



# **Results and insights from the child labor free zone program in West Nile, Uganda**

**Baseline study, endline study, and analysis**

## **Final Report**

**Submitted to:**  
Rainforest Alliance

June 2021

Aidenvironment  
Barentszplein 7  
1013 NJ Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
+ 31 (0)20 686 81 11  
info@aidenvironment.org  
www.aidenvironment.org

# Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 Objective of the program	7
1.2 The Child labor Free Zone approach	7
1.3 Profile of Nebbi and Zombo Districts program area	8
1.4 Defining child labor and child labor risk	9
1.5 Project design	10
<b>2. Methodology</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1 Indicators and data collection methods	12
2.2 Data collection of costs	13
2.3 Baseline and endline studies	13
2.4 Ethical considerations	14
2.5 Data entry and analysis and quality assurance	14
2.6 Factors that may influence the results	15
<b>3. The results of the different approaches</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1 The incidence of child labor and child labor risk	15
3.2 Root cause 1: Income changes among households	18
3.3 Root cause 2: Community level attitudes and practices	20
3.3.1 The effectiveness of community child labor committees (CLCs)	20
3.3.2 The effectiveness of VSLAs	21
3.3.3 The change of socio-cultural norms	23
3.4 Root cause 3: The quality of education	24
3.5 Root cause 4: Child labor policies and enforcement	25
<b>4. Assessment of cost-effectiveness</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>5. Analysis and evaluation questions</b>	<b>28</b>
5.1 Comparing cost-effectiveness per zone	28
5.1.1 Overview	28
5.1.2 High and sub-high intensity - VSLA approach – zone A	29
5.1.3 Moderate intensity - area-based approach – zone B	30
5.1.4 Low intensity – RA basic activities – zone C	31
5.2 Scaling and sustainability of the approach	31
5.3 Lessons from the partnership	33
<b>6. Evaluation of the CLFZ approach</b>	<b>35</b>
6.1 Addressing the root casus of child labor	35
6.2 Strengths of the CLFZ approach	37
6.3 Weaknesses and remaining challenges of the CLFZ approach	38
6.4 Main conclusions	39
6.5 Recommendations	39

<b>Annex 1 Indicator protocols</b>	<b>41</b>
1.1 Protocol for household surveys to map child labor and child labor risk	41
1.2 Protocol for school performance	42
1.3 Protocol for Handling of child labor by teachers	43
1.4 Protocol for survey on the socio-cultural norm	44
1.5 Protocol for survey on effectiveness of child labor committees at community level	45
1.6 Protocol for survey of effectiveness of village savings and Loan association	47
1.7 Protocol for sub-county child labor steering committee	49
<b>Annex 2: Details on surveys conducted and sampling</b>	<b>50</b>
Households sampled and surveyed on the occurrence of child labor	50
Community child labor committees and VSLAs	50
Sub-county child labor committees	50
Schools and teachers	51
Interviews with children	51
<b>Annex 3: Details on norms and attitudes on child labor</b>	<b>52</b>
Insights from FGDs on child labor and change of attitude	54
<b>Annex 4: Data and insights on quality of education</b>	<b>55</b>
Attitudes of teachers: tabular overviews and analysis	56
Opinions from interviews and FGDs on schools and education	57
<b>Annex 5: Cost estimates of the activities carried out</b>	<b>60</b>

## **Acknowledgements**

This report is based on the results of implementing a Child Labor Free Zone (CLFZ) in West Nile, resulting from an intensive collaboration during five years between the Stop Child Labour Coalition (led by Hivos), in Uganda the NGO CEFORD, Kyagalanyi Coffee Limited (KCL), the teachers association UNATU, and the Rainforest Alliance (RA) who sets the standard for sustainable coffee production. This study could not have been done without the dedicated work by these organizations.

The baseline- and endline studies were conducted by field teams including mainly KCL and CEFORD staff. Many thanks for their time and efforts to ensure high quality data collection. Also many thanks for the support of data collection and analysis by KCL and Rainforest Alliance local teams.

This study was executed with funding from the Rainforest Alliance.

## Abbreviations

CA	Change Agent
CL	Child labor
CLC	Child labor Committees
CLFZ	Child labor Free Zone
CLLO	Child Labor Liaison Officer
CLMRS	Child labor Monitoring and Remediation System
GALS	Gender Action and Learning System
HH	Household
KCL	Kyagalanyi Coffee Limited
RA	Rainforest Alliance
SCL	Stop Child Labour
VSLA	Village Savings and Loan Associations

## **Executive summary**

See separate link and file

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Objective of the program

The CLFZ approach has been introduced in the West Nile area in 2014 by the Stop Child Labour Coalition led by Hivos. The approach was introduced by a project implemented in close collaboration with Kyagalanyi Coffee Limited (KCL), one of the largest coffee traders in Uganda and working with coffee farmers in the study area. A 2017 evaluation of the Hivos CLFZ program found the approach to be effective, but also raised concerns about the high costs of this intensive approach as compared to supply chain based approaches to tackle child labor.


Therefore, the Rainforest Alliance (RA) Sector Partnerships Program took the initiative to implement the program “Developing cost effective and scalable child labor approaches for RA implementers: Piloting in coffee communities in Uganda and strengthening civil society capacities to work with private sector to resolve child labor issues in coffee growing communities of West Nile”. It was implemented with local partners in West Nile region, Uganda from January 2017 to the end of 2020. The objective of the program was to determine the cost-effectiveness of the Child Labor Free Zone (CLFZ) approach, as compared to other less intensive approaches. For the purpose of this program, the full CLFZ and less intensive approaches to tackle child labor were implemented in four different zones. Comparison of the costs and results between these intervention zones should generate insights on the most cost-effective approach.

This report includes a comparison of the baseline study with the endline study, based on quantitative data from surveys as well as qualitative assessments, generating results and insights on the cost-effectiveness of the CLFZ and other less intensive approaches to stop child labor.

## 1.2 The Child labor Free Zone approach

The child labor free zone (CLFZ) approach aims to minimize and mitigate the incidence of child labor. The CLFZ approach was developed as a response to the experience that many child labor approaches, while eradicating child labor in a specific supply chain or production system, often do not succeed in achieving a sustainable solution because child labor simply is displaced to other supply chains or nearby geographies, and positive outcomes are not sustained over time. This is because these approaches do not address the root causes of child labor, which are often related to socio-cultural norms, endemic multi-dimensional poverty and poor governance systems.

The CLFZ approach is basically a landscape approach that aims to address the root causes of child labor in a geographical area or jurisdiction and thus achieve a more enduring transformation of behavior in regard to child labor in a wider area, irrespective of the supply chain or production system. To achieve this ambitious objective, the CLFZ approach includes multiple activities, including raising awareness, developing household level child labor mitigation plans and monitoring, establishing and supporting community-based child labor committees (CLCs), and savings and loan systems (VSLAs), enhancing the quality of education in local schools, and engaging local government (see theory of change, Figure 1). Considering this scope and ambitions, the CLFZ approach requires several years of support to achieve its set objectives.



**adenvironment**

Figure 1: Theory of change of the child labor free zone approach

### 1.3 Profile of Nebbi and Zombo Districts program area



The RA program was implemented in Nebbi and Zombo Districts in the West Nile region of Uganda (Figure 2). The West Nile region has a population of 396,794 people out of whom 191,104 are male and 205,690 are female (data from 2014). Zombo district has a population of 240,081 people out of whom 115,824 are male and 124,257 are female (data from 2014). Both Districts rank among the poorest in Uganda with a Human Development Index of 0.399 according to 2012 data.<sup>1</sup>

Figure 2: Location of the program intervention area in West Nile region in Uganda

As part of several studies related to the establishment of the CLFZ approach in West-Nile region, it was found that there is a high incidence of child labor and child labor risk. Gradually, insights were developed on the root causes of child labor, which consists of 4 strongly inter-related components, as illustrated in Figure 3.

Widespread poverty, weak socio-cultural norms, poor quality education and poor law enforcement result in many people taking their children out of school before they have even finished primary school.

<sup>1</sup> Nebbi district Local Government statistical Abstract.



In terms of reducing poverty, in the West-Nile region the Kyagalanyi Coffee Limited (KCL) company aims to increase income of coffee farmers by increasing coffee productivity (improving yields and quality of coffee beans). KCL supports its member coffee farmers through training, secured market offset, and access to KCL washing stations. KCL also establishes additional VSLAs for its members and has taken some additional initiatives like the establishment of youth clubs. Non KCL members may also produce coffee, but will sell their coffee to other traders. It is KCL's assumption that by increasing income through coffee revenues one root cause of child labor and child labor risk is being addressed and thus a significant contribution is provided to reduce child labor and child labor risk. In addition, in the intensive zone KCL supports farmers with incidence of child labor and child labor risk to develop child labor remediation plans.




Figure 3: Baseline situation with four types of root causes of child labor (CL) in West Nile

## 1.4 Defining child labor and child labor risk

Child labor is prohibited in Uganda by law. However, law enforcement is weak. Where child labor is criminalized, children may be arrested by the police and their parents fined before children are released from the police office. Sometimes police take children of school going age to school.

In this study, household heads were asked whether any children in their home were: a) conducting dangerous work; b) working outside the family farm; c) attending school part-time; or d) not attending school at all. In the original study, a household with a child in any of these categories was designated as a household with child labor. This is consistent with the approach used by the Stop Child Labour Coalition, which essentially classifies any child who does not attend school full time as “participating in child labor<sup>2</sup>.”

However, this definition is not consistent with that of the Rainforest Alliance Sustainable Agriculture Standard and the previous UTZ standard, which both use the ILO Conventions and ILO definition of child labor. The ILO considers a child to be participating in child labor if he or she is conducting dangerous work, is below certain age thresholds, or is working excessive hours. Thus, a child who is not in school

<sup>2</sup> See Stop Child Labour Coalition, 5X5 stepping stones for creating child labour free zones, available at:

[https://www.stopchildlabour.org/assets/SCL\\_CLFZ\\_handbook\\_FINAL\\_LR\\_complete.pdf](https://www.stopchildlabour.org/assets/SCL_CLFZ_handbook_FINAL_LR_complete.pdf)

full time - but for whom there is no evidence of dangerous, age-inappropriate or excessive work - is considered “at risk of child labor” but not “in child labor” using this definition. When reporting on the results of the household surveys conducted for this study, we use the terminology “in child labor” when referring to children that are conducting dangerous work or are working outside the family farm, and “at risk of child labor” when referring to children who are attending school part time or not at all.<sup>3</sup>

The following scheme (Box 1) summarizes how child labor, child labor risk and child work are defined.

**Box 1: Definition of child labor in Ugandan law**

Note the distinction between child labor (not allowed), family labor (allowed) and paid work.

- ⇒ **Children < 6 years:**
    - **NEVER** allowed to do any **paid** or **dangerous work** = **CHILD LABOR**
    - Allowed to assist parents with age-appropriate light chores = Child work
  - ⇒ **Children 6-11 years (school-age):**
    - **NEVER** allowed to do any **paid** or **dangerous work** = **CHILD LABOR**
    - **NOT** allowed to help at family farm / household **DURING school hours** = **CHILD LABOR RISK**
    - Allowed to help on family farm / household **OUTSIDE school hours** = Child work
  - ⇒ **Children 12-13 years (school-age):**
    - **NEVER** allowed to do any **dangerous work** = **CHILD LABOR**
    - **NEVER** allowed to do any **paid work DURING school hours** = **CHILD LABOR**
    - **NOT** allowed to help at family farm / household **DURING school hours** = **CHILD LABOR RISK**
    - Allowed to help on family farm / household **OUTSIDE school hours** = Child work
    - Allowed to do light paid work under supervision of an adult **OUTSIDE school hours** = Child work
  - ⇒ **Children 14-18 years:**
    - **NEVER** allowed to do **dangerous work** = **CHILD LABOR**
    - **NEVER** allowed to do **night work** = **CHILD LABOR**
    - Allowed to do paid work under supervision of an adult, **NEVER** more than 8 hrs/ day = Child work
- Dangerous work** includes carrying heavy loads, spraying chemicals, hunting and operating machines.

## 1.5 Project design

This project, which began in 2017 and ended in 2020, was conceptualized as follows: the original CLFZ project would continue as before (in “Zone A1”), and its costs and effectiveness would be compared to three alternative approaches. The first alternative approach (in “Zone A2”) contained all of the elements of the original CLFZ project, but for a shorter duration (three years instead of six) and with a slightly lower density of Child Labor Committees; the second alternative approach (in “Zone B”), involved a moderate-intensity set of activities that included some - but not all - CLFZ elements and was primarily aimed at Kyagalanyi members; the third alternative approach (in “Zone C”) was considered to be “low intensity” and included only the child labor related activities that were required under the UTZ certification program at the time, which included: 1) basic awareness-raising on child labor among member farmers, 2) inspection of farms for child labor during the annual certification audit, and 3) in areas with a high risk of child labor, appointing a child labor liaison officer to monitor child labor and remediate any identified cases.

<sup>3</sup> Relying solely on observations of ‘dangerous work’ and ‘working outside the family farm’ will likely underestimate child labor, since children may do such work in seasons other than when the survey was done. The evidence on the causal relationship between child labor and education is mixed; causality can be difficult to establish (ILO, 2003, Child Labour, School Attendance and Academic Performance: A Review)

The specific activities conducted in each zone are summarized in the following table 1.

*Table 1. The characteristics and activities of the four project zones.*

Main parameters / activities per zone	Child Labor Free Zone approach		Moderate intensity approach	Low intensity approach
	Zone A1	Zone A2	Zone B	Zone C
Year intervention started	2014	2017	2017	2017
Staffing	3 community change agents and 1 child labor liaison officer per sub-county			no staff dedicated to child labor
Household surveys to identify child labor?	Yes, conducted in all village households		Yes, but only in Kyagalanyi member households	
Household-level child labor remediation plans and monitoring?	Yes	Yes	Only in Kyagalanyi member households	No remediation plans; monitoring occurs during annual certification audits only
Child Labor Committees and Village Savings and Loans Associations created?	13 (one per village)	10 (two or three per parish)	9 (one per parish)	No
Women's empowerment program using GALS* approach?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Support and awareness-raising for teachers and schools?	All 15 primary schools		All 12 primary schools	No
Coalition-building and development of sub-county steering committees?	Yes, started in 2014, steering committee established		Yes, started in 2017, no steering committee established	No
Training on practices to improve coffee productivity (e.g. fertilizing and pruning)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

\* Gender Action and Learning System

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1 Indicators and data collection methods

An overview of the indicators and the methods used for data collection is shown in table 2. There are basically two types of methods for data collection, being the household survey, which generates quantitative data, and focus group discussions and key informant interviews for selected stakeholders or stakeholder groups, which generates qualitative information and semi-quantitative data based on a preference scoring list. The indicator protocols for all methods are presented in Annex 1. In addition, we used available data on school attendance and enrolment obtained from UNATU. Also, during the endline study focus group discussions were held with children from KCL families that send their children to school. In terms of low intensities, surveys were also conducted of non-KCL (Kyagalanyi Coffee Limited) households (who might also be coffee growing but are not KCL member and therefore part of the KCL program of increasing coffee production).

*Table 2: Overview of indicators (see for reference of indicator codes theory of change in Figure 1) and methods used for data collection*

Indicators	Methods
<b>HH level: KCL and non-KCL coffee farmers</b>	
G1: Number of KCL coffee households with incidence of child labor and child labor risk G2: Number of non-KCL households with incidence of child labor and child labor risk E2: Change of awareness on child labor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household surveys. The survey methods were aligned between KCL and Ceford so that one standard survey format was used.</li> <li>Focus group discussions with children (endline only)</li> </ul>
<b>Community level</b>	
F1. Improved incomes and access to funds from education fund E4. Functionality of VSLAs including education support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus group discussions and questionnaire with response categories</li> </ul>
F2. Socio-cultural norm established of not accepting any child labor (boy/girl) in the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household surveys. Questionnaire with response categories</li> </ul>
E3. Functionality of community Child Labor Committees in monitoring, reporting and remediating child labor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus group discussions and questionnaire with response categories</li> </ul>
<b>Schools</b>	
F3. School enrolment rate and school attendance rates (age groups, boys/girls)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Official data from education agencies</li> </ul>
E5. Effective handling of child labor issues by schools E6. Quality of education and school facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus group discussions, key informant interviews and questionnaire with response categories</li> <li>Focus group discussions with children (endline only)</li> </ul>
<b>Sub-counties</b>	
F4. Improved policies and initiatives to reduce child labor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus group discussions and semi-structures key informant interviews with response categories</li> </ul>
E7. Functionality of sub-county stop child labor steering committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus group discussions and semi-structures key informant interviews with response categories</li> </ul>

Details on data collection and sampling of households, child labor committees, schools and sub-counties, are provided in Annex 2.

