

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Executive summary</u>	3
<u>Evaluation report</u>	5
1 Background	5
1.1 <u>Specifications</u>	6
1.1.1 <i>Service contract for independent evaluation</i>	6
1.1.2 <i>Project document</i>	7
1.2 <u>Project history</u>	7
1.2.1 <i>Initial period</i>	7
1.2.2 <i>First year implementation</i>	7
1.2.3 <i>Second year implementation</i>	8
1.2.4 <i>Concluding period</i>	9
2 Methodology	9
2.1 <u>Hypothesis</u>	9
2.2 <u>Process:</u>	9
2.3 <u>Data collection</u>	10
2.4 <u>Statistical method</u>	10
3 Findings	11
3.1 <u>Reporting analysis</u>	12
3.1.1 <i>Initial period</i>	12
3.1.2 <i>First-year implementation</i>	12
3.1.3 <i>Second-year implementation</i>	13
3.2 <u>Survey</u>	15
3.2.1 <i>Project design assumptions</i>	15
3.2.2 <i>Role of constituents during implementation</i>	17
3.2.3 <i>Effects of the Project’s management arrangements</i>	17
3.2.4 <i>Contribution of the Project towards the achievement of ILO’s operational objectives</i>	18
3.2.5 <i>Contribution of the Project towards the achievement of Regional and/or Sub-regional priorities</i>	19
3.2.6 <i>Contribution to ILO’s shared policy objectives in the context of Poverty reduction and informal economy</i>	20
3.2.7 <i>Project results</i>	23
3.2.8 <i>Project completion targets</i>	26
3.2.9 <i>Respondent comments and recommendations</i>	27
4 Conclusions	29
4.1 <u>Survey population</u>	31
4.2 <u>Project design</u>	32

4.3	<u>Impact</u>	32
4.3.1	<i>Successes</i>	32
4.3.2	<i>Lessons learnt</i>	33
4.4	<u>Failures & causes</u>	34
4.5	<u>Future sustainability</u>	35
4.5.1	<i>Threats & risks</i>	35
4.5.2	<i>Current weaknesses</i>	36
4.5.3	<i>Solutions to current failures, problems and weaknesses</i>	36
4.6	<u>Roles</u>	37
4.6.1	<u>ILO/HQ</u>	37
4.6.2	<u>DfID</u>	38
5	Recommendations	38
6	Bibliography	40
7	Glossary of acronyms and abbreviations	41
8	Annexes:	
	<i>Annex I – Survey Analysis Charts (EXCEL Read-only file)</i>	
	<i>Annex II – Survey Text Transcriptions</i>	
	<i>Annex III – Project document</i>	
	<i>Annex IV – Survey questionnaire</i>	
	<i>Annex V – Interview guide</i>	
	<i>Annex VI – LOGFRAME chart</i>	

Executive summary

Background and history

The project is rooted in the tripartite conclusions adopted by the International Labour Conference in 2002 Decent Work and the Informal Economy and the immediate follow-up work carried out by ILO's higher management as well as by HQ, field staff and constituent representatives.

During the same period, Decent-Work-and-Informal-Economy-related projects launched through technical collaboration between DfID's and the ILO offered an opportunity to learn lessons, reduce gaps, resolve overlapping efforts and strengthen ILO's ability to measure impact on poverty reduction. DfID thus offered a modest contribution to give ILO the means to introduce a Knowledge Sharing component amongst four DfID-funded projects then being launched. The projects covered various geographical areas of Africa, the Americas, Asia and Europe and would generate knowledge and replicable experiences at macro, meso and micro policy levels through structured interventions in, municipal services, improvement of living conditions, poverty eradication, gender equality, jobs for the poor, market access, policy, governance and representation, youth and other vulnerable groups and the informal economy at large.

The first challenge was to introduce a global Knowledge Sharing component led by ILO's INTEGRATION department into four projects that had already been planned independently from one another. The first six months of the project, (second half of 2003) required considerable efforts to bring together field-projects and HQ staff from key departments. A model of change was produced and improved during the following two years. Newly-generated knowledge and experience were documented and diffusion trials tested through workshops, a Knowledge Fair and personal and electronically-aided communications (2004 and 2005). At the time this evaluation took place, although not strictly institutionalised, an increasingly dynamic group of committed professionals from various structures, disciplines and geographical settings had been created providing ILO with a distinctive opportunity and the potential to scale up Knowledge Sharing as one of the key elements of success in the new millennium.

