind) _____
- No → C.37

C.35: Is this meal distributed daily?

- Yes
- No

C.36: Do you eat the meal received

- Yes
- No

C.37: Do you eat before coming to school?

Yes

No → C.39

C.38: If the answer to C.37 is yes, what kind of breakfast did you have this morning?

C.39: Do you bring snacks/lunch with you to school?

Yes

No

C.40: If you bring pocket money to school, what do you buy?

Sweets

Biscuits

Crisps

Other (specify) _____

Do not bring pocket money

C.41: Did any of your brothers/sisters leave school?

Yes

No → C.43

C.42: If the answer to C.41 is yes, please indicate reasons:

C.43: Did any of your friends leave school?

Yes

No → Section D

C.44: If the answer to C.43 is yes, please indicate reasons:

**SECTION D: CHILD EMPLOYMENT (to be administered to working child only,
preferably directly outside his workplace)**

D.1: Are you currently working?

Yes

No → Section E

D.2: Sector and type of work:

D.3: Do you work...?

As an apprentice

Alongside parent/guardian

As a paid worker

D.4: Main jobs/tasks performed by you:

D.5: Address of work:

Town/village:

D.6: Hours usually worked per day:

D.7: Are you attending school while working?

Yes

No → D.10

D.8: Time of work:

- Before school
- During school hours
- After school
- Weekends
- School holidays/vacations
- Peak season

D.9: Has work affected your attendance in school?

- Yes
- No
- Somehow

D.10: Remuneration per week:

_____ L.E.

D.11: Age when you first started working:

_____ old

D.12: For how long have you been working?

- Under 1 year
- 1–3 years
- 3–5 years
- 5–10 years
- Over 10 years

D.13: Have you worked in another place prior here?

- Yes
- No → D.15

D.14: What type of work?

D.15: Have you suffered from any work-related health problems or been exposed to any health risks?

Yes

No → D.20

D.16: What kinds of problems/risks are you experiencing? (read each risk for child)

Problems/Risks	Yes	No
Exposure to physical abuse		
Exposure to psychological abuse		
Exposure to sexual abuse		
Exposure to chemicals		
Work performed underground/underwater		
Work involves dangerous/hazardous heights		
No proper ventilation at work		
Work involves using and/or manipulating hazardous heavy equipment		
Work involves using toxic substances (e.g., insecticides)		
Work is done in extremely high or cool temperatures		
Work involves exposure to high noises		
Work involves bending for a long time		
Exposure to adverse weather conditions (e.g., burning sun)		
Exhausting work		
Injury and accidents (e.g., from exposure to uncovered gears or bare electricity)		

D.17: In case you have experienced health problems, have you, or anyone responsible for you, taken steps been taken to address some or all of these problems?

Yes

No → D.20

D.18: Please fill out the table.

Illness Type	Action Taken	Person who took action
	1. Child given protective work attire 2. Child treated at hospital/clinic 3. Child refused to work 4. Incident reported to police 5. Herbal treatment 6. temporary treatment at site of injury 7. Other (specify) _____	1. Child 2. Parent/guardian 3. Employer 4. Recruiter 5. Friends/Work Colleagues 6. Others (specify) _____ 7. No action was done

D.19: Have you been working whilst ill?

Yes

No

D.20: In your opinion, please indicate whether each of the following is considered a hazardous or non-hazardous occupation:

Occupation	Hazardous	Not Hazardous	Do not Know
Underground work in mines and quarries			
Manufacture of explosions			
Glass melting and forming			
All types of soldering			
Agriculture			
Auto-repairs			
Auto-repairs if it includes operation or supervision of big machinery or the use of paints manufactured with organic solvents			
Work in tanneries			
Working in Textile factories			
Working in Textile factories if it involves bleaching and dyeing of textiles due to the dangers these chemicals may pose on children's skin.			
Blacksmithing			
Blacksmithing if it involves carrying heavy weights			
Construction works			
Construction works if it involves hazardous heights			

SECTION E: PLANNED ACTION AND TYEPES OF PROJECT SERVICES PER CHILD (this section to be completed after full assessment of child situation by NGO and social workers. Recommendation to be given by NGO to PMU. Final assessment by PMU)

E.1: Is the child engaged in a hazardous occupation?