## 2.2 Data collection of costs

For making an assessment of cost-effectiveness, there is need to document what was done and what were the costs. However, it appeared quite difficult to know exactly what was done in each zone. High and moderate intensity implementation of the CLFZ approach had not been well defined at the onset, and planned activities were often adjusted along the way. This is due to the attitude of trying to achieve the best impact, rather than sticking to a predetermined design. In addition, activities were carried out by other programs as well, such as KCL installing additional VSLAs, KCL implementing a gender program in the same zones, and SCL/Hivos supporting Ceford to implement the CLFZ approach in the sub-high intensity zone. Thus, the costs that are be indicated in this report relate to costs for implementation of this programme only, but exclude general overhead or management costs, neither of KCL’s general sustainability work and the KCL gender programme.

## 2.3 Baseline and endline studies

The baseline study for this program was conducted in 2018 (with some surveys done in early 2019) while the end line study using the same methodology was conducted in March-April 2020. Both studies were done by KCL and Ceford field officers with some assistance by enumerators who had been trained for this assignment. In addition to the endline survey, a 1-week field study was conducted by Aidenvironment in September 2020 for a qualitative assessment of the endline situation and the changes observed. Table 2 shows the number of individuals (or sometimes organizations) interviewed in 2018 and in 2020. As noted in table 3, the 2020 numbers were reduced for some groups due to COVID-19 travel restrictions. Details on sample size can be found in Appendices 2 and 3.

*Table 3. Survey sample sizes in 2018 and 2020. Figures include all study zones combined.*

Survey type	Sample size 2018	Sample size 2020
Households visited to assess school attendance and the presence of child labor	4,231	2,827
Households surveyed about perceptions on child labor	2,544	2,440
Child Labor Committees and VSLAs	28	31 (plus an additional 10 qualitative surveys)
Sub-county governments (and Child Labor Steering Committees if present)	3	6 (plus an additional six qualitative surveys)
Children included in focus group discussions	0	22
Teachers surveyed about perceptions on child labor	31	0 (reduced due to COVID-19)
Teachers surveyed about child enrollment	42	4 (reduced due to COVID-19)
Data on school enrolment, attendance and drop out rates	27 (zones A1, A2 and B)	12 (zone B only)

## **2.4 Ethical considerations**

Participants gave their informed consent based on understanding of the goal of the study before they participated in the focus group discussion or interview. We assured study participants of confidentiality in research reporting and provisions to ask questions at any time and opt out of the research at any point. We obtained consent from all participants after providing this explanation. As researchers we maintained a reflexive practice to ensure rigor of the data collected for this research.

## **2.5 Data entry and analysis and quality assurance**

### **Quantitative data analysis**

Clean-up of the survey data enabled us to identify and correct incomplete or inaccurate responses, which were validated through a follow up process to improve the quality of the responses. The data was coded, digitalized and analyzed using Microsoft Excel.

To determine the incidence of child labor and child labor risk, households were surveyed using a protocol (Annex 2.1) distinguishing 4 categories of child labor (multiple categories are possible):

- Completely out of school (6-14 years)
- Partially out of school (6-14 years)
- Dangerous work (6-14 years)
- Working elsewhere (6-14 years)

To establish the percentage of households with child labor and child labor risk, we counted households with any child with a positive score on any of the above 4 criteria. Double counting was avoided if a child would be out of school and/or engaged in dangerous work and/or working elsewhere, by entering the data about a child in a household only once.

### **Qualitative data analysis**

For other indicators focus group discussions and interviews were held with a questionnaire using response categories, as follows (see for details Annex 1):

- On socio-cultural norms: HHs survey with response categories
- On functionality of community CL committees and VSLAs: focus group discussions and interviews / questionnaire with response categories
- On effective handling of child labor issues by schools: focus group discussions and interviews / questionnaire with response categories
- On functionality of sub-county stop child labor steering committees: Focus group discussions and interviews / questionnaire with response categories

The responses to questionnaires were coded and response options then analyzed using the assigned numeric codes. The qualitative responses were then presented in a semi-quantitative form using tables. The focus group discussion were transcribed and integrated in the baseline and this report.

### **Quality assurance**

Quality assurance and supervision was provided by a local consultant specialized in M&E, as well as an international consultant specialized in M&E.

## 2.6 Factors that may influence the results

There are three issues that limit the validity of some of the data collected in this study, as follows.

- The first is that the percentage of households with child labor and child labor risk that were calculated in 2018 do not reflect the true baseline rates for Zones A1 and A2. This is because CLFZ activities in Zones A1, which began in 2014 and showed spill over to zone A2, had already substantially reduced rates of child labor and child labor risk by 2018. Therefore, when assessing the effects of the interventions on rates of child labor and child labor risk, a more accurate baseline rate of child labor and child labor risk for Zones A1 and A2 is estimated by local experts to be roughly 50 percent.
- The second limitation – specifically, the data collected in 2020 – is the COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic prevented researchers from conducting focus group discussions with teachers at the end of the project, since schools were closed and many teachers had left. Instead, one-on-one interviews were held with the remaining teachers.
- Thirdly, calculating the costs of implementing each of the four approaches to eliminating child labor also proved to be quite difficult. Cost was estimated based on the activities carried out in each zone and the related expenditures of these activities. Because cost-accounting was not done per activity and per zone, the cost figures should be considered rough estimates.

## 3. The results of the different approaches

In this chapter we discuss the results of the program, by applying the CLFZ and other approaches, in different intensities, per intervention zone. We start by looking at the impact, being the incidence of child labor and child labor risk (section 3.1). Subsequently, we look at underlying effects (outcomes), which are related to the root causes of child labor, in line with the theory of change and the respective indicators (Figure 1), being:

- Changes in income and access to funds for going to school
- Changes in community awareness and attitudes to child labor
- Changes in the quality of education
- Changes in institutions at sub-county level

Overall conclusions on cost-effectiveness and other evaluation questions will be drawn in the next chapter, using the findings of this chapter.

### 3.1 The incidence of child labor and child labor risk

**The high and sub-high intensity approach (zone A) has eradicated child labour (dangerous work or working elsewhere). Remaining are cases of child labor risk by children working fully or partly during school hours. This is in contrast to the moderate intensity (zone B) or low intensity (zone C) approach where some cases of child labor by children doing dangerous work or working elsewhere still remain, for boys mainly.** Figure 4 shows a detailed breakdown of the categories of child labor per child (% children in surveyed HHs with types of child labor), being boys or girls, and being fully or partly out of school, doing dangerous work, or working elsewhere. In terms of categories of child labor, which explain the incidence of child labor, the following trends can be observed:

- a. **The rate of children fully or partly out of school** has dropped for every zone. At endline the percentages remain highest for zones B and C, especially for children partly out of school (5-6% of children in zone B KCL or non-KCL, 23% in zone C). For children out of school there are **no consistent differences between boys and girls.**

- b. **Children doing dangerous work** at baseline occurred in every zone, but at endline only remained in zones B non-KCL and zone C, and is **higher for boys than girls** (2-4%; 1% respectively). It ceased to occur among KCL households and in zone A as a whole.
- c. **Children working elsewhere** at baseline occurred in every zone, but at endline **remained for boys only** in zone B non-KCL and zone C (none for girls), albeit at very low intensities (0.3-1.4% of boys). It ceased to occur among KCL members and in zone A as a whole.
- d. As regards boys and girls, the remaining cases of dangerous work and children working elsewhere are both with boys mainly. There do not appear to be differences between boys and girls fully or partly out of school.




Figure 4. Percentage of children attending school part-time or not at all (i.e. at risk of child labor) or doing dangerous work or working off the family farm (i.e. in child labor) among Kyagalanyi Coffee Limited (KCL) members and non-members in each study zone, in 2018 and 2020. A child that falls into multiple categories will be included in multiple bars in the graphic.

Shifting from individual children to households, Figure 5 shows the percentage of households with child labor or at risk of child labor in each of the study zones. Note that the rates among households are



higher than the rates among individual children because households are classified as having child labor if at least one child is in or at risk of child labor, regardless of the number of other children in the household (e.g. a household with one child in or at risk of child labor, and four children that are not, would be counted as in or at risk of child labor in Figure 5).




Figure 5. Percentage of households with at least one child in child labor or at risk of child labor, among Kyagalanyi Coffee Limited (KCL) members and non-members in each study zone, in 2018 and 2020.

The incidence of child labor or at risk of child labor has declined in every intervention zone for both KCL and non-KCL households, with the strongest reduction in the high and sub-high intensity zones, less strong in the moderate intensity zone, and limited yet apparent in the low intensity zone. Zone C (basic stop child labour activities) shows a 20% decline in child labor or at risk of child labor, and an endline rate of 44%, which could be taken as a reference. However, the overall rate is now lowest in the high and sub-high intensity zones, followed by the moderate intensity zone. This shows that high intensity approach has been most effective in reducing child labor or at risk of child labor, followed by the moderate intensity approach. Both have effects which exceed the reference values in the low intensity zone. Since the endline situation in the moderate intensity zone for KCL households is comparable to the baseline situation for the high and sub-high intensity zone (around 10% of HHs), we would expect that a further decline of child labor or at risk of child labor for HHs in the moderate intensity zone is possible. These findings are supported by the qualitative findings from FGDs and interviews with stakeholders.

In the high- and sub-high intensity zones the rate of child labor or at risk of child labor has reduced to 2.5-5% of households. Remaining cases in these zones are related to ‘problem families’, which may be due to particular situations, such as absentee parents. CLCs stated that they sometimes meet resistance from parents who do not want to support their children in school. These are mainly ‘problem families’ due to specific conditions, such as absentee parents, girls having had teenage pregnancies and grandparents raising these children, parents having conflicts or alcoholism. There are no indications that these cases are particularly frequent with certain types of households, for instance female-headed households. In the high intensity zone these cases were discussed with the sub-county steering committee to find solutions.

The effects of applying the CLFZ approach has spread from the core zone where activities started in 2014, to surrounding areas, and from KVCL households to non-KCL households in zone B. Figure 5 shows that at baseline (2018) the situation in terms of child labor or at risk of child labor is already much better in the high and sub-high intensity zones as compared to the other two zones. This may be explained by the history of adopting the CLFZ approach which already started in 2014 in a small core area in the high intensity zone (4 villages). In 2018 the effects have already spread beyond this small core area to other villages. This suggests there is spin-off of the child labor practices from the core zone to the other villages. The same effect can be observed in zone B, between KCL households (who were targeted) to non-KCL households (who were not targeted) who also showed a decline in incidence of child labor and child labor risk. This might imply that once a core zone has been well established, a less

intensive approach of awareness raising may be sufficient to allow for the spread of good practices. In achieving this, as will be demonstrated in later sections, the role of the sub-county authorities may be important.

**The high and sub-high intensity approach leads to a reduction in child labor or at risk of child labor in both KCL and non-KCL households (i.e. the overall community), while the moderate intensity approach shows a spill-over from KCL to non-KCL households.** Figures 4 and 5 show the differences between KCL households and non-KCL households. Note that non-KCL households may also be growing coffee. In the high and sub-high intensity zones the child labor rate with non-KCL households has also reduced strongly, showing that in the community as a whole there is awareness on child labor. In the moderate intensity zone non-KCL households have twice higher child labor and child labor risk rates than KCL households (18% and 9% respectively at endline). Actually, in zone B a difference between KCL and non-KCL households already existed at baseline, which could be due to the fact that awareness raising on child labor with KCL households had already started before the baseline study was carried out. The continuing decline of child labor or at risk of child labor with non-KCL households suggest there is a spill-over effect from KCL households, and also shows the effect of the community-based approach.

### 3.2 Root cause 1: Income changes among households

Poverty (in its broad multi-dimensional understanding) is considered to be one of the main root causes of child labor (see Figure 1). The CLFZ approach stimulates income generating activities (IGAs) through training and setting up VSLAs. More specifically, through the education fund of the VSLAs parents can acquire funding for their children to go to school. However, in terms of reducing poverty, most important are the activities by KCL to increase household revenues from coffee, with the assumption that the increased revenues will also be used to reduce child labor in an indirect way.

**Disregarding the change in coffee prices, the increase in revenues from coffee could be 35-65%.** The expected increase in incomes from coffee due to improved practices promoted by KCL can be related to (i) yield increase and (ii) RA & quality premiums. Table 4 shows that it can be expected that income increases are highest in zones A1 and A2, followed by zones B and C. Lower yield increase in zone B and C is partially due to additional farmers that were recruited in 2018 and 2019, bringing average yields down as they have not yet adopted better practices.

Table 4: Changes in coffee production and revenues between 2015 and 2019 (source: KCL)

Zone	2015		2019		Coffee income impact	
	# farms	Average yield/tree	# farms	Average yield/tree	Yield increase (%)	RA & quality premium (% coffee price)
A1 + A2	978	1.3	1,404	1.8	+ 46%	+ 20%
B	576	1.3	1,148	1.5	+ 15%	+ 20%
C	699	1.4	1,590	1.6	+ 14%	+ 20%

The endline survey included questions among both KCL and non-KCL households on changes in household incomes as experienced during the last 3 years (increase, decline or stable) and what were the main causes of the changes. The following table 5 gives an overview of the results per zone.

**Among all KCL households considerable increase of incomes has taken place during the last 3 years, as a result of revenues from coffee mainly. Non-KCL households in the intensive and sub-intensive zones also had income increases, but due to other crops (vegetables, Irish potato) mainly.** It can be observed that the sub-high intensity zone shows most positive scores (high income increase, few income

declines), with increases for KCL members due to coffee mainly, while for non-KCL members these are banana and Irish potatoes. KCL farmers in the high intensity and moderate intensity zone also show positive scores, with coffee as the leading source of income. Non-KCL members in the high intensity zone have less positive scores, while non-KCL members in the moderate intensity zone and KCL members in the low intensity zone have almost equal number of farmers with income increase as income decline. While increased coffee revenues are certainly due to the KCL program, increased income from other crops could also be due to using VSLA funds and training on income generating activities, as part of the CLFZ approach. During the duration of this program, the KCL's gender program was implemented in Zone A1, A2 and zone B. The VSLAs and trainings on gender equality, joint household decision making and joint household and farm visions definitely have contributed to the positive changes in HH income. Income declines are mainly related to maize and beans (prices and/or market access).

Table 5: Opinions of households on income changes during the last 3 years, and the 3 main causes.

Zone	KCL/non-KCL	% HHs with income changes		3 main causes of increase	3 main causes of decline
		increase	decrease		
Zone A1 - High intensity	KCL	56.5%	14.7%	1. coffee 2. vegetables 3. sweet potatoes, banana	1. maize 2. poor returns to trade*
	non-KCL	47.0%	20.0%	1. vegetables 2. coffee 3. livestock	1. maize 2. beans 3. poor returns to trade*
Zone A2 - Sub-high intensity	KCL	71.2%	9.0%	1. coffee 2. vegetables 3. banana	1. maize 2. beans 3. livestock
	Non-KCL	76.7%	3.8%	1. banana 2. sweet potatoes	1. maize 2. beans 3. poor returns to trade*
Zone B - Moderate intensity	KCL	70.6%	9.4%	1. coffee 2. vegetables	1. sweet potatoes 2. beans 3. poor returns to trade*
	Non-KCL	37.4%	30.5%	1. coffee 2. vegetables 3. livestock	1. old age national pension 2. beans 3. poor returns to trade*
Zone C - low intensity	KCL	31.2%	29.0%	1. banana 2. coffee 3. commodity trade	1. other business or retail 2. beans 3. maize

\* poor returns to trade refers to low income from trade due to a number of factors like: fluctuation in prices, poor access to markets, low prices due to role of middlemen

Green colour means relatively high / good scores, with more than 10% difference

Yellow colour means moderate scores

Orange colour means relatively low / poor scores, with more than 10% difference

### 3.3 Root cause 2: Community level attitudes and practices

#### 3.3.1 The effectiveness of community child labor committees (CLCs)

In all zones child labor committees (CLCs) and back-to-back village savings and loans associations (VSLAs) were established. The main activities were trainings and exchange visits. CLCs and VSLAs in the high intensity zone have the highest density (one per village) and were established from 2014 onwards, while in the sub-high intensity zone density is lower and were established in 2017, and in the moderate intensity zone there is one CLC + VSLA per parish and they were established from 2017 onwards.