Evaluation process

The evaluation process was three-fold: a desk review of the project history, an assessment of the appropriateness of project design and an assessment of the knowledge-sharing process introduced in the context of the four DfID-funded projects on the informal economy. In addition to the desk review, the assessment method included a survey amongst 104 selected staff members on the project implementation process and impact, interviews of key field and HQ-department staff directly involved with the project implementation process and the evaluator's attendance as an observer at the end-of-project workshop.

Although the project design and initial implementation was hampered by the fact that the project was added to four already-planned DfID-funded field-projects, requiring an introductory and interactive and adjustment period with field-project and HQ related staff, the project did achieve its aim as an efficient knowledge-sharing link between the field-projects that benefited substantially from it. Even if they did not have identical specific objectives, they were linked by their purpose to contribute to ILO's operational objectives, to Regional and/or Sub-regional priorities and to ILO's shared policy objectives in the context of poverty reduction and the informal economy

Conclusions

The evaluation focused on this knowledge-sharing umbrella project and collected and analysed a considerable amount of information which led to the following general conclusions:

- ☐ The planning objectives, according to the initial project formulation, are rather general and it was difficult to measure performance against planned actions with precision, although the number of outputs is considerable.

- ☐ The effect of having a knowledge-sharing project coordination team of committed staff imbedded with the INTEGRATION Department organising active sharing amongst HQ/field staff, and coordinating the flow of knowledge-sharing had a great impact on the success of the project.
- ☐ The realisation of the need to institutionalise knowledge-sharing as a global institutional service of the ILO to its constituency and staff is critical for the future of ILO’s performance in a continuously changing world that is moving the labour market away from its traditional operational environment.
- ☐ The knowledge-sharing nature of the project contributed significantly to the improvement of the four DfID-funded field-projects on decent work and the informal economy in the context of poverty reduction as well as strengthening ILO’s internal sharing within the context of the projects and related HQ departments.
- ☐ Gender sensitivity was fully integrated into the implementing team interactions and their exercise of KS. Specific activities related to the field-projects are being evaluated separately.
- ☐ Sustainability will depend on the institutional approach the ILO will take in relation to the four field-projects and on the application of the lessons learnt and the recommendations stemming from this evaluation.
- ☐ Overall, the project provides a thorough base of experience and learning to guide the implementation of an institutional response to the findings and the current need for knowledge-sharing and knowledge-management throughout the Organisation.

Recommendations

Based on the current global socio-economic developments – which demonstrate that the labour market is rapidly moving out of control – knowledge-sharing within the Organisation, its constituents and partners is a must for the ILO to continue to honour its mandate.

To ensure effective knowledge-sharing, a knowledge management service organised within the ILO is required conforming to standard requirements for quality management systems to ensure quality of research, knowledge generation, knowledge storage, knowledge retrieval, knowledge packaging, knowledge delivery and measurement of results.

The outcome of implementing this recommendation would provide the ILO with integrated knowledge databases linked with library services, research outcomes, project results and informal new knowledge; a network of communities of practice on operations towards the achievement of each ILO operational objective and inFocus activities, and a knowledge management service assuring a global knowledge-sharing process flow, validity of data, information and knowledge, and continuous renewal of knowledge databases..

Evaluation report

“The ILO’s means of action are knowledge, service and advocacy.”
WORKINGOUT OF POVERTY, Report of the Director General,
ILC, 91st Session, 2003.

The following report was compiled between 11 October 2005 and 23 January 2006.

1 Background

The project was based on the tripartite conclusions adopted by the International Labour Conference in 2002 on decent work (DW) and the informal economy (IE) which were considered by the project designers as providing a strong mandate and guidance to the Office for its future work on the IE including the opportunity for a highly visible, integrated programme of work.

Taking into consideration the expansion of the IE around the world, these conclusions also represented at the time an important political opportunity for the ILO and its constituents. With this perspective, the field/HQ staff workshop (Turin, Feb. 2003) used the ILC conclusions to identify five themes around which coherent work on the IE could be pursued: representation and voice, governance, productivity and market enhancement, addressing vulnerabilities and macro level policies. In addition, gender and poverty reduction were considered dimensions of each of these themes, being cross-sectoral by nature and key elements of the Decent Work Agenda. The ILC discussion in June 2003 of the Director-General's report, Working out of poverty, consolidated the constituents' commitment to tackle issues raised by the IE in the context of poverty.