Yes

No

E.2: Is one or more of the child' siblings a child laborer?

Yes

No

E.3: Is the child experiencing severe financial family problems?

Yes

No

If yes, describe: _____

E.4: What type of project services is/are targeted for this child?

Enrollment in KG

Enrollment in formal primary school

Enrollment in community school

Enrollment in Girls Education Initiative (GEI) school

Apprenticeship/vocational training

Literacy

Remedial classes

Micro-credit loans to family

Other (specify) _____

E.5: What type of project services the Adult in the family is targeted for?

- Basic literacy
- Income generating activities
- Vocational skills training
- Awareness campaigns (including health)
- Other (specify) _____

E.6: Planned duration for service:

_____ years

E.7: What type of project services is targeted for the child's school?

- Teacher training
- Remedial courses
- School feeding
- Improved facilities
- Other (specify) _____

E.8: Planned duration for service:

_____ years

E.9: What type of incentives or support will child receive?

- Uniforms
- Shoes
- School bags
- Learning materials
- School fees
- Food
- Counseling
- Other (specify) _____

E.10: If child to be enrolled in remedial courses, duration of enrollment:

____/____/____ to ____/____/____

E.11: If enrolled in vocational course/apprenticeship, date of enrollment:

____/____/____ to ____/____/____

E.12: Type of vocational/apprenticeship institution

Government/public

Private

NGO

Other (specify) _____

E.13: Name of vocational/apprenticeship institution:

E.14: Type of vocation:

E.15: Address of institution:

Town/village:

E.16: Telephone of institution:

E.17: If enrolled in literacy course, date of enrollment:

____/____/____

E.18: Type of literacy course:

- Government/Public
- Private
- NGO
- Other (specify) _____

E.19: Name of institution:

E.20: Address of institution:

Town/village:

E.21: In case child enrolled in any school (KG, formal, GEI or CS), what is the date of enrollment me of teacher:

____/____/_____ to ____/____/_____

E.22: Planned duration for school:

_____ years

E.23: Name of school:

E.24: Address of institution:

Town/village:

MONITORING THE WORKPLACE FORM¹⁰

F.1: QUESTIONNAIRE/FORM NUMBER:

F.2: Name of labor inspector:

F.3: Date of filling out the form:

____/____/____

F.4: Time of the visit:

_____ hr. _____ min.

F.5: Name of employer:

F.6: Name of workplace:

F.7: License number of the workplace:

F.8: Insurance number of the workplace:

F.9: Address of workplace:

Town/village:

F.10: Telephone of workplace:

¹⁰ Monitoring the workplace form is filled by labor inspectors in coordination with the NGOs' social workers. Each form will be filled for one workplace. If more than one child work at the workplace, only one form will be filled out, and the names of children noted in F.11.

F.11: Name(s) of child/children targeted at the workplace:

F.12: Code of child/children targeted:

G.1: What are the main activities of the workplace, and whether this occupation is considered hazardous in the opinion of the labor inspector:

Occupation	Hazardous	Not Hazardous
Palm leaves industry		
Funances (including pottery)		
Glass melting and forming		
All types of soldering		
Agriculture		
Auto-repairs ¹¹		
Work in tanneries		
Working in Textile factories ¹²		
Blacksmithing ¹³		
Construction works ¹⁴		
Carpentry		
Electric works		
Upholstering		
Other(s) (indicate)		

¹¹ Auto-repairs not listed under the 44 occupation, yet it might be hazardous due to the operation or supervision of big machinery or the use of paints manufactured with organic solvents.

¹² Hazardous if it involves bleaching and dyeing of textiles due to the dangers these chemicals may pose on children's skin.

¹³ Blacksmithing not listed under the 44 occupation, yet it might be hazardous due to carrying heavy weights.

¹⁴ Construction works not listed under the 44 occupations, yet it might be hazardous due to exposure to hazardous heights.