**Child labor committees are effective in carrying out a range of activities related to monitoring child labor and remediation activities for children in child labor and their families. There are indications that the effectiveness of some activities declines after some years.** Table 6 provides an overview of the activities being carried out by child labor committees (CLCs), based upon surveys with the committee members. According to the FGDs with CLC members the following activities are critical: mapping households on child labor, sensitization of parents on child labor, counselling both parents and children at risk of child labor, conducting follow up of former school dropouts at both community levels and visiting schools. Although none of the CLCs reports to have lobbied for improved quality of education in schools, they also visit schools to hand over school materials to the vulnerable children and check whether they are attending school. According to the survey (Table 6), some activities show a decline between baseline and endline, mainly in the high intensity zone. Most likely this is related to the decline of the incidence of child labor or at risk of child labor in this zone and less need to be very active.

Table 6: Activities carried out by CLCs (based upon surveys with CLC members)

Did the CL committee undertake the following activities during the last year?	% positive responses*		Are there any differences between zones?
	Baseline	endline	
Community mobilization for child labor issues	90%	84%	Yes, endline low zone A1
Sensitizing community members on child labor issues	94%	94%	No
Mapping households with child labor issues	52%	56%	Yes, low mainly zone A1
Identifying child labor cases beyond HH, at market	94%	69%	No
Providing guidance to children and parents at risk of CL	94%	94%	No
Attending community meetings	81%	69%	No
Organising community meetings to lobby and advocate on child labor issues in the community	42%	22%	Yes, baseline high in Zone A1, but low at endline
Sharing best practices, lessons learnt etc.	71%	66%	No
Making follow-ups with child laborers for remediation	87%	84%	Yes, endline low zone A1
Visiting and monitoring schools	84%	78%	No
Working with community leaders on CL remediation	97%	84%	no
Coordinating with stop child labor partner staffs	97%	97%	No
Reporting on child labor to the police or local council	68%	66%	Yes, endline low zone A1
Contributing to the educational fund in their VSLA	84%	91%	Yes, increase in zone B
Attending VSLA meetings and other VSLA activities	90%	97%	Yes, increase in zone B
Monitoring VSLA groups and activities	90%	100%	Yes, increase in zone B
Supporting CL to enter school by using educational fund	55%	59%	Yes, increase in zone B
Linking children in child labor who are homeless to social protection, e.g. by other families	45%	34%	No

\*) Positive responses means the responses were: 'yes, often' or 'yes, sometimes'  
Green colour means relatively high / good scores, with more than 10% difference  
Yellow colour means moderate scores

Orange colour means relatively low / poor scores, with more than 10% difference

**In all zones, but especially in the moderate intensity zone B, and occasionally in zone C, it was reported that, in coordination with local councils and the police, the CLC also arrested children.** This can be considered as an undesirable side-effect of implementing the CLFZ approach, because criminalization of child labor does not lead to a sustainable change of norms and practices. Arresting children would occur especially on market days. Most of these children would be skipping school to assist their parents to transport and sell goods in the market either together with their parents or other adults. Parents can get fined (for about US\$ 3 according to the FGDs).

**The child labor committees by its close contacts with schools and the sub-county play a central critical role in coordinating activities to monitor, remediate child labor and reduce child labor risk at village level.** While the CLCs in the high and sub-high intensity zones report to have effective collaboration with the SC steering committee (sub-county level), the CLCs in the moderate intensity Zone B report to have a weak working relation with their sub-counties. In zone B sub-counties they report slow or there is no response from the sub-county when they ask for support or did not respond to their request for help. The linkage of the CLCs to the schools is crucial to reduce the children being sent away by the school administration for lack of fees payment. This is the case in the high intensity zone but is less developed in the other zones.

**Emerging from the interviews and FGDs, success factors that play a role in determining the effectiveness of the community-based child labor committees are as follows:**

- **Careful selection of CLC members.** CLC members should represent persons that have some level of authority in the village. To identify and motivate these persons takes time. Of the 31 CLCs surveyed, the composition was approximately 70% male and 30% female respectively.
- **Having internal by laws.** Of all CLCs surveyed, 55% have internal bylaws that guide and regulate their activities and operations. Of those that have by laws 94% reported to function well, which is slightly more than the average level of satisfaction (84-90% at baseline and endline).
- **Receiving support from the community and the local council.** The survey showed that the majority (84% at base- and endline) of CLCs received support from the community in carrying out its activities, but this did not include financial support. The number of CLCs that received support from the local council when conducting their activities increased from 58% (baseline) to 78% (endline), and is higher in the high and sub-high intensity zones as compared to the moderate intensity zone.
- **Members receiving material and financial support.** Many CLC members have their own work on the farm and at households (especially women) and yet they have to allocate time to the work of the CLC. This has led to dropout of some members. CLCs mentioned as key motivators the support from the subcounty or the NGO Ceford. They are also motivated by individually receiving and wearing T-shirts for CLC, because then they are well recognized and are invited to speak at social gatherings. They also like the financial support that was given to them at the start.
- **The walking distances to cover the villages falling within the CLC mandate.** While in the intensive zone the CLCs were one per village, in the semi-intensive zone the density was lower, and in the moderate zone the density was just one per parish (including several villages). CLCs in the moderate zone complained walking long distances, because they have to cover more than 10 villages.

### 3.3.2 The effectiveness of VSLAs

**The VSLAs are first of all effective by enabling members to start income generating activities.** VSLAs are established alongside the CLCs, thus with the same density. VSLA members see as their main role to support each other with loans and financing for their IGAs. At baseline most CLC members (81%) benefitted from the linkages to VSLAs by setting up income generating activities mainly agricultural based but this proportion had declined at the endline (38%). Of the 32 VSLA groups surveyed the active members are 264 males (40%) and 399 females (60%). They are engaged in:

- Income generating activities to raise finance (92%)
- Sensitizing community members on child labor issues (85%)
- Engagement in child labor monitoring and sensitization (78%).

**The VSLAs are effective in reducing child labor and child labor risk by making funds available from the social and the education fund. Since the number of children who have been supported by the education fund has greatly increased, from 82 to 684 per quarter, the available funds per child has declined.** The VSLAs have a social fund which is used to support families in need of funding, and which can also be used by VSLA member families to pay school fees for their children to go to school. In addition, VSLA members contribute funds specifically for education fund savings which is used to buy school materials for vulnerable children in their communities (once every month, an average fee of 500 UGX = EUR 0.11). At the endline survey, it was noted that during the past year 92% of VSLAs have lend money to families in the community for purpose of children going to school. The CLCs in collaboration with the VSLAs decide on who can benefit from the education fund. In addition, in the high intensity zone A1 the VSLA had a collaboration with schools not to send children home for school related expenses, but supported them to pay off the school dues. Table 6 gives an overview of the funds used per month and children reached, showing that:

- As a reference, total VSLA savings per quarter have increased between base- and endline to an average of EUR 295 per VSLA, more than doubling from the baseline value.
- Both the social fund and the education fund given out per VSLA per quarter have increased between baseline and endline. In 2020 the education fund available per VSLA is about 10% of overall savings.
- The number of children who benefited from the education fund has increased enormously, from 72 at baseline to 684 at endline, per quarter (3 months).<sup>4</sup>
- The average available funding from the education fund per child that benefitted reaches EUR 5.30 at baseline and EUR 0.85 at endline, per quarter. It seems that the education fund has become popular, but as a result funds available per child are reduced to the costs of books and stationery. Note that the social fund can also be used by VSLA members for school fees of their children.

*Table 7: Performance of 19 VSLAs established by CEFORD, per quarter: savings, social fund given out, education fund given out and boys and girls who benefitted from the education fund (in Euro)*

	Savings		Social fund given out		Education fund given out		Boys supported to go to school		Girls supported to go to school	
	All VSLAs	Average / VSLA	All VSLAs	Average / VSLA	All VSLAs	Average / VSLA	All VSLAs	Average / VSLA	All VSLAs	Average / VSLA
Baseline (2018)	2,500	130	840	44	430	22	32	1.3	50	2.0
Endline (2020)	5,760	290	1340	70	565	30	313	16.4	374	19.7

**Additional VSLAs established by KCL as part of their gender program have greatly contributed to funds available for children to go to school.** In addition, the KCL gender program that was started at the end of 2017 in zone A1 + A2 and in zone B also included the establishment of VSLAs, for KCL members only. Each VSLA had a Gender Change Agent that was responsible for the VSLA and for rolling out a series of group and individual HH gender tools, based on the GALS (Gender Action and Learning System) approach. Table 7 shows the savings within these VSLA groups, which are comparable to the savings in the VSLAs established by CEFORD (Table 8). These VSLAs are mainly used to finance investments in coffee production. But in addition, loans are used for school fees. In 2019, looking at individual VSLAs, from these savings 15-30% was used for school fees, which is higher than the average of 10% within the VSLAs established by CEFORD.

<sup>4</sup> These data were verified as they seem very high indeed

Table 8: Performance of VSLAs established by KCL, **per quarter for 2020**: savings and coffee loans taken out (in EURO)

Region	# VSLAs	# KCL HHs in VSLAs	Total savings	Average saving by VLSA
Zone A	18	510	3,910	218
Zone B	11	316	2,210	200

**The proportion of VSLAs that are satisfied with their contribution in reducing child labor and child labor risk has increased from 53% to 84% from base- to endline. Success factors that play a role in determining the effectiveness of the VSLAs to support children to go to school are as follows:**

- The collaboration with CLCs and sub-counties to identify children in child labor and child labor risk and in need of support, and with schools and teachers to keep children at school who are at risk of child labor
- The contribution by VSLA members to the education fund.

### 3.3.3 The change of socio-cultural norms

Activities to raise awareness and change norms and attitudes on child labor were done through house-to-house mapping and follow-up activities focused on households with child labor and child labor risk, as well as the activities by CLCs. In the high and sub-high intensity zone mapping and monitoring was done for every household (KCL and non-KCL), in the moderate intensity zone this was done for KCL households only.

**The survey on norms and attitudes against child labor shows effective change among households surveyed in three types of zones: high and sub-high intensity zones among KCL and non-KCL households, and moderate intensity zone among KCL households only.** In these three zones there is not a single HH stating that they will not send their child to school if there is lack of funding. Also, the majority of these HHs states that they will make use of the VSLA if they do not have enough funds. Lastly, in these zones the majority of respondents, when seeing a case of child labor, would report this to the CLC. By contrast, in the other zones reporting to the police remains high as well. The score on norms and attitude against child labor in the moderate intensity zone among non-KCL households still lags behind. The scores on norms and attitudes against child labor are by far lowest in the low intensity zone.

**Insights from FGDs with CLCs and also those with children, suggest that only in the high intensity zone we can speak of a change in socio-cultural norms, while in the other zones change in behavior is mainly motivated from the need to comply with legislation and fear of getting fined.** In the high intensity zone people have understood the need for a change of behaviour regarding child labor, and from the discussions there is evidence of a change in underlying norms. On the other hand, in the semi-intensive and moderate intensive zones, a change in behavior to stop child labor is witnessed but the underlying norm has not changed. There is change in their level of awareness e.g. on what child labor is, and that it is not a legal or acceptable practice, but both parents and even local leaders seem not to have fully translated this awareness into social change. They seem to be complying with it only to avoid arrests or punishment of some kind, which is different from the high intensity zone.

**There are strong indications from the FGDs that women have a more positive attitude towards children's education, and their role in decision-making within households is important.** The FGDs showed that women have a more positive attitude to sending their children to school and making available funds for school fees. However, women have a limited role in decision-making on expenditures, and have no responsibilities in coffee production. The CLFZ approach does not specifically

include activities on women empowerment, even though the majority of VSLA members are women (60%). However, KCL has started in 2017 a separate project on women empowerment, in zone A and B, setting-up VSLAs and using a range of gender tools to help households develop joined visions & plans for their family and farm development. This has very likely supported the child labour program, through improving the decision-making power of women on spending revenues from coffee.

### 3.4 Root cause 3: The quality of education

Activities at schools were implemented by Unatu in zone A1 (high intensity since 2014, sub-high intensity since 2017) and included the following: selection and training of focal point teachers and child labor committees at the schools, exchange visits to Kampala and Arua schools, support to teaching aids and children from vulnerable families with school materials, child monitoring program in the schools, sensitization of parents, support to school clubs, training of senior women teachers in making reusable pads, radio programs on 3 local stations and printing T-shirts for school clubs. In addition, in the high intensity zone a children's parliament was established at several schools. In the moderate intensity zone, activities started in 2017, and were similar but less intensive. It did not include visits to Kampala and Arua schools, but instead to sub-county schools. Also it includes provision of sporting equipment.

**Improvements in school attendance have been strong in the moderate intensity zone, and most likely have also improved in the high intensity and sub-high intensity zone. However, COVID 19 pandemic has had a negative effect.** Before the program was implemented, all schools in the three zones had a high numbers of school dropouts especially in the third school term, which coincides with the coffee harvest season. Several children used to miss school for several days to either support their parents or to make some money for themselves. Since implementation of the program, some changes have been noticed – details can be found in Annex 4. School attendance data show that in the moderate intensity zone drop-out rates have declined strongly from 39% at baseline to 17% at endline in one sub-county in zone B and 27% at baseline to 15% at endline in the other sub-county in zone B. At baseline the drop-out rate in the high intensity zone and sub-high intensity zone were already low (7% and 18% respectively), but endline data are not available. The above data are averages for both boys and girls. However, drop out rates are consistently higher for girls than for boys. However, the COVID 19 pandemic has affected the enrolment of pupils, schools closed in the 7th week of term one 2020 yet schools were still registering more pupils from the village. The lock down has affected most schools as well as the local governments and has exposed children to more child labor risks at home and in the community.

**Surveys and FGDs show that teachers from the high and sub-high intensity zones are better informed and motivated to deal with cases of child labor and child labor risk in their school or class, as compared to those in schools in the moderate intensity or low intensity zones.** This was remarked by children and was found from a survey among teachers. This suggests that the training that has been given to teachers is useful and effective.

**The awareness on child labor led to more children to attend school, which also put a pressure on the limited school infrastructure. Due to lobbying for funds, together with the sub-county, the quality of school infrastructure and teaching has improved in the high intensity zone mainly.** The project did not provide direct support to school infrastructures but due to the increase in enrolment at school, there was need for more and better infrastructures. The funds at school were limited for this provision. In the high intensity zone, due to advocacy and good relations built with the district, the sub-county could allocate a 3 classroom block every year, which is not usual practice. In addition, desks were received from the District and the sub-county allocated funds to construct latrines in the schools. In the moderate intensity Zone B, there was no lobbying done, and only some schools received latrine blocks



from the sub-county, but classrooms and desks did not change. This shows the importance of good collaboration between the three parties: community, schools and the sub-county.

**A children's parliament was established in the high intensity zone, and was found effective, but found too much effort to replicate.** Children's parliaments were established in several schools in the high intensity zone. The aim was to monitor fellow children and report to teachers, who would then report and discuss with the community child labor committee, and jointly try to find a solution. Teachers, children, some parents and Ceford staff all have the opinion the approach was good and beneficial for returning children to school. Some of the schools in the sub-high intensity zone have tried the approach. Teachers from the moderate intensity zone went on a learning visit and it was one of the topics to be learnt. They were impressed with the approach but none of the schools replicated the approach in their schools. It is our impression that they found the approach to require much effort by the administration to get it started and to keep it running. On the other hand, the project did not follow up on this item, nor has a children's parliament received support like in the high intensity zone.

**According to children there are issues that could be improved in terms of the quality of education in all zones:**

- Corporal punishment seems to be the norm; 61% of the children mentioned caning. Reasons given for caning included arriving late at school, poor performance, not bring scholastic materials, not bring to school the cleaning supplies as requested by the teachers, etc.
- Lack of parental support to buy books and uniforms or pay the fees required at school. Most of the children associated higher dropout rate with lack of parental support.
- Children missing school due to request from parents to support on market days to take items to the market or babysit younger siblings.

**The average costs for UNATU to carry out the various activities at schools and with teachers, are about EUR 600 per school, for the 4-year program period.<sup>5</sup>** In addition, Ceford has been visiting schools and organizing meetings with teachers, of which the costs have been about EUR 110 per school, over the 3-4 year program period.