Amongst the considerable work on the IE the ILO was already carrying out, four regional DfID-funded projects stood out as potential sources for a knowledge-sharing opportunity to learn lessons, to help reduce gaps, resolve overlapping efforts and strengthen the ILO's ability to measure the impact of its technical cooperation activities and heighten linkages to poverty reduction frameworks. Together with spreading this knowledge widely within the ILO this project would contribute to ILO's already existing efforts towards improving knowledge management more generally. Thus, an exchange of lessons learnt among DfID-funded technical cooperation projects focusing on the IE would help to address shortcomings. Wider showcasing of good practices and of the results of ILO research in the development community would promote greater understanding of how the DW agenda in the context of the IE contributes to poverty reduction efforts.

With this objective, DfID offered USD 500'000 and ILO allocated USD 100'000 from INTEGRATION's Regular Budget¹ (over two biennia, between 2004 and 2007) to fund this project that would strengthen the KS components on DW and the IE in the context of poverty reduction within and amongst the already operating DfID-funded projects. The INTEGRATION-managed project would thus provide an opportunity to make linkages between the various themes and to develop frameworks such as the MDG and the PRSP.

The scope of the four technical cooperation projects involved in this KS support-project being evaluated is:

Africa: ILO Office, Dar es Salaam (DSM) - Employment creation in municipal service delivery in Eastern Africa – improving living conditions and providing jobs for the poor; covers Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda; main themes are market access, governance and representation; levels of intervention are micro, meso; project languages are English, Kiswahili.

¹ Annex III, Project Document, Page 8, Section A8, para.5.

Americas: ILO Office, Brasilia and ILO SRO Lima - Poverty Eradication, employment creation and gender equality policies for the IE in Latin America; countries covered are Brazil, Ecuador; main themes are macro policy, representation, addressing vulnerabilities and productivity. Level of intervention: macro. Project languages: Spanish, Portuguese.

Asia: SRO Bangkok - IE, poverty and employment: an integrated approach; covers Cambodia Mongolia and Thailand; main themes addressed are representation, market access, vulnerabilities and macro policy; mixed level(s) of intervention (macro, meso); project languages (Region/HQ language listed first) English, Cambodian, Mongolian, Thai.

Europe: ILO SRO Moscow - Reducing poverty by promoting employment of youth and other vulnerable groups in the IE of Central Asia and Caucasus; countries covered are Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Georgia; main themes are macro policy, governance, market access, addressing vulnerabilities; main level of intervention: macro; project languages English

1.1 Specifications

The documents used to establish the evaluation specifications are the service contract and the original project document referred to below.

1.1.1 *Service contract for independent evaluation*

On 11 October 2005 the International Labour Organisation and *Zegers TQM* signed a service contract by which the latter took on the task to perform work according to the following Terms of Reference:

Mr Luis L. Zegers (for *Zegers TQM*) will undertake an independent evaluation of “Knowledge Sharing on Decent Work and the informal economy in the context of poverty reduction” for project INT/03/M57/UKM (Iris project 10838).

Evaluation is to be done in relation to:

- efficiency (actual performance against planned action)
- effectiveness
- impact
- relevance to (a) poverty reduction, (b) strengthening the ILO’s internal knowledge-sharing
- sustainability and future linkages
- gender-sensitivity
- lessons learned
- recommendations

The evaluator is to refer to:

- ILO guidelines on project evaluation, including guidelines on gender-mainstreaming
- Project documents, products, electronic and other files, and other relevant information that will be provided to the evaluator (including the ILO-DfID Partnership Framework Agreement and the ILC 2002 conclusions on DW and the informal economy).
- Interviews with project staff and project clients.

The evaluator will participate as a silent observer in the Final Knowledge-sharing Workshop for DfID-funded projects on the informal economy (Siem Reap, Cambodia, from 28 November to 1 Dec. 2005) and use this period for interviews with participating staff. A debriefing taking place on 2 December between the evaluator and the Knowledge-Sharing project staff.

The evaluator will deliver an oral evaluation report at a mutually agreed time during the week of 9 January 2006. The evaluator’s written report, in Word and/or Excel, will be delivered by 23 January 2006.