G.2: Number of employees:

Male: _____

Female: _____

G.3: Age group of child workers:

< 7 Boys _____ Girls _____

7–12 Boys _____ Girls _____

12–17 Boys _____ Girls _____

G.4: Number of apprentices in the workplace:

Boys _____

Girls _____

Work Environment

H.1: Emergency exits present or needed?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

H.2: Availability of protective gear¹⁵ at work?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

¹⁵ Protective gear is equipment that can protect against a possible health hazard from a particular job (i.e. controlling occupational hazards), such as plastic coats, boots, gloves, and hats.

Exposure to Hazards

Chemicals/Dangerous Substances

I.1: If present, are chemical properly stored at work?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

I.2: Are there chemical fumes, smoke or gases present?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

I.3: Is there contact between child's skin and chemical?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

I.4: Is child exposed to a dusty atmosphere (e.g., wood sawdust?)

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Ventilation

J.1: Is workplace open?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

J.2: Is exhaust ventilation/air suckage system present?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

J.3: Are fans present?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

J.4: Are repulsive strong odors present?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Lighting

K.1: Is lighting level adequate?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Welding Operation

L.1: Is oxy-acetylene welding used?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

L.2: Is electrical arc welding used?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

L.3: Is welding done in closed spaces?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

L.4: Are welding eye shields visors used?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

L.5: Are welding fumes emitted all over?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Working Postures

M.1: Are working surfaces too high to reach?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

M.2: Are working platforms beyond hand reach?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

M.3: Is lifting heavy weights required?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

M.4: Are there cranes present?

Yes

No

M.5: If yes, do they meet the quality standards?

Remarks: _____

M.6: Is lots of bending required?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Fire Safety

N.1: Are fire hazards present?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

N.2: Is firefighting equipment present?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Safety and Health

O.1: Are first aid boxes available?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

O.2: Are workers trained on safety?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

O.3: Are workers aware of possible hazards?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Noisy Environment

P.1: Is workplace noise too loud?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

P.2: Is normal conversation heard only by shouting?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

P.3: Is noise problem mostly caused by vibrations?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Thermal Environment

Q.1: Is workplace too hot?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Q.2: Is workplace too cold?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Q.3: Is thermal environment comfortable?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Q.4: Is air conditioning available?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Q.5: Is heating/radiators available?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Electrical Hazards

R.1: Are electrical bare wires, plugs present?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

R.2: Are electrical controls suitable and protected?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

R.3: Is electrical machinery in good condition?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

R.4: Is electrical grounding present?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Mechanical Operation

S.1: Are cars, machinery poorly hoisted?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

S.2: Is handling of chemicals/machinery parts common?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

S.3: Are hand gloves used?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Machinery Guards

T.1: Does machinery have guards?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

T.2: Is there a significant risk of accident present?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

T.3: Is there a significant risk of falling from heights present?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

T.4: Are mobile belts (if present) protected?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Welfare Facilities

U.1: Is hand washing facility present?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

U.2: Is drinking water available?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

U.3: Are toilet facilities available?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

U.4: Is eating room facility available?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

U.5: Are work breaks granted?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Waste Disposal

V.1: Is waste disposal taken care of?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

V.2: Is workplace generally clean?

Yes

No

Remarks: _____

Outdoor Work

W.1: If working in construction sites, provide a detailed description of the work carried out by children

W.2: If working in agriculture, provide a detailed description of the work carried out by children

W.3: If working in other types of outdoor workplaces, provide a detailed description of the work carried out by children

W.4: Please cite any other observation not cited above.

This page intentionally left blank.

FOLLOW-UP FORM MONITORING TOOL (FFMT)

Governorate: _____

City/center of child: _____

Village of child: _____

SECTION X: CHILD INFORMATION (to be filled out by the NGO and Project Manager)

QUESTIONNAIRE/FORM NUMBER: _____

Name of NGO: _____

Name of Data collector: _____

Date the survey is conducted: ____/____/____

X.1: Full name of child:

X.2: Child code:

X.3: Child reported as—

Prevented

Withdrawn

X.4: Date of entry into program:

____/____/____

X.5: If exited, date of exit:

____/____/____

X.6: If exited, please indicate reason:

X.7: Reporting period:

- Monitoring Period 1 (1 Sep. 2007–28 Feb. 2008)
- Monitoring Period 2 (1 Mar. 2008–31 Aug. 2008)
- Monitoring Period 3 (1 Sep. 2008–28 Feb. 2009)
- Monitoring Period 4 (1 Mar. 2009–31 Aug. 2009)
- Monitoring Period 5 (1 Sep. 2009–28 Feb. 2010)
- Monitoring Period 6 (1 Mar. 2010–31 Aug. 2010)

X.8: What type of education is child currently enrolled in?