### **3.5 Root cause 4: Child labor policies and enforcement**

Activities with sub-counties included regular meetings and support to establish sub-county child labor steering committees. Sub-county leaders were invited to meetings. In the high and sub-high intensity zones these meetings started in 2014, in the moderate intensity zone in 2017.

**Only in the high and sub-high intensity zones a sub-county child labor steering committee was established. This committee has been effective in coordinating activities to raise awareness and remediate child labor.** The sub-county child labor steering committee was composed of the Local council chairman, Community Development officer, Subcounty chief, the chairperson of the Head teachers association, community change agents representatives, 3 security officials (GISO, Police and army representative) and secretary social services. The team meets on a quarterly basis and receives reports from the CLCs through the change agents and a report from schools. The steering committee supports CLCs, schools and the police. They have been involved in community sensitization, dialogue meetings, sensitization and training local council one executives on child labor and early marriage, road and market child labor inspections, identifying child labor cases at community level and provision of appropriate remedy. The sub-county child labor steering committee has stimulated education quality at school by providing technical support and trainings to teachers in line with handling of children in child

---

<sup>5</sup> For details on costs see Annex 5. Budgets items were not kept per activity, so these are estimates. Also, it is difficult to allocate regular staff costs to specific activities, so real costs may be higher.

labor. They also organized review meetings with key stakeholders, awarding academic trophies to best performing schools and organized a child labor free week.

**In all zones the sub-county has supported the police to effectively deal with child labor by several activities. These activities included:**

- Provision of technical support
- Provision of financial supports especially in line with provisions of fuel and transport means
- Enforcement to round up children
- Sensitization of community on child labor issues.

**The sub-county in zone A is in the process of developing a by law on education and issues of child labor.** The by law has been drafted, the first reading to the council was done with financial support from CEFORD, but the financial support is inadequate. Needed are 4 sittings of the council, costing EUR 220 each. Thus, there is a risk the process will take long to finalise or may be abandoned all together. None of the other sub-counties was in the process of developing a by law.

We were not provided insight in the contents of this by law, but we were told that it includes the following areas:

- Rights of children including access to education
- Roles and responsibilities of stakeholders especially of parents, teachers etc.
- Regulating or banning some traditional practices e.g. child marriage, participation in traditional ceremonies, discos, drinking , employing children, sending children to relatives during school days etc.
- Reactivating local government structures e.g. local councils in the villages
- Fines and punishments for not adhering to child labor regulations.

**The SC steering committee in zone A has been lobbying the District for education equipment, facilities and materials. The sub-county also hosts an annual stop child labor week.** The child labor week has been organised with both financial and non-financial support from stakeholders in education including schools and the District education office. This has been institutionalised and planned for by the sub-county every year. During this week, there is a parade by the school children through the town, there are different discussions and events through the week, this climaxes with a workshop and action planning on the last day. This has allowed the sub-county to build a stronger relationship with District leaders and other stakeholders in the sub-county, making lobbying for materials and teachers easier.

## 4. Assessment of cost-effectiveness

Estimates were made of the costs of implementing each of the different interventions. Note that the costs presented in this section are related to the implementation of the child labor programme only, and includes activities such as conducting house-to-house visits, providing financial support for schools, setting up and training Child Labor Committees (CLCs), hiring child labor liaison officers, and conducting project monitoring and evaluation. The cost figures presented here do not include general overhead or management costs for the Stop Child Labour Coalition/Hivos, Ceford, or Kyagalanyi, nor does it include their programmes on gender or good agricultural practices.

**The project costs per zone are shown in Table 9, which indicates that, as expected, costs increase substantially as the intensity of the approach increases.**

*Table 9. Costs of activities per zone, during the 2017-2020 project period (in Euros). These values represent only the costs of activities related to child labor and education, not costs related to certification or training on good agricultural practices.*

	Child Labor Free Zone approach		Moderate intensity approach Zone B	Low intensity approach Zone C
	Zone A1	Zone A2		
<b>Total intervention cost*</b>	EUR 34,460	EUR 32,840	EUR 28,620	EUR 700
<b>Cost per household</b>	EUR 19	EUR 8	EUR 6	EUR 2

\* Excluding the activities noted earlier in this section.

The total costs between 2017 and 2020 for activities specifically related to schools, CLCs and VSLAs are as follows:

- School-based activities: EUR 700/school
- Establishing and supporting Child Labor Committees: EUR 1,200/CLC
- Establishing and supporting Village Savings and Loan Associations: EUR 600/VSLA

The total cost paid by Kyagalanyi for the activities that they supported – which were primarily aimed at their members - was EUR 13,320.

**Costs are relatively high for establishment of the Child Labor Committees (CLCs), and decline strongly once CLCs have been well established.** The costs for the establishment of one CLC are about EUR 220, while support, training and exchange visits have a cost of about EUR 880 per CLC, within the 3-4 year program period. However, once CLCs are established, refresher training is considerably less expensive, at around EUR 100 per CLC annually.

**Costs will be higher if communities are located further apart from one another, due to travel costs and time.** This is one reason why fewer CLCs were established in Zone A2 than in Zone A1. Remoteness and scattered communities also influence the distance that children must travel to attend school. Generally, the CLFZ approach will be more costly to apply if communities or households are widely scattered.

**Having a project coordinator on staff who links the various project partners and monitors progress is an essential financial investment.** This is because the ability of the diverse project partners to commit to a single, consistent message – that all children must be in school – is a fundamental element of changing community norms about child labor.

## 5. Analysis and evaluation questions

### 5.1 Comparing cost-effectiveness per zone

#### 5.1.1 Overview

The following table 10 provides an overview of the cost-effectiveness per intervention zone. The following 3 sections provide details in a narrative for each zone.

*Table 10: Overview of main activities and results per intervention zone*

Zone, intensity, target, start date	Key interventions / level of effort	Main outcomes	Enabling factors	Costs and pitfalls
<b>Zone A1</b> <b>High intensity - CLFZ approach</b>  <b>All households</b>  <b>Start in 2014</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All HHs monitored and supported by CLLOs and CAs</li> <li>VSLA and CLC in every village</li> <li>All schools supported, incl. children parliament</li> <li>Sub-county engaged</li> <li>Coffee agronomy trainings and basic awareness raising on CL for KCL HHs</li> <li>RA &amp; coffee premiums</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Child labor or CL risk now 2-5% for all HHs</li> <li>Drop out rates less than 10% (2018)</li> <li>Socio-cultural norm on child labour changed</li> <li>Improved school infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Long period of interventions (6 years, from 2014)</li> <li>Local authorities committed</li> <li>VSLAs appreciated and functional</li> <li>By-laws being developed</li> <li>Increased coffee revenues KCL HHs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High intervention costs (EUR 19 per HH)</li> <li>Long duration</li> <li>Sustainability of CLCs (limited risk)</li> <li>Low level of VSLA education funds</li> <li>Remaining 'problem families' with CL</li> </ul>
<b>Zone A2</b> <b>Sub-high intensity - CLFZ approach</b>  <b>All households</b>  <b>Start in 2017</b>	<p>As above, but differences are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VSLA and CLC <b>not</b> in every village</li> <li><b>Most</b> schools supported, <b>no</b> children parliament</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Child labor or CL risk now 3-5% for all HHs</li> <li>Drop out rates 16-19% (2018)</li> <li>Socio-cultural norm on child labour improved</li> <li>Improved school infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>As above, but differences are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 years period of interventions (start 2017)</li> <li>Spill-over from zone A1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate intervention costs (EUR 8 per HH)</li> <li>Sustainability of CLCs (moderate risk)</li> <li>More remote than zone A1 - less market access</li> <li>Low level of VSLA education funds</li> </ul>
<b>Zone B</b> <b>Moderate intensity – area-based approach</b>  <b>KCL households</b>  <b>Start in 2017</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only KCL HHs monitored and supported by CLLOs</li> <li>VSLA and CLC per parish (multiple villages)</li> <li>Most schools supported, no children parliament</li> <li>Sub-counties not engaged</li> <li>Coffee agronomy trainings and basic awareness raising on CL for KCL HHs</li> <li>RA &amp; coffee premiums</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Child labor or CL risk now 9% for KCL and 18% non-KCL</li> <li>Drop out rates 15-17% (2020)</li> <li>Socio-cultural norm not Improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 years period of interventions (starting in 2017)</li> <li>Motivated by exchange visits to zone A</li> <li>VSLAs appreciated and functional</li> <li>Increased coffee revenues KCL HHs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate intervention costs (EUR 6 per HH)</li> <li>Sustainability of CLCs (serious risk)</li> <li>Local authorities not committed</li> <li>Awareness of child labour KCL HHs only</li> <li>Criminalization of child labor</li> </ul>
<b>Zone C</b> <b>Low intensity – RA basic approach</b>  <b>KCL households</b>  <b>Start in 2017</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No HHs monitored</li> <li>No VSLA and CLC</li> <li>No schools supported</li> <li>Coffee agronomy trainings and basic awareness raising on CL for KCL HHs</li> <li>RA &amp; coffee premiums</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Child labor or CL risk now 44% for KCL HHs</li> <li>Socio-cultural norm not Improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inspiration and spill over from other zones</li> <li>Increased coffee revenue KCL HHs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low intervention costs (EUR 2 per HH)</li> <li>Criminalization of child labor</li> <li>Local authorities not committed</li> <li>Lack of CL awareness</li> </ul>

### 5.1.2 High and sub-high intensity - VSLA approach – zone A

**Effectiveness is high in the high and sub-high intensity zones, but only in the high intensity zone the results are sustainable. Most likely this is primarily because the activities have been continued over a long period.** In the high and sub-high intensity zones child labor and child risk has dropped to low levels (2.4-5.5%), and there are no more children doing dangerous work or children working elsewhere. At schools, drop-out rates in 2018 had already declined to levels lower than 10% in the high intensity zone, due to the fact that CLFZ activities had started in 2014, while in the sub-high intensity zone where activities started in 2017 drop-out rates were still 17-19% in 2018 (for boys and girls respectively). There are no recent data on drop out rates for this zone, but these could be expected to have further declined (i.e. before the COVID 19 pandemic). The behaviour with respect to child labor has changed, but only in the high intensity zone the change in practices is based on a change of socio-cultural norms. In the sub-high intensity zone there is no change in attitude, but change of behaviour is largely based on compliance and fear, which is not sustainable.

**It seems to be very difficult to fully eradicate child labor, even with the high intensity CLFZ approach.** The remaining cases of child labor and child labor risk in this zone seem to be households with particular conditions, mainly absent parents. These families now receive particular attention by KCL and the sub-county. It is doubtful whether with more attention or longer time span a further reduction can be achieved.

**In this zone some of the children, who were former dropouts, reported that there has not been much change in corporal punishment but there has been increased parental support and reduction in number of children who miss school.** In this zone 93% of the children report to have good materials like books, chalks, rulers and textbooks in schools. Parents confirm that less children are loitering in the villages during school days or selling products in markets. There are improved relations between the children and teachers, while teachers mention increased support from parents towards the education of their children. Several teachers carried out follow up of the children who missed school or returned to school with the help of the CLCs. Several were given remedial teaching, which reduced dropout.

**High effectiveness in the high intensity zone is due to the strong collaboration between agents of the 4 root causes: sub-county steering committee, CLCs and VSLAs, schools and teachers, KCL liaison officers. Also, the long duration of project activities in this zone enabled this collaboration to materialise.** The collaboration is institutionalised by teachers having a representative in the sub-county steering committee (chairperson of head teachers), as well as the CLCs having a representative (community facilitators). This allows the sub-county steering committee to act on the reports or challenges expressed by the CLC or schools reported through their representatives. Sub-county steering committee members also participate in sensitization of the general public and coffee buyers on stopping child labor.

**It is likely that in this zone the results will sustain, because there have been changes in socio-cultural norms, the sub-county steering committee has been firmly established, and a new by law is being developed.** In spite of that, low intensity support is still required (see below).

#### Costs

Given the highest intensity of activities, this zone has highest costs. This is due to the longer time span during which the activities were implemented, the house-to-house visits for all (KCL and non-KCL) households, and the higher density of CLCs and VSLAs (see Table 2). Costs are highest in the high intensity zone as compared to the sub-high intensity zone due to the higher density of CLCs and VSLAs, the former having one CLC per village. A rough estimate would be that the costs for the high intensity

approach are about EUR 19 per HH, and much lower for Zone A2 (EUR 8 per HH). Costs of the specific activities are indicated in the previous section.

### 5.1.3 Moderate intensity - area-based approach – zone B

**Effectiveness is less than in the high intensity zones, and the results are not yet sustainable.** In the moderate intensity zone child labor and child risk has dropped strongly for KCL households (from 40% to 9.3%), but remains higher for the non-KCL households (from 58% to 17.9%). For the KCL households there are no more children doing dangerous work or children working elsewhere, while for non-KCL households there are a few. At school, drop-out rates have declined considerably between 2018 and 2020, from 39% at baseline to 17% at endline in one sub-county in zone B and 27% at baseline to 15% at endline in the other sub-county in zone B (with higher drop out rates for girls than for boys). The behaviour to child labor has changed among KCL members only, but is not based on a change of socio-cultural norms, rather than being based on compliance and fear, which is not sustainable.

**In this zone, both teachers and children confirm that the changes have not yet been effective.**

Teachers who had put an effort to follow up children faced a challenge because there were less CLCs to support them and VSLAs to provide support funding for children to go to school. Thus, the retention of the children brought back to school was poor. In one primary school a teacher remarked that, 'out of the 10 children brought back to school, only 4 remain but 6 dropped out again...'. In this zone the children confirm that there are more sports, games and clubs like music. But there has not been much change in terms of parental support, skipping classes, or corporal punishments. In this zone, 50% of the children complained of overcrowded classrooms and a shortage of desks.

**In this zone the collaboration between agents on the 4 root causes pillars is still weak or missing: a sub-county steering committee is not yet established, CLCs and VSLAs are widely spread, schools and teachers still face several challenges.** There is no sub-county steering committee but sub-county staff and other stakeholders were periodically invited to participate in quarterly review meetings. They felt they needed to be more involved in the implementation of activities to stop child labor. There is no person responsible and no budgets allocated for child labor activities. Also, the schools don't link with the VSLAs but they send away fees defaulters from school and don't effectively follow up children. The sub-county does not back up the CLC hence and tend to treat households with child labour as perpetrators. In brief, in this zone the socio-cultural norm on child labor has not yet changed. The pull factors for former child workers and more children out of school still dominate. These range from businesses employing children, entertainment businesses admitting children, limited awareness in the population, etc.

**It is likely that in this zone the results will not sustain, because there have not yet been changes in socio-cultural norms, the sub-counties are not sufficiently committed, and by laws are not being developed.** This leads to the conclusion that the results are not yet sustainable. In short, activities should be continued to achieve transitional change.

#### Costs

Given the moderate intensity of activities, this zone has moderate costs. This is due to the fact that only KCL households are monitored and the lower density of CLCs and VSLAs (see Table 2). A rough estimate would be that the costs for the moderate intensity approach are about EUR 6 per household, for a period of 3-4 years, with reducing intensity once the structures have been established. Costs of the specific activities are indicated in the previous section.

#### 5.1.4 Low intensity – RA basic activities – zone C

**In the low intensity zone child labor or child labor risk has slightly dropped but remains very high (43.8%). There are still children doing dangerous work or children working elsewhere. School drop-out rates are not known. There are a few promising developments, some of which may be by inspiration from sub-counties in the other zones.** Promising activities are the following:

- The sub-counties were able to allocate budgets to support schools in terms of infrastructure development, but only one school per year, there was no awareness raising on child labor
- There are interventions in education by some NGOs like AFARD & CEFORD in Atyak sub-county, and UNICEF in Jangokoro but their intervention is to support education and not reduce child labor and child labor risk.
- Teachers in Nyapea sub-county mobilize children for enrolment in the first term every year.
- There are several VSLA groups in the sub-counties that learnt by copying from other groups and are not supported by external agencies. They have good savings schemes and collect both money for general savings and also social funds but no education component.

**In this zone, there has been a significant shift from children being fully out of school to being partly out of school, which is positive (see Figure 4). The quality of education has not shown positive change over the last three years, parental support is weak, children are still out of school.** Formal drop-out rates are not recorded. The dropout rate for girls in Jangokoro Subcounty was reported to be alarming: in one school Mazi Primary school, there was only 1 girl in Primary seven after 8 years, she was eventually transferred to another school (Owenju Primary school) which had at least some girls. In this zone, the classes are overcrowded and shortage of latrines and desks were reported.