These ToR are part of a standard ILO service contract N° 40007690 / 0 dated 11-OCT-05.

1.1.2 *Project document*

The project document (see Annex III) establishes the project’s purpose as “to contribute to an integrated, coherent programme of work on DW and the IE across the ILO, taking into account the context of poverty reduction and the tripartite conclusions of the 2002 International Labour Conference , by:

- (a) facilitating interchange between the field and headquarters in the preparation, implementation and evaluation of ILO activities targeting the IE, and
- (b) having good practices, tools, lessons learned, findings of studies, etc. in relation to DW and the IE collected and shared between headquarters and the field, and made more visible to constituents and others, particularly the development community.”

The document also defines the project as a “knowledge umbrella project for four field-based DfID-funded technical cooperation projects that take various approaches to the issues, with their interventions planned at different levels (micro, meso, macro)”.

It makes reference, too, to the outcomes of the staff workshop held in Turin and the mapping exercise conducted by INTEGRATION and GENPROM during the first half of 2003, both held in the first half of 2003, as the basis to develop a conceptual framework for project implementation and focus on the support to communities of practice.

The project document also makes reference to the ILO Programme and Budget for 2004-05 (p. 102), indicating that this project was designed to sustain an efficient network for knowledge exchange, enhancement and dissemination. Also, to share good practice in selected development fora with a view to reaching wider audiences that focus on poverty reduction. In addition, CODEV indicated its wish to explore using the project as a vehicle for strengthening ILO capacity in impact assessment.

Organisationally, the project document foresees that INTEGRATION would involve CTAs, the principal ILO official for each of the field-based projects, in shaping the knowledge sharing activities and ensure the participation of ACT/EMP and ACTRAV, GENDER, CODEV and PROGRAM in an advisory capacity through interaction with the Working Group on the IE.

Finally, lessons learnt are expected to be fed back into ILO management and to constituents, with a view to strengthening the ILO's future work on the IE.

A simplified logframe chart attached to the project document summarises key planning elements. (A revised version of January 2004 is attached in Annex VI)

1.2 Project history

1.2.1 *Initial period*

During the period July-December 2003 activities were highlighted by initial contacts between INTEGRATION and the field-based projects to explain what was envisaged and to explore interest in knowledge sharing as a tool for the accomplishment of field-project objectives. The initial phase was essentially preparatory as the field-based projects were still being set up and recruiting staff. Various activities took place including development workshops, further KS learning and planning retreats for key field and HQ staff, website development, and initial planning for project networking.

1.2.2 *First year implementation*

2004 could be considered as the first year of actual implementation of the KS project. During the first half of this year, work focused on three areas: (a) developing and launching a resource database of ILO work on the IE to meet the field projects’ expressed need for information going beyond each others’ projects and reaching broader audiences, (b) providing support to the field-based projects in relation to their use of impact assessment, KS and selected areas of

substantive interest, and (c) preparing for next steps in the project that aimed at showcasing good practices on DW and the IE for KS with constituents and development audiences.

During the second half of the year, further development of tools to carry forward integrated work on DW and the IE took place, in preparation for the identification and showcasing of ILO good practices. Ideas continued to emerge through the project interaction with initiatives at the national level, wider ILO processes, and research agendas. The project continued to use the initial conceptual framework, while building on it through the development of a model of change as a working tool for addressing the IE. Staff experience with KS techniques also grew.

1.2.3 *Second year implementation*

2005 was the peak year of activity for all four ILO/DfID-funded projects as well as for the Department at HQ.

The main activity during the first half of the year was to prepare and present a Knowledge Fair on DW and the IE. Preparations had started in the second half of 2004 with preliminary discussions with the Office’s WGIE followed by the agreement of the officers of the GB for the activity. Once agreement had been obtained a call for submissions of good practice in relation to decent work and the informal economy was made. Out of more than 60 submissions for inclusion, approximately 30 were showcased in the Fair’s main exhibit. The fair took place during a one week period (8-15 June 2005) that coincided with part of the ILO’s annual International Labour Conference. It was held in the Palais des Nations in Geneva where most of the Conference activities took place. It included an exhibition in three languages, a detailed documentation guide including explanations and contact information on each project, examples of work on the IE, a multi-media presentation on the model of change for the IE, tutorials on the ILO IE Resource Database, a video corner including videos shows from various projects, three discussion panels with ILO constituents, staff and academics, and a display of handicrafts and other objects produced in the context of the DfID-funded projects on the IE.