- Formal school, KG
- Formal primary school
- Community school → X.10
- Girls Education Initiative (GEI) school
- Apprenticeship/vocational training → X.10
- Literacy → X.10
- Remedial classes

X.9: If formal education, current class:

- Nursery/KG
- Elementary 1
- Elementary 2
- Elementary 3
- Elementary 4
- Elementary 5
- Elementary 6

X.10: Date of first enrollment:

____/____/_____

X.11: Name of school child attends through the project:

X.12: Address of school:

Town/village:

X.13: Types of services provided through the project to child:

Uniforms

Shoes

School bags

Learning materials

School fees

Food

Counseling

Other (specify) _____

X.16: Date of service provision:

____/____/_____

X.18: End date if applicable:

____/____/_____

X.19: Is child still living with the same caregiver?

Yes

No

X.20 If not give reasons for change.

- Death of caregiver
- Poverty
- Relation breakdown
- Poor health of caregiver
- Education
- Abuse and exploitation
- Other

X.21: Does the adult responsible for the child receive any type of project services?

- Yes
- No → Section Y

X.22: Code of adult:

X.23: Type of project services provided to the Adult in the family

- Basic literacy
- Income generating activities
- Vocational skills training
- Awareness campaigns (including health)
- Other (specify) _____

X.26: Date provided:

____/____/____

X.29: End date if applicable:

____/____/____

SECTION Y: CHILD EMPLOYMENT (to be filled out with working child)

Y.1: Is the child currently working?

Yes

No

Y.2: Main tasks the child performs at work:

Y.3: What kinds of problems/risks is the child experiencing?

Problems/Risks	Yes	No
Exposure to physical abuse		
Exposure to psychological abuse		
Exposure to sexual abuse		
Exposure to chemicals		
Work performed underground/underwater		
Work involves dangerous/hazardous heights		
No proper ventilation at work		
Work involves using and/or manipulating hazardous heavy equipment		
Work involves using toxic substances (e.g., insecticides)		
Work is done in extremely high or cool temperatures		
Work involves exposure to high noises		
Work involves bending for a long time		
Exposure to adverse weather conditions (e.g., burning sun)		
Exhausting work		
Injury and accidents (e.g., from exposure to uncovered gears or bare electricity)		

Y.4: Time of work:

- Before school
- During school hours
- After school
- Weekends
- School holidays/vacations
- Peak season

Y.5: Average hours of work per day?

SECTION Z: CHILD EDUCATION (to be filled out at school or any educational program. Discussions should take place with teachers, school administrators as well as viewing school records)

Z.1: If the child receives take-home rations (THR), how much has he received?

Month (Indicate Month)	Type of THR	Amount (in kg)

Z.3: In child's opinion, please indicate whether each of the following is considered a hazardous or non-hazardous occupation:¹⁶

Occupation	Hazardous	Not hazardous	Do Not Know
Underground work in mines and quarries			
Manufacture of explosives			
Glass melting and forming			
All types of soldering			
Agriculture			
Auto-repairs			
Auto-repairs if it includes operation or supervision of big machinery or the use of paints manufactured with organic solvents			
Work in tanneries			
Working in Textile factories			
Working in Textile factories if it involves bleaching and dyeing of textiles due to the dangers these chemicals may pose on children's skin.			
Blacksmithing			
Blacksmithing if it involves carrying heavy weights			
Construction works			
Construction works if it involves hazardous heights			

Z.5: Do you like your school?

Yes

No

¹⁶ Occupations based on the list of 44 hazardous occupations in the Egyptian decree no.118 for the year 2003 concerning child labor, as well as results of the RA that showed the high incidence of some of these occupations in all targeted governorates by the project.

Z.7: Do you currently face learning difficulties...?

- In all courses
- In some courses, specify _____
- In learning methods, specify _____
- In school schedule, specify _____
- Because working while studying
- Other (specify) _____

Z.8: If you have experienced difficulty at school, have you resorted to...?