**There is an undesirable tendency towards criminalization of child labor, which may hamper change based on understanding and socio-cultural norms.** Particularly in this zone there are some fragmented initiatives that could help in the eradication of child labor, but no multiple levels collaboration and coordination. But the initiatives from the sub-county are based on law enforcement, and not to inform, empower or mobilize community members to take action against child labor. For example, once in a term the sub-county of Jangokoro conducts arrests of children who are not in school and parents are fined. This is usually discussed and agreed in the council meetings and budgets for it allocated. But this was not happening in Atyak and Nyapea.

## 5.2 Scaling and sustainability of the approach

**There are strong indications of copying or learning from best practices, in every zone, including between community members, between sub-counties and between schools.** In the FGDs it was often reported that people visit the CLCs, VSLAs, sub-counties or schools to learn, especially in the high intensity zone, but also in the moderate intensity zone. Following are some details:

- CLC members had organised exchange visits but also visited each other on personal initiative
- There are several VSLA groups that emerged on their own in all 3 zones by copying from existing VSLA groups, mainly for the purpose of supporting income generating activities. Not all of them have an education fund to support vulnerable children.
- Practices copied by other groups from the CLCs and VSLAs is mainly the farming component (coffee production and kitchen gardening). Similarly, best practices in coffee production are also reported as being copied in all zones by farmers who are not members of KCL.
- There was learning and copying of best practices between schools. Schools from the moderate intensity zone were taken to the high intensity zone for a learning visit but also within the zones there was a lot of learning. Some of the key lessons learned by the schools included: using the child register to map and track dropouts, having a school feeding program through establishing school gardens, not

chasing children out of school for fees but following up through the parents etc. It is not known to what extent the learnings were implemented.

- The sub-county steering committee in zone A received groups both from within and outside the region to learn from them. No follow-up was done to check whether lessons were implemented.

**Especially CLCs and VSLAs mention that, to sustain their activities, they need to be motivated and supported in terms of funding, training and exchange visits mainly. Especially learning trips can be an important incentive.** The following requests emerged from the FGDs mainly (see also following Box 2):

- Most of the CLCs (61% at base- and endline) said it is a challenge to execute their activities effectively and on a large scale. This is especially the case for CLCs that have large coverage.
- Especially needed are resources to support needy children in secondary schools and undertaking income generating activities to improve their livelihood.
- CLCs in all zones reported that they were trained on how to establish the VSLA and were taken on learning trips while CEFORD staff continued to visit them periodically. All the CLCs requested for follow up support from CEFORD staff, to energize the members as they continue on their own.
- The SC steering committee in zone A recommended there is need to partner with CEFORD or KCL or be supported to develop proposals to fundraise for continued work of the committee, more specifically for expanding the scholarship for vulnerable children in the sub-county and support to infrastructures.
- To sustain the efforts by the teachers, there was a request for follow-up by Unatu staff to check what is happening at schools and backstop them. The general feeling was that schools did not get much follow up support from UNATU coordinators. Teachers stated that some of the activities are now mainstreamed in school budgets especially things like purchase of play materials, remedial teachings, clubs, making sanitary pads. Childrens' parliament and monitoring was not replicated, in spite of the fact that teachers learned about the approach and were positive. Probably the approach was considered too costly and/or time consuming, but also no specific follow-up support was provided.

#### **Box 2: Detailed follow-up activities proposed in the surveys and FGDs**

##### **What would the CLC need in order to be able to carry on its activities in the coming years?**

Highest priorities in terms of expected support are the following:

- Having exchange visits with other CLCs
- Diversify and support income generating activities (IGAs) to lay a foundation for sustainability
- Provision of value addition tools and equipment to enhance productivity and income from IGAs
- Training and provision of stationaries
- Provision of identification materials like T-shirts, identity cards etc.

##### **What would the VSLA group need in order to be able to carry on its activities in the coming years?**

Highest priorities in terms of expected support are the following:

- Financial support to increase the education fund
- More training and capacity building in financial literacy and management
- Support and training for diversification in income generating activities
- Refresher trainings in business development and entrepreneurship
- Exchange visit to successful VSLA groups
- Linking the groups to government and financial institutions

##### **Interesting suggestions by CLC and VSLAs were also:**

- Linking them to financial institutes and other development partners locally and outside for more funding to support their activities and build their sustainability.
- Linking the children withdrawn from child labor that exceled in primary to join secondary with sponsors especially those that have school fees issues.



## 5.3 Lessons from the partnership

Discussions were held with implementing partners CEFORD (the project manager, M&E and some change agents), with KCL (the manager, the gender officer and the liaison officers), and with UNATU (the Coordinator). In addition, some lessons emerged from the consultants responsible for monitoring and evaluation activities, these are specifically referred to if mentioned below.

**The partnership was well chosen, including partners with different expertise, in terms of community mobilization, business and educational support.** This was productive and blended to produce value for the project. The partnership brought together a mix of short term/ immediate needs and longer term solutions to child labor e.g. returning children to school and giving them school materials versus supporting the parents economically to grow more coffee and earn better income in the long run.

All project partners shared one key message: all children (of school going age) have to be in school. Having one joint message / vision, that is communicated by all partner staff to all stakeholders, strengthens the roll-out of the project, buy-in from stakeholders and socio-cultural norm change. Everyone in the community was receiving the same message from the CEFORD staff, KCL staff, local government officials, teachers and community agents.

**On the other hand, the main internal challenge that emerged in the partnership was that of coordination and harmonizing various interests and orientation of the partners.** This was mainly a challenge at the beginning. KCL reported that sometimes their dominant activities like coffee buying had to take priority and this created some misunderstanding among partners. At the start of the project, local government – incorrectly - perceived KCL to be one of the causes of child labor in the community, instead of being a partner that offered to help solve a deeply rooted social problem. At the beginning there were also some unrealistic expectations from the various partners e.g. KCL reported that all partners expected them to be having and investing a lot of money into the project yet they had a limited budget. Some partners and communities could not understand why they needed donor money to implement the project.

**As a result, an important lesson is to employ a joint project coordinator that links up with all partners, keeps things moving and is responsible for M&E and reporting.**

**Child labor is a very sensitive topic in the coffee sector. As there is no easy, quick solution to child labor, it is rarely openly discussed. KCL therefore requested to change the project's name and main slogan from 'Stop child labor' to 'Promote child education'.** Child labor is often a deeply rooted social problem that cannot be solved by a RA certificate holder alone. As a result, it is either 'hidden' and/or farms that are affected by child labor are removed from the certified value chain. This does not solve the problem and, worse, pushes affected farms further into poverty as they no longer have access to services offered by the certificate holder (e.g. trader, cooperative). This project shows that in partnership with other stakeholders good progress can be made in significantly reducing child labor incidences. However, the resources needed to implement the most effective, intensive CLFZ approach throughout the whole operational area of certified value chains are very high and the most problematic cases are not solved. This calls for partnerships between buyers of RA certified commodities and certificate holders (traders, cooperatives) working with smallholder farmers to jointly solve child labour in certified value chains.

**It is important for all stakeholders (including certification bodies, RA staff and RA buyers) to acknowledge that solving child labor in certified value chains is a long-term commitment.** The new RA standard has moved away from a pass/fail approach to child labor to a Assess & Address approach. The new approach supports the implementation of projects to reduce the incidences of child labor in certified value chains.

**One of the main lessons learnt by the partners was on scaling up the CLFZ approach using a cascade approach.** The cascade approach is interpreted as starting out with a well established CLFZ model in a core zone and expecting others to apply the same model by sharing knowledge and copying it to their own zones. The cascade approach was not designed from the onset but appeared to work out in the high intensity zone. The sensitization and working with a few core villages in the beginning generates deep local capacity and can form the basis for knowledge sharing and adoption by others.

**Another lesson is to develop a good monitoring system at the beginning of the project.** This lesson was also mentioned by the M&E consultant. Key lesson was to ensure that all project partners are using the same monitoring forms for the same activities that are jointly implemented by multiple partners (i.e. household surveys to map child labour, VSLA monitoring) and that these data are entered into one joint database that is verified by all parties. Monitoring could include how the approach is being copied by others. Monitoring should be a dedicated task with sufficient time and resources made available for one of the partners. The M&E activities and resources needed for this program were underestimated, which was especially due to its particular set-up and need to demonstrate cost-effectiveness. In spite of this, capacity building on M&E has been successful, showing a steep learning curve.

**Part of the monitoring would also be to properly track the activities being implemented.** The consultants found that the activities actually being implemented were difficult to track and not well documented. For instance, it is still not fully clear what material and financial support CLCs were given at the onset, as an incentive to get started, and what incentives were provided later on.

**The consultants found that apart from the surveys, the qualitative assessment of the endline situation by a senior local expert has had a large additional value.** This shows the value of using a mixed methods evaluation approach (quantitative and qualitative methods).


## 6. Evaluation of the CLFZ approach

From this evaluation several insights emerged on the strengths and weaknesses of the CLFZ approach. These are summarized in this chapter.

### 6.1 Addressing the root casus of child labor

The following scheme summarizes the changes for each of the 4 root causes when implementing the CLFZ approach.

Figure 6: Endline situation with realized activities and impacts per root cause of child labor in West Nile



#### Root cause 1: Poverty

The combination of increased incomes from the main value chain (coffee), due to training to increase coffee productivity, has much contributed to increased incomes. In addition, increased incomes could be from promoting income generating activities and supporting this through VSLAs.

- Income changes during the last 3 years have been mainly positive for KCL households in the high and sub-high intensity zones and for KCL households in the moderate intensity zone. Improved incomes for KCL farmers are primarily due to coffee sales. Disregarding the change in coffee prices, the increase in revenues from coffee could be 35-65%. The expected increase in incomes from coffee due to improved practices promoted by KCL can be related to (i) yield increase and (ii) RA & quality premiums.
- For non-KCL farmers income increase mainly results from other crops, like vegetables. This could be due to the IGAs promoted by the VSLAs, with funds available and trainings provided.
- Non-KCL members in the moderate intensity zone and KCL members in the low intensity zone have almost equal number of farmers with income increase as income decline, so on average the income situation has not improved.

#### Root cause 2: Socio-cultural norms at community level

Changing socio-cultural norms on child labor requires a high intensity approach. By contrast, reducing child labor by criminalizing may seem effective on the short term but is not sustainable.

- In the high and sub-high intensity zone, already at baseline households had a good understanding and show change of behaviour as regards child labor, while at endline this was also apparent in the moderate intensity zone for KCL members, but not for non-KCL members or KCL farmers in the low intensity zone.
- However, qualitative findings show that achieving change in socio-cultural norms is more complex, and seems to have taken place only in the high intensity zone. Three factors have contributed to this difference: the stronger role of the sub-county steering committee in the high intensity zone, the longer implementation period of the CLFZ approach, and the higher density of CLCs.
- There are strong indications that women have a more positive attitude towards children's education than men, and their role in decision-making within households is important. The relation between women's role and child labor was not specifically studied.
- In the other zones there is change of behaviour but this seems mainly based upon compliance and fear to get punished.
- The surveys among CLCs and VSLAs show few differences between their functioning in different zones. However, the qualitative assessment shows that the greater density of these structures causes these to be more effective in the high intensity zone. In addition, an important factor is the good collaboration with the sub-county in the high intensity zone.

### ***Root cause 3: Quality of schools / education***

**Significant improvements in the quality of education can be achieved by the combination of training teachers, provision of new materials, and improved infrastructure through external funds, which could be stimulated through lobbying by the sub-county.**

- Drop-out rates have declined strongly as a result of the support given to schools and the training of teachers. In addition, only in the high intensity zone children's parliaments were established at schools, which was found to be effective to decrease drop-out rates.
- Teachers have become more aware of child labor due to various forms of support that were provided, especially in the high intensity zone because here support has been longer and was provided by both UNATU and CEFORD, whereas in the moderate intensity zone support was only given by Unatu and was given recently.
- The decline of drop-out rates and the resulting increased number of children attending school made more visible the lack of infrastructure (small classrooms, poor sanitation facilities) and the lack of budget for such investments. In the high intensity zone schools have received support in terms of new buildings, desks and better teachers, due to lobby work done by the sub-county in zone A. In contrast, in the moderate intensity zone, where the sub-county did provide less support, the quality of the schools has not changed much.
- In all zones children, who were former dropouts, reported no changes in corporal punishment, but increased parental support.

### ***Root cause 4: government policies and regulations***

**The engagement of the sub-county and the development of a sub-county child labor steering committee is of critical importance for collaboration and coordination of child labor activities, and for lobbying for more school funds.**

- A subcounty steering committee was formed in zone A but not so in zone B. The latter could be due to a combination of less intensive engagement, and less time during which the activities were implemented.
- The process of making a by law on child labor started in zone A sub-county but got stuck, due to the fact that bringing the council together is expensive and the by law reading is a long process that requires a special council sitting three to four times.
- The steering committee may sustain due to their commitment. If they are to be supported further, building their capacity on how to fundraise for projects in education could move the sub-county a step further.

## 6.2 Strengths of the CLFZ approach

**1. The main strength of the CLFZ approach is the combined efforts at different levels: value chains to raise incomes, community-level socio-cultural norms, schools and improved education, and sub-county child labor measures. Multi-level collaboration and coordination is key to success.** In the high intensity zone, one gets the sense of a wider awakening to the vises of child labor. This awakening is seen across all stakeholders and it's in their words, expressions and it's slowly getting into their businesses and the need to find alternatives to employing children. This has been realized through a multi-level and coordinated approach. Examples of good collaboration and synergy are the following:

- The collaboration of the sub-county steering committee with the CLC, the steering committee organising child labor events to raise awareness and finding solutions for 'problem' families.
- The collaboration of the sub-county steering committee with schools, jointly organising lobby activities for more education budget for improved school infrastructure and better teachers.
- The collaboration between schoolteachers and CLCs and VSLAs to identify children not going to school but working, providing the support and finding financial means for these children and their families, through the VSLA education fund and other means.
- The collaboration between the KCL coffee company and the CLCs, to jointly identify and work on measures to mitigate child labor and child labor risk.
- The initiative by the sub-county steering committee to participate in awareness raising and organising an annual child labor free week, thus avoiding that child labor is criminalised
- The collaboration between the sub-county steering committee, the CLCs and KCL, to identify and support 'problem families'.

**2. A strength is the high coverage by community structures which enhances effectiveness, but which is also most costly.** The coverage of CLCs in the high intensity zone was found to be most effective, it allows for ease in sensitization and also reaches all households in the parish. However, clearly it is also most costly.

**3. A strength and key to success is to ensure subcounty ownership, which is not costly.** There was a strong sense of commitment and effectiveness from the steering committee in the high intensity zone. The difference with the moderate intensity zone was probably due to their early and consistent engagement and training for the job and internal leadership. In the high intensity zone the steering committee had clear roles, were trained and engaged well, which allowed them to own the process. As a result, the CLCs and schools enjoy full support and backing from the sub-county. The subcounty is capable of managing advocacy activities if it's well instituted as an annual event.

**4. A strength is the improved incomes from coffee and other products, which have contributed to reduce child labor and child labor risk, directly or indirectly through VSLAs.** Most KCL households experienced an increase of incomes, primarily due to improved incomes from coffee. Most likely, improved incomes have contributed to the availability of finance to directly pay for school fees, as well as reduced need to send children to work for money, or to pay for the education fund in the VSLAs.

**5. A strength is the empowerment and use of voluntary gender-sensitive local structures like CLCs and VSLAs.** The use of these structures including the change agents have been effective in reaching the households and they are voluntary. Although they required investments at the beginning in terms of trainings and exposure, their structural composition (CLCs with VSLAs) allows for a more sustainable existence and effectiveness even after the project has ended. It should be noted that the majority of VSLA members (60%) are women, which is good because women have a more positive attitude to children's education.

**6. A strength is to work with local staff.** The implementing partners trained and worked with change agents who are locals and residents in the communities they work in. This allows for sustainability of the

knowledge and processes through them. The child labor committees and sub-county structures can still continue to engage with these persons after the project has ended.

**7. A strength is the long period during which the model has been implemented, which could be at low cost at later stages.** In the high intensity zone time allowed for building of local structures, repetition of the message, networking of stakeholders and overall change in behavior and attitude among stakeholders. This has certainly produced better results. While initial costs are relatively high, follow-up activities and refresher trainings do not need to be costly.