This year, the project also contributed to using the model of change for the IE in several countries. Other on-going activities include the regular updating of the IE Resources Database, which now contains approximately 700 entries (over 400 publicly available), in June 2005 it came up first on a Google search of “informal economy”. The Policy Integration Department also continues to moderate the IE section of the virtual forum.

At the end of the year, the end-of-project workshop took place. This workshop was the third and final meeting organised as part of a series of cross-office KS initiatives under the project. It took place in Siem Reap, Cambodia from 28 November – 1 December 2005. The purpose of the workshop was to share lessons learned and to serve as a basis for planning future action in the context of country programming and conceptual development. It was attended by project staff from the four technical projects linked by the KS project (Bangkok, Brasilia, Dar-es-Salaam, and Moscow), as well as representatives from the various HQ sectors, the Gender Bureau, and other KS projects of the ILO.

Together with producing a number of outputs in relation to each of the DfID-funded field projects, the workshop produced an update of the model of change, a collection of conclusions and lessons learnt on KS in relation to DW and the IE as well as the base conceptual elements for an integrated TC proposal including initial framework ideas for: (a) Up-scaling of micro-interventions for local economic and social development, (b) Influencing and applying national DW policies, (c) Connecting institutions and their knowledge sharing, (d) Information and Knowledge sharing, (e) Suggestions on policy and development. Furthermore, the end-of-project workshop produced detailed sets of suggestions on: (i) Model of change, (ii) Community of practice, (iii) TC proposal, (iv) Role of INTEGRATION.

1.2.4 *Concluding period*

The concluding period, which extends throughout the first two months of 2006 is part of the ToR for this evaluation and is therefore not covered by this report.

2 **Methodology**

In order to meet the evaluation requirements established by the ToR within the timeframe, the following methodology was proposed to and approved by the INTEGRATION Department:

- ☐ Desk review of the project history (see bibliography);
- ☐ Assessment of the appropriateness of project design in relation to the evaluation specifications of the ToR;
- ☐ Assessment of project results within the framework given by the ToR;

Together with an analysis of the project reporting documentation, the design and results would be assessed through a questionnaire (see Annex IV) mailed to a sample group of 104 persons proposed by the INTEGRATION Department who supposedly had partial or full knowledge of the project through their participation in project activities or as staff involved in implementation.

Interviews of key field-project staff and key HQ staff from departments directly related to the project would be carried out to support the evaluation process (see Annex V).

The independent evaluator would attend the end-of-project workshop as a silent participant to interview participants included on the sample list and obtain overall information about the project implementation.

2.1 Hypothesis

The hypothesis made for the evaluation suggests that it would be difficult to obtain specific data and that the response to questionnaires was going to be slow and limited. The final material would most probably constitute a number of opinions from people who had a high degree of knowledge about specific aspects of the project, but not necessarily about the overall picture. The data was probably going to show a large spectrum of opinions, each with a low level of statistical significance.

2.2 Process:

Activity	Dates
<input type="checkbox"/> Review of the documentation provided by INTEGRATION to the independent evaluator, including a review of progress reports	14 Oct. 2005 – 20 Jan. 2006
<input type="checkbox"/> Information-gathering meetings with INTEGRATION	17 Oct. 2005 07 Nov. 2005
<input type="checkbox"/> Identification by INTEGRATION of the core group of collaborators from whom project evaluation data would be collected	17 Oct. 2005
<input type="checkbox"/> Identification of key project staff to be interviewed by independent evaluator	17 Oct. 2005
<input type="checkbox"/> Elaboration of a standard project evaluation questionnaire	15 Nov. 2005
<input type="checkbox"/> Issue of questionnaire and request for responses by independent evaluator after introduction to core group by INTEGRATION	22 Nov. 2005
<input type="checkbox"/> Attendance of independent evaluator as observer to end-of-project workshop	28 Nov. 2005 – 02 Dec. 2005
<input type="checkbox"/> Interviews of key staff attending end-of-project workshop during workshop	28 Nov. 2005 – 02 Dec. 2005