- Teachers
- Social workers at school
- Parents
- Friends
- Other (specify) _____

Z.10: If you have been subjected to violence at school, have you resorted to...?

- Teachers
- Social workers at school
- Parents
- Friends
- Child hotline
- Other (specify) _____

Z.11: What do you do when you finish school?

- Go home to support parents
- Go to work
- Go to play with friends
- Finish homework
- Other (specify) _____

SECTION AA: ADULT BENEFICIARY MONITORING

AA.4: Has the education program your child been enrolled in through the project been worthwhile?

- Yes to a big extent
- Somehow
- No, it has not been worthwhile.

AA.5: Please explain choice of AA.4

AA.6: In your opinion, please indicate whether each of the following is considered a hazardous or non-hazardous occupation:¹⁷

Occupation	Hazardous	Not Hazardous	Do Not Know
Underground work in mines and quarries			
Manufacture of explosives			
Glass melting and forming			
All types of soldering			
Agriculture			
Auto-repairs			
Auto-repairs if it includes operation or supervision of big machinery or the use of paints manufactured with organic solvents			
Work in tanneries			
Working in textile factories			
Working in textile factories if it involves bleaching and dyeing of textiles due to the dangers these chemicals may pose on children's skin.			
Blacksmithing			
Blacksmithing if it involves carrying heavy weights			
Construction works			
Construction works if it involves hazardous heights			

SECTION BB: ASSESSMENT OF CHILD SITUATION (to be done by NGO and Project Manager after filling out the form)

BB.1: Have there been any changes in child situation compared to last reporting period?

Yes

No

BB.2: If yes, please describe:

¹⁷ Occupations based on the list of 44 hazardous occupations in the Egyptian decree no.118 for the year 2003 concerning child labor, as well as results of the RA that showed the high incidence of some of these occupations in all targeted governorates by the project.

BB.4: What other interventions are needed to enable the child to continue with education/training?

- Pay school fees
- Support from family members
- Psychological support
- Provide uniforms
- Nothing

BB.5: General appearance and behavior:

Guidance to assess personal well being and behavior Does the child have any particular worries? Does the child appear frightened? Is the child crying/unhappy?

Observation	Action Taken During Visit	Further Action Recommended

Assessment?

- Urgent intervention
- Ongoing monitoring
- No further action needed

BB.6: Did the child drop out from the educational system?

- Yes
- No

BB.7: If the child dropped out, give the main reason for drop out.

- Moved out of target area
- Take care of family members
- Prolonged illness
- Lack of parents support
- Early marriage
- Pregnant
- Parent/guardian does not value school

SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

CC.1: Name of school:

CC.2: Address of school:

CC.4: Number of project beneficiary children enrolled in this school:

Boys

Girls

CC.5: Does the school benefit from the government school feeding program?

Yes

No → CC.7

CC.6: If the answer to CC.5 is yes, have the students been receiving government biscuits/pies every school day since the start of school year?

Yes

No

CC.7: If the answer to CC.5 is no, please indicate average period of distribution:

_____ days

CC.8: When was the first delivery of WFP food commodities made?

____/____/____

CC.9: Was the food delivered to school in good condition?

Yes

No

Indicate reasons for choice: _____

Delete CC.10

CC.10: What is the amount of food delivered to this school during the past six months:

Month (indicate month)	Amount of Bix (in packets)	Stock at school after monthly dist.	Amount of Milk (In bottles)	Stock at school after monthly dist.
Month 1				
Month 2				
Month 3				
Month 4				
Month 5				
Month 6				

CC.11: What are the names of teachers in this school who have received project trainings?

CC.12: How many committees are present in school?

CC.13: Please indicate name and number of meetings of each committee during the past 6 months:

Committee Name	Number of meetings

ANNEX G: REFERENCES CITED

Ahmed, Y. M., & Jureidini, R. (2010). *An exploratory study on child domestic workers in Egypt*. Cairo, Egypt: Center for Migration and Refugee Studies. Retrieved from <http://www.aucegypt.edu/GAPP/cmrs/Documents/Child%20Domestic%20Workers%20Report.pdf>