### **6.3 Weaknesses and remaining challenges of the CLFZ approach**

**1. In the moderate intensity zone, the lack of support by the sub-county stakeholders was mentioned as one of the main barriers to a higher level of success in the zone.** This was both from the technical and the political officials in the sub-county. This could be partly due to factors beyond the control of the project, such as poor leadership or replacement of officials.

**2. There is a remaining need for finance inputs from external sources.** While coffee revenues increase incomes in the region, additional funds are needed especially to improve the quality of education. Also, the contribution by the VSLA education funds remained limited. The increasing school attendance due to reduced child labor and child labor risk increases the demand for desks, teachers, classrooms and school supplies. On the other hand, an improvement in school environment and conditions can be an effective pull factor for the children. There have been some improvements in schools and quality of education, but generally speaking the quality remains moderate.

**3. Poor level of women empowerment / role in decision-making.** It is common that women have a more positive attitude to sending their children to school and making available funds for school fees. However, women have a limited role in decision-making on expenditures, and have no responsibilities in coffee production and decisions on using coffee incomes. The CLFZ report does not directly address this.

**4. Absence of a true child labor free environment in businesses.** There are several businesses in the sub-county like coffee trade and other value chains or food crops, but there are also entertainment businesses like discos, bars and video halls. The qualitative assessment revealed that entertainment business owners in most parishes still get away with admitting children to night discos and video halls. This is compounded by the fact that most parents sleep in separate huts with their teenage children and have less control of their night movements. These conditions and interactions in the night continue to increase teenage pregnancies and thus the cycle continues.

**5. A remaining barrier is slow change of socio-cultural norms. Traditional practices and norms like teenage pregnancies, preference for a boy child, and low value placed on education by some parents takes long to change.** There are still early marriages or teen pregnancies in many communities in all zones. Some parents still don't think education of girls is valuable since they will go and marry someone else.

**6. Mobility of the children from parents to grandchildren and relatives.** This practice was reported in all zones where several children who are mapped and being traced change their residence, others move to live with grandparents or other relatives making them difficult to be traced.

**7. COVID 19 and its impact on education in all zones.** During the survey most parents reported that the prolonged stay at home had resulted into several teenage pregnancies and most children have returned to the streets to make money especially those formerly engaged in child labor. It has been difficult to control them and no child-arrests are being made currently.

**8. There is a boundary problem in one sub-county and Town Council (TC).** Although the intervention was in the sub-county, the Town council has unclear social boundary with the sub-county. This means, even though child labor is eradicated in the sub-county, the environment in the Town council acts as a pull factor for both sub-counties.

## 6.4 Main conclusions

This study conducted on three approaches to eradicating child labor in Uganda found that, combined with certification and quality premiums, basic farmer training on child labor awareness and yield-enhancing agronomy practices can improve farmer income and solve some cases of children in child labor or at risk of child labor. In the West Nile low intensity zone (Zone C), the percentage of Kyagalanyi member households with child labor or at risk of child labor was reduced by twenty percentage points over the course of the three-year project, but a high percentage remained: 44% of households had a child in child labor or at risk of child labor (i.e. were doing one or more of the following: hazardous work, working beyond the family farm, or not attending school full time). With little change in underlying root causes of child labor, such as socio-cultural norms and poor quality schools, the incidence of child labor and risk of child labor will likely remain high.

The study also found that working together with local partners to identify child labor and develop remediation plans with Kyagalanyi member households, in tandem with community-based structures supporting local schools, has a significant positive impact. In the West Nile medium-intensity zone (Zone B), this approach resulted in a decrease in child labor or risk of child labor from 31 to 9% of Kyagalanyi member households, and from 50 to 18% in non-member households. Researchers suggest that further declines are likely possible if the approach is pursued for a longer timeframe.

Setting up a full Child Labor Free Zone (CLFZ), in which a Rainforest Alliance certificate holder intensively collaborates with local partners, community members, schools and local governments to address all four root causes of child labor and communicate a consistent, straightforward message –*all children must be in school*– created the strongest and most expansive reduction in child labor or risk of child labor, with rates in Zones A1 and A2 as low as 2 percent. This approach led to the strongest community and government buy-in and, critically, created the shift in norms that is required for long-term change.

## 6.5 Recommendations

The above findings have implications for the certified producers, donors, companies and governments who are committed to eradicating child labor from agricultural supply chains, as follows.

**Rainforest Alliance certificate holders** should know that the approach to child labor used in Zone C, which is based on the requirements of the former UTZ certification standard, appears to decrease rates of households with child labor or at risk of child labor, but does not go far enough on its own. The recognition that certification should be enhanced to address the root causes of child labor – such as poor quality education – is one of the strongest drivers of the recent changes made to the 2020 Rainforest Alliance Sustainable Agriculture Standard. These changes include the assess-and-address system, which equips certificate holders with the knowledge and practical tools to better prevent child labor, tackle root causes, and remediate actual cases, where possible, through collaboration with local government and others. In addition, the new standard includes a sustainability investment requirement, whereby supply chain partners such as coffee roasters, traders and retailers invest in their producers' sustainability plans – such as the assess-and-address system or specific remediation projects.

Rainforest Alliance partners who would like to further bolster their activities to eliminate child labor are advised that the most cost-effective approach is to implement the full CLFZ in one core zone, with a lighter touch in surrounding regions. Evidence shows that exchange visits between the core zone and surrounding regions greatly enhance the transfer of norms and practices from the core zone to neighboring regions.

To implement the CLFZ approach, the report authors have the following staffing recommendations:

- Recruit field staff from the intervention area, to enhance acceptance and facilitate long-term relationships;
- Appoint one person who is responsible for overall coordination of activities at the various program levels (household, community, sub-county);
- Appoint one person who is responsible for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of program activities.

**Donors** who would like to support efforts to eradicate child labor should plan to implement the CLFZ approach in its full capacity for three years, with lighter support in subsequent years to maintain the results. In addition, all projects located in areas with child labor – even those without an explicit child labor focus - should include a component to strengthen women’s decision-making at the household level, as this is shown to reduce child labor.

**Companies** that trade in or sell coffee, cocoa, or other agricultural products should know that, while costly for the first three years, the CLFZ approach to addressing child labor has been shown to drastically reduce rates of child labor or risk of child labor. The results of this research suggest that companies can maximize their efforts to reduce child labor by doing the following: 1) not limiting interventions to their own value chain; 2) collaborating with local NGOs, especially those that work with communities and schools; and 3) dedicating resources to a core Child Labor Free Zone that can be used as an example and a source of learning, rather than using a less-intensive approach over a broader area.

As is clear from the research presented in this summary, no single organization can tackle child labor alone; collaboration is the key to successful efforts to eliminate the root causes of child labor. The Child Labor Free Zone approach – with its consistent message that all children must be in school – provided an important framework for that collaboration in the West Nile region of Uganda. Yet even without resources to put the full CLFZ framework in place, the research shows that there are many actions that farmers, supply chain partners, government agencies and teachers can take to facilitate children’s access to free and quality education alongside age-appropriate work.



# Annex 1 Indicator protocols

## 1.1 Protocol for household surveys to map child labor and child labor risk

SUB-COUNTY: ..... PARISH: ..... VILLAGE: ..... DATE: .....  
 NAME OF H/H HEAD: ..... KCL CODE: ..... CEFORD CODE: ..... STAFF NAME: .....

- In below table, record all children in the household. If a child is involved in ANY form of child labor, indicate in which form(s) (s) he is involved. Make sure to tick the sex appropriate box. If a household has more than 8 children, use two questionnaires and staple them together.
- Summarise the information in the grey column and row. Do not double count a child.

	Name of child	Sex		Birth year	Age	Name of school & Class	Completely out of school (6-14 years)		Partially out of school (6-14 years)		Dangerous work <sup>1</sup> (6-14 years)		Working elsewhere (6-14 years)		CHILD LABOR SUMMARY	
		M	F				M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
1																
2																
3																
<b>Total # children in HH between 6-14 years</b>						<b>Total # children in child labor forms</b>										

3. Does the household sometimes hires children (6-14 years) from neighbours to help with the work? If so, fill below table.

	Name of child	M	F	Birth year	Age	Parent/ Name of Household Head	Village	Parish	Sub-county
1									
2									
3									
<b>Total # children (6-14) hired by household</b>									

4. What reason(s) does the household give for having child labor?

.....

## 1.2 Protocol for school performance

Name of school..... Parish: ..... Sub-county: ..... Contact person:..... Tel: .....  
 Title:..... Date: .....

1. Does the school active school management committee? 1. Yes 2. No if yes how many members? Male..... female.....
2. Does the school active PTA? 1. Yes 2. No. If yes how many members? Male..... female.....
3. How many registered teachers are in the school? Male..... Female.....
4. Does the school have latrines for both boys and girls separately? 1. Yes 2. No if yes, how many doors? .....Boys .....Girls
5. Does the school have water points for the pupils? 1. Yes 2.No
6. Does the school provide co-curricular activities/items for the pupils? 1. Yes 2.No. if yes name the activities provided

7.	December 2017									First term 2018								
	Pupils Enrolment (6-14years)			Pupils Enrolment (15 years and above)			Teachers Enrolment			Pupils Enrolment (6-14years)			Pupils Enrolment(15 years and above)			Teachers Enrolment		
Class	Female	Male	Total	Male	Total	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
P.1																		
p.2																		
p.3																		
p.4																		
p.5																		
p.6																		
p.7																		

8. How many of the pupils dropped out in 2017? Male..... Female.....

Why did they dropped out if any?.....

PLE RESULT SUMMARY	DIVISION 1		DIVISION 2		DIVISION 3		DIVISION 4		DIVISION U		DIVISION X		TOTAL REGISTERED	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
2016														
2017														
2018														

### 1.3 Protocol for Handling of child labor by teachers

#	Questions	Response Code	Code List
<b>Identification of cases of child labor in your class</b>			
1	Do you register children in your class that come too late?		1=yes, always 2=yes, mostly 3=yes, sometimes 4= no
2	Do you register children in your class with poor performance?		
3	Do you register children in your class that are frequently absent?		
4	Do you register cases where you believe children in your class are involved in child labor?		
<b>Measures taken when there are suspected cases of child labor</b>			
5	Do you take time to talk with the child suspected of child labor?		1=yes, always 2=yes, mostly 3=yes, sometimes 4= no
6	Do you take time to build a relationship with the child suspected of child labor?		
7	Do you discuss and try to understand the causes of the child being suspected of child labor?		
8	Do you take time to counsel the child suspected of child labor?		
<b>Engagements to find a solution to cases of child labor</b>			
9	Do you discuss the issue of suspected child labor with colleague teachers?		1=yes, always 2=yes, mostly 3=yes, sometimes 4= no
10	Do you discuss the issue of suspected child labor with the school management committee?		
11	Do you contact the parents of the child suspected of child labor and discuss possible solutions?		
12	Do you discuss the issue of suspected child labor with the local council?		
<b>Measures taken to make the school more attractive for children</b>			
13	Do you stimulate the child suspected of child labor to join youth clubs?		1=yes, always 2=yes, mostly 3=yes, sometimes 4= no
14	Do you stimulate the child suspected of child labor to join music, dance, and drama activities?		
<b>Involvement in remedial teaching</b>			
15	How much time do you spend per week on activities of remedial teaching?		1=no time spent on remedial teaching 2=max 2 hours per week 3=between 2 and 4 hours per week 4=more than 4 hours a week
16	How many children have you supported in remedial teaching during the last 4 weeks?		1=not any child 2=1 child 3=2 children 4= more than 2 children
17	Do you receive support (for instance from parents) to undertake activities of remedial teaching?		1=yes, always 2=yes, mostly 3=yes, sometimes 4= no

## 1.4 Protocol for survey on the socio-cultural norm

#	Questions	Response Code	Code List
<b>Within your own household</b>			
1	Do you take your BOY child out of school to help you with work on your farm?		1=yes, often 2=yes, sometimes
2	Do you take your GIRL child out of school to help you with work on your farm?		3=yes, rarely 4=no, never
3	Do you take your BOY child to help you with work on your farm, outside of school hours?		1=yes, often 2=yes, sometimes
4	Do you take your GIRL child to help you with work on your farm, outside of school hours?		3=yes, rarely 4=no, never
5	Can your BOY child spray chemicals on the crops on your farm?		1=yes, that is always possible 2=yes, but only when there is no school
6	Can your GIRL child spray chemicals on the crops on your farm?		3= yes, when I really need help 4=no, this is not possible any time
7	Should your BOY child of less than 14 years old be in school, at school hours?		1=no, that is not necessary 2=no, not always
8	Should your GIRL child of less than 14 years old be in school, at school hours?		3=yes, most of the time 4=yes, always
9	Do you agree with your husband / wife on the desirable level of education for your BOY child?		1=no, we do not agree at all 2=no, we do not agree most of the time
10	Do you agree with your husband / wife on the desirable level of education for your GIRL child?		3=yes, we agree most of the time 4=yes, we always agree
11	What do you consider as a desirable level of education for your BOY child?		1= grade 3 would be enough 2=grade 5 is good
12	What do you consider as a desirable level of education for your GIRL child?		3=grade 6 4= grade 7
13	What do you do if you do not have enough money to send you BOY child to school?		1=then it will not go to school 2=then I will look for money
14	What do you do if you do not have enough money to send you GIRL child to school?		3=then I will make use of the VSLA 4=then I will ask money from others Other response: .....
<b>Within the community</b>			
15	What do you do if you see a BOY child working in the market-place?		1=do nothing, it is his own responsibility 2=do nothing, I have nothing to say
16	What do you do if you see a GIRL child working in the market-place?		3=report to the CL committee 4=report to the police Other response: .....
17	What do you do if you see your neighbor taking a BOY child from school to work on the farm?		1=do nothing, it is his own responsibility 2=do nothing, I have nothing to say
18	What do you do if you see your neighbor taking a GIRL child from school to work on the farm?		3=report to the CL committee 4=report to the police Other response: .....
19	What do you do if you see your neighbor using a BOY child to carry heavy loads on the farm?		1=do nothing, it is his own responsibility 2=do nothing, I have nothing to say
20	What do you do if you see your neighbor using a GIRL child to carry heavy loads on the farm?		3=report to the CL committee 4=report to the police Other response: .....

## 1.5 Protocol for survey on effectiveness of child labor committees at community level

### Basic information

Name of child labor committee.....  
 Village ..... Parish: ..... Sub County..... Date: .....  
 Name of Contact Person: .....Title:.....  
 Contact:.....

### Survey

#	Questions	Response Code	Code List
<b>Composition of the child labor committee</b>			
1	How many members does the child labor committee formally have? Make distinction between male and women	Men: Women:	Mention the number of members: • Men: • Women:
2	How many members have been actively participating <i>during the last year</i> ? Make distinction between male and women (Active members are those that attended the CL committee activities at least 3 times a month)	Men: Women:	
<b>Legal status of the child labor committee</b>			
3	Does the CL committee have a by law?		1= yes 2= no
4	If yes, does the CL committee believe they are following the by law?		
<b>Level of satisfaction and support during the last year</b>			
5	Is the CL committee satisfied by the way it operates?		1= yes, very satisfied 2= moderately satisfied 3=not satisfied
6	Does the CL committee receive support from the community to carry out its activities?		1=yes, very much 2=yes, sometimes 3=yes, rarely 4=no, never
7	Does the CL committee receive support from the local council to carry out its activities?		
<b>Did the CL committee undertake the following activities <i>during the last year</i>?</b>			
8	Community mobilization for child labor issues		1=yes, often (at least once a week) 2=yes, sometimes (at least once a month, but not once a week) 3=yes, rarely (less than once a month) 4=no, never
9	Sensitizing community members on child labor issues		
10	Mapping households with child labor issues		
11	Identifying child labor cases beyond household level, e.g. at the market place		
12	Providing guidance and counselling to children and parents suspected of child labor		
13	Attending community meetings		

#	Questions	Response Code	Code List	
14	Organising community meetings to lobby and advocate on child labor issues in community			
15	Sharing best practices, lessons learnt etc. on child labor remediation with the community			
16	Making follow-ups with child labor households and child laborers for child labor remediation			
17	Visiting and monitoring schools			
18	Working with community stakeholders, political & religious leaders on child labor remediation			
19	Coordinating with stop child labor partner staffs			
20	Reporting on child labor issues to the police or the local council			
21	Contributing to the educational fund in their VSLA			
22	Attending VSLA group meetings and other VSLA related activities			
23	Monitoring VSLA groups and activities			
24	Supporting needy withdrawn children form child labor using educational fund			
25	Adopting / linking children withdrawn from child labor that are homeless to social protection			
<b>Funding and sustainability of the CL committee</b>				
26	Has the committee carried out or set-up some economic activity to raise income for the CL committee activities, during the last year?			1= yes 2= no Additional information: ...
27	Has the CL committee received some financial support from any person, organization or government, during the last year?			
28	Is the funding enough for the CL committee to keep functioning in the coming years?			
29	Has the CL committee received some technical support or training from any person or organization, during the last year?			
30	Is the technical support enough for the CL committee to keep functioning in the coming years?			
<b>Open question</b>				
31	What would the CL committee need in order to be able to carry on its activities in the coming years?			