Activity	Dates
<input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation data-gathering from key project & departments’ staff	28 Nov. 2005 – 16 Dec. 2005
<input type="checkbox"/> Independent analysis of evaluation data by independent evaluator (protection of core group personal privacy)	03 Dec. 2005 – 20 Jan. 2006
<input type="checkbox"/> Collection of project evaluation questionnaire and data analysis	28 Nov 2005 – 13 Jan. 2006
<input type="checkbox"/> Data processing	09 Dec. 2005 – 17 Jan 2006
<input type="checkbox"/> Elaboration of evaluation report	09 Dec. 2005 – 20 Jan 2006
<input type="checkbox"/> Handover of evaluation report	23 Jan. 2006

2.3 Data collection – See chart A².

☐ Response:

Of the 104 selected respondents, 49% did not reply even after a reminder and extension of the deadline; an additional 4.8% were absent from their offices during the survey period; another 4.8% encountered IT problems either because the e-mail address given to the evaluator was incorrect or because the respondents’ data were lost in the web before reaching the evaluation office; 6.7% of respondents indicated that they were not related to the project and could not reply to the questionnaire. 34.6% had consistent replies to contribute.

☐ Valid cluster

The 36.6% that had consistent replies is divided as follows: 28.8% returned fully or partially-filled questionnaires; 4.8% provided comments but reported not having enough involvement in the project to be able to reply to specific questions, and 1.0% indicated having no interest in the ILO activity any longer.

The valid cluster is thus composed of 36 respondents of which 83.3% returned questionnaires, 13.9% returned comments and 2.8% has no interest in ILO activities any longer. (See chart B)

☐ Knowledge-cluster

The 83.3% of respondents who returned questionnaires (30) are considered the “knowledge-cluster” in the survey. These respondents contributed specific replies either to open questions or to check-box questions.

2.4 Statistical method

According to ILO guidelines for evaluation, the type of data analysed here could be classified as “dirty data” given their characteristics, size and the short time to carry out the research. These types of data would probably not qualify for traditionally strict and academic types of statistical analysis. However, in spite of these characteristics, some general tendencies can be calculated.

An application of the Pareto analysis method was used to identify major tendencies by considering significant any variable result showing a frequency of 80% or above or groups of results from a given variable that would add up to a coherent tendency. For example a result indicating that the knowledge-cluster opinions about how well a given team handled a situation

² A set of data analysis charts is attached in Annex I – Survey Analysis Charts.

could be: Very badly = 5%, Badly = 15%, Well = 60%, Very well = 20%. The conclusion, in this case, would be that the respondents’ opinion is significant on the fact that “the given team handled the situation well”.

In the case of open questions, the number of questions responded to was used to calculate the proportion of knowledge about the topic of the question in relation to the number of “Don’t know” or blank replies. Each opinion provided is listed under the appropriate question transcript in Annex II – Survey Text Transcriptions

For the data analysed from check-box questions, two indicators were calculated:

- ☐ **S indicator:** a measure indicating the proportion of respondents in the knowledge-cluster responding to the particular question, in other words, the level of “knowledge-sharing” or “significance” of the number of responses within the knowledge-cluster for a given variable. If the “S indicator” is 80% or above, the opinion provided by the respondents from the knowledge-cluster, including its frequency distribution, will be considered significant.
- ☐ **K indicator:** questions were designed with four possible “knowledge” alternative answers divided in two degrees of negative perception and two degrees of positive perception. The K indicator is a proportional measure representing the sum of the positive replies from the responding group. For instance, in the example given above, the K indicator would be 80%.

For many years statistical analysis has required costly surveys of large populations which most of the time have only confirmed the perception of a small group with “insider knowledge” or sometimes even insinuated wrong knowledgeable opinions advanced by groups of initiates with a broad perspective who turned out to be correct in the long-run.

This survey analysis is an attempt to bring out the opinions of those who have direct knowledge of the project and/or have genuine interest in the impact of ILO’s work and at the same time to measure the level and value of KS achieved by the project.

Ideally, for confidence in the result, both indicators should be 80% or above, demonstrating that there is a large-enough group amongst the knowledge-cluster who feel in a position to give an opinion on a given subject and that the positive portion of the reply is high enough for the opinion to be considered significantly positive.

In other words, this method gives credit to three qualitative aspects of the collected data: the weight of KS by assessing its significance through the S indicator, the range of impact of the shared knowledge through analysis of the variable’s frequency distribution, and the weight of the positive aspects of the shared knowledge by assessing its significance through the K indicator.