## 1.6 Protocol for survey of effectiveness of village savings and Loan association

### Basic information

Name of VSLA Group: ..... Sub-county: .....

Parish: ..... Quarter .... (..... To.....) 20.....

Contact Person: ..... Tel: ..... Title: .....

Data collector:..... Title:..... Date:.....

#	Questions	Response Code	Code List
<b>Composition of the VSLA group</b>			
1	How many members does the VSLA group formally have? Make distinction between male and women	Men: Women:	Mention the number of members: • Men: • Women:
2	How many members have been actively participating during the last quarter? Make distinction between male and women (Active members are those that attended the VSLA activities at least 3 times a month)	Men: Women:	
<b>Did the VSLA group undertake the following activities during the last year?</b>			
3	Income generating activities to raise finance to sustain or expand the VSLA activities		1=yes, often (at least once a week) 2=yes, sometimes (at least once a month, but not once a week) 3=yes, rarely (less than once a month) 4=no, never
4	Sensitizing community members on child labor issues		
5	Engagement in child labor monitoring and sensitization		
<b>Level of satisfaction and support received</b>			
6	Is the VSLA group satisfied by the way it operates?		1= yes, very satisfied 2= moderately satisfied 3=not satisfied
7	Is the VSLA group satisfied by their contribution to reduce child labor in the community?		
8	Is the VSLA group satisfied by their contribution to increase school attendance in the community?		
9	Has the VSLA group received some technical support or training from any person or organization during the last year?		1=yes 2=no Additional information: ...
10	Is the technical support enough for the VSLA group to keep functioning in the coming years?		
<b>Open question</b>			
11	What would the VSLA group need in order to be able to carry on its activities in the coming years?		

**VSLA Financial overview last quarter**

<i>S/N</i>	<i>VSLA Activities Particulars</i>	<i>1<sup>st</sup> Month (UGX)</i>	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> Month (UGX)</i>	<i>3<sup>rd</sup> Month (UGX)</i>	<i>Quarter (UGX)</i>
1.	Savings				
2.	Social Fund received/collected				
3.	Educational Fund received /collected				
4.	Loans: Amounts given out				
4.1	Savings: given out to members				
4.2	Savings: given out to non-members				
4.3	Social fund: given out to members				
4.5	Education fund: used to support children in school				
		<i>1<sup>st</sup> Month Boys: # Girls: #</i>	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> Month Boys: # Girls: #</i>	<i>3<sup>rd</sup> Month Boys: # Girls: #</i>	<i>Quarter Boys: # Girls: #</i>
5	# of children supported with the educational funds (boys and girls less than 15 years)				



## 1.7 Protocol for sub-county child labor steering committee

#	Questions	Response Code	Code List
1	What is your opinion about the incidence of child labor in your sub-county?		1=it is too high 2=it is not too high 3=it is low 4=it does not occur
2	What is your opinion about the changes on the incidence of child labor in your sub-county during the last year?		1=it has increased 2=it has remained the same 3=it has decreased somewhat 4=it decreased a lot
3	What can the steering committee do to avoid children working during school hours in the market-place?		1=nothing, it is their own responsibility 2=support CL committees
4	What can the steering committee do to avoid children working on farms during school hours?		3=support the schools 4=support the police Other response: .....
5	How much has the steering committee done during the last year to help reduce child labor?		1=nothing in particular 2=very little
6	Which of the mentioned activities has been most effective, in your opinion?		3=several activities 4=many activities
7	Which of the mentioned activities will be continued in coming years?		Mention the activities: .....
8	How has the steering committee supported child labor committees in the community?		1=nothing 2=given training/technical support 3=given material support 4=given financial support Other response: .....
9	How has the steering committee supported child labor committees at schools?		1=nothing 2=given training/technical support 3=given material support 4=given financial support Other response: .....
10	How has the steering committee stimulated education quality at schools?		1=nothing 2=given training/technical support 3=given material support 4=given financial support Other response: .....
11	How has the steering committee supported the police to effectively deal with child labor?		1=nothing 2=given training/technical support 3=given material support 4=given financial support Other response: .....

## Annex 2: Details on surveys conducted and sampling

### Households sampled and surveyed on the occurrence of child labor

Both KCL households (treatment) and non-KCL households were surveyed. At baseline in each zone all KCL members were surveyed. At baseline all non-KCL households in zone A1 were surveyed. In zone A2 and zone B samples of non-KCL households were taken at random. At endline due to Covid not all KCL were surveyed and samples of non-KCL households were somewhat lower. Table 2.1 gives an overview of the number of households that were surveyed.

Table 2.1: Overview of households surveyed on the occurrence of child labor

Intensity / zone	KCL / treatment or non-KCL	Baseline survey # of HHs surveyed	Endline survey # of HHs surveyed
A1 – 1 parish	KCL	623	541
	Non-KCL	1001	123
A2 – 4 parishes	KCL	842	729
	Non-KCL	168	139
Zone B	KCL	1068	684
	Non-KCL	208	161
Zone C	KCL	321	450

### Community child labor committees and VSLAs

Table 2.2 shows the number of child labor committees (CLCs) and village savings and loan associations (VSLAs) established and those surveyed during the baseline survey, the endline survey and during the qualitative assessment.

Table 2.2: Data collection for Child labor committees and VSLAs

Intensity / zone	CLCs and VSLAs established	Baseline survey	Endline survey	Endline qualitative study
		CLCs and VSLAs surveyed	CLCs and VSLAs surveyed	CLCs and VSLAs interviewed
A1 – 1 parish	13	13	13	2
A2 – 4 parishes	10	9	9	2
Zone B	9	6	9	5
Zone C	0	0	0	1

### Sub-county child labor committees

Table 2.3 shows the number of sub-counties that were surveyed and where a qualitative assessment was done during the endline study.

Table 2.3: Data collection for sub-counties and child labor committees

Intensity / zone	Baseline study Sub-counties surveyed	Endline study Sub-counties surveyed	Endline study qualitative assessment
A1 – 1 parish	1	1	1
A2 – 4 parishes			
Zone B	2	2	2
Zone C	0	3	3

### Schools and teachers

Table 2.4 shows the total of public and private schools in the three study areas. Clearly, the proportion of public schools predominates. The aim was to collect data from all schools on school enrolment, attendance and dropout rates. Data from public schools were collected by Unatu, but unfortunately these were not available for all schools. Data from private schools were not available.

Table 2.4: Primary and secondary schools in the study areas.

Intensity / zone	Primary schools		Secondary schools	
	Public	Private	Public	Private
A1 – 1 parish	4	2	1	1
A2 – 4 parishes	11	4	0	0
Zone B	11	2	1	0
Zone C	21	5	2	1

During the baseline study, in total 31 interviews were held with teachers from primary public schools (Table 2.5). During the endline study, schools were closed and only a few interviews could be held.

Table 2.5: Interviews with teachers in primary schools.

Intensity / zone	Baseline survey		Endline qualitative assessment
	# of male teachers interviewed	# of female teachers interviewed	# of teachers interviewed, men and women
A1 – 1 parish	4	3	1
A2 – 4 parishes	10	2	1
Zone B	8	2	1
Zone C	9	4	1

### Interviews with children

For the endline study, FGDs were also conducted with children in 3 groups per village, of KCL member families who send their children to school. They were grouped into 6-11 years old, 12-13 and 14-17 years old. Each group had 5 to 8 children. Due to time limitation, it was difficult to split them into gender specific groups. A participatory methodology was used to collect information from the children.

Table 2.6: Focus group discussions with children during endline study.

Intensity / zone	6-11 years old	12-13 years old	14-17 years old
A1 – 1 parish	2	2	2
A2 – 4 parishes	2	2	2
Zone B	3	3	3
Zone C	1	-	-

## Annex 3: Details on norms and attitudes on child labor

### Survey results

The table 3.1 below provides an overview of the responses of the perception survey on norms and attitudes of households to child labor, for selected response categories, with colours indicating relatively good, moderate and poor scores. These perception surveys were carried out separately from the child labor surveys. The full survey format can be found in Annex 2.

A general overview of scores shows that, when comparing the four different zones, for both the baseline and the endline survey the majority of positive scores (green) are for zone A1 and zone A2. In these two zones there has also been an overall improvement from baseline to endline. There are no differences between KCL and non-KCL members, which means the perceptions are the same within the communities as a whole. In zone B-KCL scores were poor and considerably improved from baseline to endline, and continue to show a considerable difference with zone B non-KCL producers. In Zone C the scores are clearly poorest.

More specific insights are as follows:

1. The understanding whether a child should not be spraying chemicals (Q1), as well the understanding whether a child should be in school during school hours (Q2), has improved in all zones. In zones A1, A2, and zone B-KCL it has now generally reached a high level of understanding, while the levels of understanding remain relatively low in zone B non-KCL and zone C.
2. In zones A1, A2, and zone B-KCL there is not a single HH stating that they will not send their child to school if there is lack of funding. Also, the majority of these HHs states that they will make use of the VSLA if they do not have enough funds. By contrast, in zone B non-KCL some HHs will not send their children to school if they lack funds, and less make use of VSLAs. These scores are both poorest for zone C.
3. The responses to the questions: “What do you do if you see a child working in market?”, “What do you do if you see a child out of school in work?”, and “What do you do if you see a child carry heavy loads?”, are comparable. For all three questions the response “report to the child labor committee (CLC)” was already highest at baseline for zone A1, and to some extent also zone A2, and further improved towards endline. For zone B-KCL the score was moderately high at baseline and improved considerably towards endline. For zone B non-KCL there was a moderate improvement, but still moderate score. For zone C, where there are no CLCs, the score on reporting to the CLC was obviously poor. The score for reporting to the police is less easy to judge. We believe it is good to report to the police, but it is better to report to the CLC, as reporting to the police might indicate that the emphasis is on law enforcement and punishment. The scores of reporting to the police have remained relatively high for zones B non-KCL and zone C.
4. The questions made a distinction between boys and girls but in general no differences appear between boys and girls. There is one exception from the baseline survey: Q3, spraying chemicals, in zone A1, significantly more boys.

Table 3.1: The attitudes to child labor within HHs, as a proportion of responses, per program zone (for selected questions and responses), for baseline (B) and endline (E) survey

Questions	Zone A1		Zone A2		Zone B		Zone C
	KCL	Non-KCL	KCL	Non-KCL	KCL	Non-KCL	KCL
	B:N=124 E:N=452	B: N=96 E:N=114	B:N=386 E:N=639	B: N=406 E:N=134	B:N=506 E:N=592	B:N=332 E:N=137	B: N=694 E:N=372
1. Your boy or girl to spray chemicals on your farm? Response 4. 'Never'	B: 78	B: 70	B: 94	B: 92	<b>B: 80 &gt;</b>	<b>&lt; B: 57</b>	B: 85
	E: 94	E: 95	E: 96	E: 94	<b>E: 96 &gt;</b>	<b>&lt; E: 65</b>	E: 81
2. Your boy or girl should be in school during school hours? Response 4. 'Always'	B: 52	B: 48	B: 79	B: 83	<b>B: 56 &gt;</b>	<b>&lt; B: 34</b>	B: 24
	E: 71	E: 76	E: 90	E: 94	<b>E: 91 &gt;</b>	<b>&lt; E: 61</b>	E: 48
3. What do you do if not enough money for child to go to school? Response 1. 'Not send to school'	B: 2	B: 1	B: 3	B: 0	B: 9	B: 8	B: 19
	E: 0	E: 0	E: 0	E: 0	E: 0	E: 7	E: 5
3. What do you do if not enough money for child to go to school? Response 3. 'Make use of VSLA'	B: 53	B: 60	B: 24	B: 24	B: 59	B: 55	B: 7
	E: 79	E: 92	E: 68	E: 55	E: 72	E: 52	E: 11
4. What do you do if you see child working in market? Response 3 'Report to CL committee'	B: 82	B: 84	B: 75	B: 72	B: 37	B: 34	B: 2
	E:88	E: 91	E: 84	E: 80	<b>E: 80 &gt;</b>	<b>&lt; E: 53</b>	E: 2
4. What do you do if you see child working in market? Response 4 'Report to police'	B: 5	B: 3	<b>B: 11 &gt;</b>	<b>&lt; B: 6</b>	<b>B: 6 &gt;</b>	<b>&lt; B: 24</b>	B: 8
	E: 4	E: 0	<b>E: 2 &gt;</b>	<b>&lt; E: 6</b>	E: 2	E: 8	E: 8
5. What do you do if you see child out of school in work? Response 3. 'Report to CLC'	B: 89	B: 80	B: 84	B: 76	B: 41	B: 35	B: 3
	E: 90	E: 89	E: 86	E: 84	<b>E: 90 &gt;</b>	<b>&lt; E: 56</b>	E: 2
5. What do you do if you see child out of school in work? Response 4. 'Report to police'	B: 2	B: 3	B: 5	B: 7	<b>B: 5 &gt;</b>	<b>&lt; B: 22</b>	B: 7
	E: 4	E: 0	E: 1	E: 1	<b>E: 1 &gt;</b>	<b>&lt; E: 8</b>	E: 4
6. What do you do if you see child carry heavy loads? Response 3 'Report to CL committee'	B: 82	B: 79	B: 84	B: 42	B: 35	B: 30	B: 3
	E: 92	E: 83	E: 88	E: 84	<b>E: 88 &gt;</b>	<b>&lt; E: 35</b>	E: 3
6. What do you do if you see child carry heavy loads? Response 4. 'Report to police'	<b>B: 14</b>	B: 8	B: 5	<b>B: 13</b>	<b>B: 7 &gt;</b>	<b>&lt; B: 23</b>	B: 5
	E: 2	E: 0	E: 1	E: 0	<b>E: 1 &gt;</b>	<b>&lt; E: 8</b>	E: 4

Green colour means relatively high / good scores, with more than 10% difference

Yellow colour means moderate scores

Orange colour means relatively low / poor scores, with more than 10% difference

Blue colour relates to the response of reporting to the police, which may be interpreted in different ways

<> and bold means difference of more than 10%

### **Insights from FGDs on child labor and change of attitude**

- Of the children interviewed 92% reported going to school every day and 8% reported to be missing school sometimes. According to the children, children missing school during coffee harvesting time has reduced in zones A & B. On the other hand, Zone C registers a high rate of absenteeism. Here, the teachers report that during market days there is minimal attendance of both pupils and teachers.
- Of the children interviewed 95% from all zones combined agree to be helping their parents on the farm, even the young ones (6 years). This has not changed over the last three years. But most of them also point out that they only help during non-school days or hours and most parents are stricter on them attending school. In addition, none of the children report their other siblings to be helping parents on the farm during school time, except those who were married.
- On the other hand, more than 80% of the children interviewed in all the zones point out that they still know children of school going age who are not in school and working to earn money. The number is highest in zone C, and lowest in zone in zone A1. Most of these are not living with their parents but are living with relatives/guardians. This points to the fact that, despite the progress made, there are still children of school going age who are not in school.
- Of the children interviewed 90% reported to have been carrying heavy loads before the intervention of the project. But parents have become more aware that it is not right and try to refrain from the practice. In Zone A1, the level of awareness is high and everyone condemns this practice. This level of awareness seems not to be the same in Zone A2 and Zone B. In these zones most of the children mentioned being afraid of arrest as the reason for compliance.
- In zone A, it is common to find even coffee traders refusing to hire children or buy coffee from them because the Subcounty has declared it illegal.
- Most of the respondents in all zones pointed out that it's their mothers who require them to carry these heavy loads to the market. This practice is still high in zone B and in zone C. About 5% of the children in zone B reported to have ever done dangerous work like spraying in the farm, pruning or working in the night or long hours etc. and about 30% in Zone C.
- In Zones A, 12% of the children interviewed admits to get paid for work, these are mostly children who were out of school. Some of the practices mentioned include picking and selling coffee, selling in the market, working on people's farmland for pay etc. The general consensus is that these practices have reduced during the last three years. In Zone B, the percentage of children working for pay is still higher. Over the last three years, there has been more awareness created that these practices are detrimental to children and not acceptable, but not much has changed. Most children reported that parents are aware and more scared of being arrested rather than out of a behavior change. On the other hand, 90% of those who were working prefer working to going to school, because if they return to school, they will not receive support for scholastic materials or fees since most of them live with guardians. In Zone C, the situation is worse, most children are working for pay, on farms as laborers, fetching water, making bricks, selling foodstuff in the markets and riding bodaboda motorcycles.

## Annex 4: Data and insights on quality of education

From the data in the following overview tables the following insights emerge:

- We take drop out rates as the main indicator for school attendance, as one root cause of child labor. At baseline the drop-out rate in zone A1 was lowest, 9% and 6% for girls and boys respectively. In zone A2 drop out rates were about double as high: 19% and 17% for girls and boys respectively. In zone B the baseline data on drop out rates were very high, highest in one sub-county 41% and 37% for girls and boys respectively, followed by the other sub-county (28% and 25%). We do not have such data for zone C but it could be expected that drop out rates are similar or even worse than zone B.
- Unfortunately there are no endline data available for zones A1 and A2. For both sub-counties in zone B the drop out rates have strongly declined between 2018 and 2020, towards 18-20% for girls and 11-14% for boys. Thus, the drop out rates are now at the same level as zone A2.
- Overall, the drop out rates are lower for boys than for girls.
- We also looked at some core indicators of school performance, notably teacher-pupil ratio, female teacher - girl pupil ratio, and Latrine - Pupil ratio. In all zones these ratios are slightly or far above (worse than) the national reference, with some very poor outliers. We do not have a national reference for the female teacher – girl pupil ratio, but here the scores are particularly poor.
- There does not seem to be a relation between these performance indicators and drop out rates. Thus, the main cause for high drop out rates in zones A2 and zone B cannot be explained by poor school performance.

*Table 4.1: School enrolment, school attendance and drop out rate data for primary schools in Zone A sub-county, data are from April and November 2018 (Baseline) – no endline data available*

Sub-zones	School enrolment		School Attendance		Drop-out rate	
	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys
<b>Zone A1</b>						
• primary school	485	618	424	582	12%	7%
• Primary school	360	378	310	330	14%	10%
• Primary school	441	544	426	535	3%	2%
• primary school	245	265	230	253	6%	4%
<i>Average</i>	<b>383</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>Zone A2</b>						
• primary school	460	450	418	420	9%	6%
• primary school	364	453	354	434	3%	4%
• primary school	421	558	384	481	14%	11%
• primary school	624	583	419	396	30%	32%
• primary school	512	535	313	352	39%	34%
• primary school	408	488	392	475	4%	0%
• primary school	277	525	240	705	13%	11%
• primary school	105	98	75	58	29%	41%
• Primary school	413	450	260	317	35%	33%
• primary school	401	445	329	383	17%	16%
• primary school	286	321	260	299	9%	11%
<i>Average</i>	<b>388</b>	<b>446</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>17%</b>

Table 4.2: School enrolment, school attendance and drop out rate data for primary schools in Zone B, data are from March and November 2018 (Baseline), and from Term one 2020 (Endline)

Sub-counties	School Enrolment		School Attendance		Drop-out rate	
	Girls Base/End	Boys Base/End	Girls Base/End	Boys Base/End	Girls Base/End	Boys Base/End
<b>First sub-county</b>						
• primary school	354 / 308	461 / 358	207 / 229	311 / 302	45% / 26%	30% / 18%
• primary school	192 / 186	238 / 206	58 / 133	95 / 174	68% / 28%	60% / 16%
• primary school	469 / 372	496 / 407	254 / 307	291 / 365	45% / 17%	41% / 10%
• primary school	222 / 202	245 / 206	142 / 143	127 / 144	36% / 29%	48% / 30%
• primary school	417 / 384	549 / 440	269 / 328	384 / 380	35% / 15%	30% / 14%
• primary school	283 / 249	333 / 292	216 / 213	233 / 255	24% / 15%	30% / 13%
<i>Average</i>	<i>323 / 283</i>	<i>387 / 313</i>	<i>191 / 226</i>	<i>240 / 270</i>	<i>41% / 20%</i>	<i>37% / 14%</i>
<b>Second sub-county</b>						
• primary school	449 / 499	462 / 531	310 / 413	352 / 466	31% / 17%	24% / 12%
• primary school	249 / 224	315 / 367	218 / 165	176 / 293	12% / 26%	44% / 20%
• primary school	642 / 610	652 / 657	497 / 508	551 / 573	23% / 17%	15% / 13%
• primary school	295 /	280 /	191 /	163 /	35% /	42% /
• primary school	441 / 411	562 / 514	283 / 357	416 / 442	36% / 13%	26% / 14%
• primary school	439 / 494	497 / 438	306 / 397	405 / 452	30% / 20%	19% / 5%
<i>Average</i>	<i>419 / 448</i>	<i>461 / 501</i>	<i>301 / 368</i>	<i>344 / 445</i>	<i>28% / 18%</i>	<i>25% / 11%</i>

Table 4.3: Overview of performance indicators of schools, at baseline (2018) and at endline (2020), if available

Zone	Baseline / Endline	Zone A		Zone B	Zone C
		A1 - Girls/Boys	A2 Girls/boys	Sub-counties 1, 2 Girls/boys	Sub-counties 3, 4, 5
F3 Drop out rates	Baseline	9% / 6%	19% / 17%	1: 41% / 37% 2: 28% / 25%	No data
	Endline	No data	No data	1: 20% / 14% 2: 18% / 11%	No data
F3 teacher-pupil ratio	Baseline	1:69	1:81	1: 1:58 2: 1:63	3: 1:61 4: 1:186 5: 1:63
F3 female teacher - girl pupil ratio *)	Baseline	1:184	1:160	1: 1:130 2: 1:117	3: 1:100 4: 1:498 5: 1:173
F3 Latrine - Pupil ratio **)	Baseline	1:86	1:134	1: 1:64 2: 1:75	3: 1:83 4: 1:138 5: 1:78

\*) National minimum teacher pupil ratio: 1:55

\*\*) National minimum Latrine stance – pupil ratio: 1:70

#### Attitudes of teachers: tabular overviews and analysis

The following table 4.4 provides an overview to the responses of the perception survey on norms and attitudes to child labor by teachers. The survey was done at baseline but not at endline, due to Covid restrictions (schools were closed).



Table 4.4: Overview of opinions of teachers at baseline

Questions	Zone A1 (%)	Zone A2 (%)	Zone B (%)	Zone C (%)
	N = 4	N=10	N=8	N=9
1. Do you register children too late? – Responses 'Always' and 'Mostly'	100	70	26	22
2. Do you register children with poor performance? – Responses 'Always' and 'Mostly'	50	30	75	67
3. Do you register children frequently absent? – Responses 'Always' and 'Mostly'	75	40	13	44
4. Do you register cases of children believed to be involved in CL? – Responses 'Always' and 'Mostly'	75	50	38	11
5. Do you take time to talk with children suspected of CL? – Responses 'Always' and 'Mostly'	50	90	63	44
6. Do you take time to build relationship with children suspected of CL? – Responses 'Always' and 'Mostly'	100	100	63	44
7. Do you discuss causes of child labor with children suspected of CL? – Responses 'Always' and 'Mostly'	100	100	50	55
8. Do you take time to council child with children suspected of CL? – Responses 'Always' and 'Mostly'	100	90	50	44
9. Do you discuss suspected CL with colleague teachers? – Responses 'Always' and 'Mostly'	75	70	63	55
10. Do you discuss suspected CL with the school management? – Responses 'Always' and 'Mostly'	50	70	26	22
11. Do you contact the parents of child suspected of CL? – Responses 'Always' and 'Mostly'	100	60	13	33
12. Do you discuss suspected child labor with local council? – Responses 'Always' and 'Mostly'	100	20	50	0
13. Do you stimulate child suspected of CL to join youth clubs? – Responses 'Always' and 'Mostly'	100	80	50	44
14. Do you stimulate child suspected of CL to join music, dance etc? – Responses 'Always' + 'Mostly'	25	70	26	33
15. How much time do you spend per week on remedial teaching? – Responses more than 2 hours	75	50	88	78
16. How many children do you support with remedial teaching last 4 weeks? – Responses at least 2	50	50	75	78
17. Do you receive support for remedial teaching? – Responses 'Always' and 'Mostly'	100	90	88	55

Green colour means relatively high / good scores, with more than 10% difference

Yellow colour means moderate scores

Orange colour means relatively low / poor scores, with more than 10% difference

## Opinions from interviews and FGDs on schools and education

From report by: Jalar Silvio Fred, District Inspector of Schools, Zombo District Local Government

### Activities Done in all Schools

- Meetings with SMCs, LCs and parents on child labor.
- Mapping of child labor hot spot like Ayuda bridge, Leda, Nyagak etc
- Sensitization of parents and children.

- Exposure visit to zone A sub-county to learn from their success stories..
- Debate on child labor related topics
- Use of sporting equipments given to promote games and sports.
- Appointment of child labor Focal Persons in each school.

#### Challenges:

- Low financial base in schools since UPE grant is the only credible source of funding.
- COVID 19 Pandemic affected the enrolment of pupils, schools closed in the 7th week of term one yet schools were still registering more pupils from the village. The lock down has affected most schools as well as the local governments and has exposed children to more child labor risks at home and in the community.
- Though teachers' preparation in terms of schemes of work lesson plans, preparation of teaching/learning aids and assessment have improved, the percentages are still low.

#### Suggested Way Forward:

- Head teachers should start income generating activities like piggery, goat rearing, poultry, apiary etc as projects to raise income for the schools.
- Community Development Officers and the entire sub-county leadership with the district team should strengthen their supervision in schools.
- CAO should lobby with Ministry of Public service to allow for recruitment of teachers after raising the wage bill.

#### **FGDs with SC staff**

- High enrolment has led to shortage of classrooms.
- The way sub county pupils looked at the time of primary schools game competition, they looked unique right from uniforms and even their games sub-county was number two in the district P.L.E performance and a girl was the best, high enrolments up to 90%.

#### **FGDs with teachers**

- It should be kept in mind that the 15 schools in Zone A were supported since 2015 by both Unatu and Ceford, while in Zone B, it was only Unatu that worked with the 12 schools since 2017.
- Thus, activities implemented in the schools in Zone A were more intensive and include the following: selection and training of focal point teachers and Child labor committees at the schools, exchange visits to Kampala and Arua schools, support to teaching aids and children from vulnerable families with scholastic materials, child monitoring program in the schools, sensitization of parents, support to school clubs and training of senior women teachers in making reusable pads, radio programs on 3 local stations and printing T-shirts for school clubs. In Zone B, the activities implemented in schools only by UNATU were similar but less intensive. It did not include visits to Kampala and Arua.
- The project did not have direct support to school infrastructures but due to the increase in enrolment at school, there was need for more and better infrastructures. The funds at school was limited for this provision. In Zone A, due to the advocacy and good relations built with the district, the sub-county could allocate a 3 classroom block every year, which is not usual practice. In addition, desks were received from the District and the subcounty allocated funds to construct latrines in the schools. In Zone B, there was no lobbying done, and only some schools received latrine blocks from the Subcounty, but classrooms and desks did not change.
- Before the CLFZ approach was implemented, all schools in the three zones had a high numbers of school dropouts especially in third terms due to coffee harvest season. Several children used to miss school for several days to either support their parents or to make some money for themselves. Since implementation of the CLFZ approach, some changes have been noticed, as follows per zone:
  - In Zone A, the number of children in the 15 schools increased and attendance improved. Parents confirm that children who loitering in the villages during school days or selling products in markets had reduced. There are improved relations between the children and teachers, while teachers

mention increased support from parents towards the education of their children. Several teachers carried out follow up of the children who missed school or returned to school with the help of the CLCs. Several were given remedial teaching, which reduced dropout.

- In zone B, attendance of school also improved in all the 12 schools and children working or selling products in the markets reduced over the project period. However, teachers who had put in effort to follow up children in Zone B faced a challenge because there were less CLCs to support them and VSLAs to provide support funding for children to go to school. Thus, the retention of the children brought back to school was poor. In one primary school a teacher remarked that, 'out of the 10 children brought back to school, only 4 remain but 6 drop out again....'
- In both zones A & B, there was learning and copying of best practices between schools within the program. Schools from Zone B were taken to Zone A for a learning visit but also internally within the zones there was a lot of learning. Some of the key things reported by the schools as learnt included: using the child register to map and track dropouts, how to have a sustainable school feeding program through establishing school gardens, not chasing children out of school for fees but following up through the parents and establishment of the Subcounty steering committee etc. Although the schools picked out learning areas, few of the learnings were implemented.
- To sustain the efforts by the teachers, there was a request for follow-up by Unatu staff to check what is happening at schools and backstop them. The general feeling was that, schools did not get much follow up support from UNATU coordinators.

#### **FGDs with children**

According to children, the things that make going to school difficult include:

- 61% of the children mentioned caning. In all zones, corporal punishment seems to be the norm although the reasons for the punishments varied.
- Lack of parental support to buy books and uniforms or pay the fees required at school. Most of the children associated higher dropout rate with lack of parental support.
- Children missing school due to request from parents to support on market days to take items to the market or baby sit younger siblings.

## Annex 5: Cost estimates of the activities carried out

Following is an overview of costs, and where possible the costs split for the high and sub-high intensity zone A, and the moderate intensity zone B, or per unit of activity.

### **Costs KCL**

During the program period KCL has spent around 54 million UGX, of which 1/3 in zone A (with one child labor liaison officer funded by KCL), and 2/3 in zone B (with 2 child labor liaison officers funded by KCL). Thus the costs in the different zones have been:

- Zone A: 18 M UGX
- Zone B: 36 M UGX
- Zone C: 3 M UGX

### **Costs Unatu**

During the program period Unatu has spent around 81 million UGX, of which the expenses are split as follows:

- Zone A: 9.3 M UGX (12 schools that had already received support in earlier phases)
- Zone B: 71.7 M UGX (27 new schools), i.e. 2.7 M UGX per school

### **Costs Ceford**

During the program period Ceford has spent around 380 million UGX, of which the expenses are split as follows:

#### **Households**

- HH mapping: total 4.3 M UGX, 1/3 in Zone A, 2/3 in Zone B, 3900 HHs → 1.1 M UGX per 1,000 HHs
- House-to-house mapping: 29.9 M UGX, zone A+B
- Link families to protection mechanisms: 8.8 M UGX, zone A+B

#### **Committees**

- Set up CLCs: total 19.1 M UGX, 9 CLCs only in zone B → 1.0 M UGX per CLC
- Set up VSLAs: total 13.5 M UGX, 9 VSLAs only in zone B → 1.5 M UGX per CLC
- Support CLCs + VSLAs in OGAs: total 19.8 M UGX, 9 CLCs only in zone B → 2.2 M UGX per CLC
- Trainings of CLCs / VSLAs: total 13.9 M UGX, 9 CLCs only in zone B → 1.5 M UGX per CLC
- Learning visits VSLAs / IGAs: total 11.2 M UGX, 9 CLCs only in zone B → 1.2 M UGX per CLC
- Support all groups: total 20.8 UGX, zone A+B

#### **Meetings and trainings**

- Inception meetings: total 6.6 M UGX, 3 in Zone B, 1 in Zone A, 4 in total → 1.65 M per meeting
- Training of CLCs: total 4.3 M UGX, zone A+B
- Refresher training: total 13.7 M UGX, zone A+B
- Quarterly meetings relevant stakeholders: 22.1 M UGX, zone A+B
- Sensitize community and school children: 5.8 M UGX, zone A+B
- IEC materials: 12.9 M UGX, zones A+B

#### **Overall costs categories are:**

- 43 M UGX for 4000 HHs: mapping, quarterly visits, linking to protection measures = 11.0 M UGX per 1,000 HHs
- 98.3 M UGX for 9 CLCs and VSLAs, with IGAs = 10.9 per CLC/VSLA
- 65.4 M UGX for meetings and trainings
- 173.9 M UGX for staff, operational, logistics, M&E