3 Findings

Findings are reported below in three styles:

(3.1) reporting analysis describes the evaluator’s understanding of the problems, constraints and lessons learnt, identified through reviewing INTEGRATION Department’s progress reports to DfID;

(3.2) analysis of the survey questionnaire is reported in two ways: (a) check-box question results are analysed using S and K indicators and frequency-distribution charts shown in Annex I; (b) open questions are analysed on the basis of the coincidence or variety of opinions transcribed from the questionnaire into Annex II; the proportion of opinions collected is used as the S indicator and the K indicator to provide the positive distribution of the opinions shared.

(4) analysis of the interview notes and the evaluator’s own experience and knowledge of the ILO was used to compile the section on conclusions.

3.1 Reporting analysis

3.1.1 *Initial period*

- ☐ Problems and constraints:
 - ☐ Difficulties in communicating the role of INTEGRATION as a facilitator and/or catalyst for KS.
 - ☐ Delays in starting field-projects activities which subsequently turned into delays in starting interchange of information and knowledge.
 - ☐ Difficulty in the design process of the logical framework, particularly in matching it with a participatory approach in design and in translating it into effective indicators.
 - ☐ Absence of a knowledge-sharing culture and related practices in the ILO, and reticence about independent impact assessment in some of the projects.
- ☐ Lessons learnt:
 - ☐ better communication is needed between ILO/HQ and the field, and between field structures;
 - ☐ knowledge sharing will only work if staff see a benefit from it for their project and themselves;
 - ☐ the logical framework for KS should be done immediately after the concept note on any topic, followed by validation aligned with the related project(s);
 - ☐ different projects participating in a KS endeavour should include explicit KS and impact assessment components from the outset rather than adding them at later stages.

3.1.2 *First-year implementation*

- ☐ Problems and constraints:
 - ☐ Three of the four field-based projects had been drawn up without awareness of the concept note on the informal economy prepared in the TC-RAM process, and all but one of the field projects had not initially planned or budgeted for KS activities.
 - ☐ The short duration of the field projects and delays in starting activities in the field had distracted field projects' attention from KS; they were overstretched.
 - ☐ Persistent knowledge gaps in the areas of governance and macro policies as related to the informal economy were a constraint that went beyond the project's ability to remedy.
 - ☐ Absence of a KS culture/incentives and related practices in the ILO, some nervousness about independent impact assessment, and limited planning of resources for evaluation.
 - ☐ Further evidence of the absence of a KS culture within the ILO was provided by the low level of participation in the virtual forum and the inexperience of participants or potential participants in IT-developed opportunities, such as the Knowledge Fair.
 - ☐ Too limited budget to support both staff and activities demanded substantial use of time by ILO regular staff, who could devote only a portion of their time to the KS project. This resulted in the Department's having to allocate regular budget funds to hire staff to organize the Knowledge Fair.
 - ☐ The fact that the KS component was added on to already-designed projects which did not include it in their original work plans increased the difficulties to develop the project efficiently, as it was necessary to get field-staff to integrate the concept into their already-projected work.

- ☐ A workshop in Montevideo uncovered further difficulties such as: assessing impact in projects with such short time frames, developing methodologies for process-oriented projects, the use of empirical methods because of the lack of impact at the macro level, and inadequate funding to identify and research adequate baselines.
- ☐ As for impact assessment constraints were: too short duration of the projects, lack of field capacity to use these techniques, underestimation of resources allocated to these activities, difficulty to quantify and even identify measurable impacts and quality of some activities such as policy advising, mainstreaming and awareness-raising.
- ☐ Lessons learnt:
 - ☐ the process of sharing initiatives requires a wide net of partners, while retaining focus on a few areas of major interest;
 - ☐ the decision to proceed slowly at the beginning was a sound one; this allowed at later stages a better use of resources, better response to field-project needs and a better ability to cast a wider net for good practices to be showcased more effectively to the development community;
 - ☐ some KS methods work better than others in the ILO. Those that bring people together, face to face, seem to have more success than electronic and more impersonal means;
 - ☐ the model of change approach is useful for reflection, planning and acting on DW and the IE;
 - ☐ a large amount of money is needed to carry out a serious impact assessment of a project;
 - ☐ the timing of this project was not optimal. Although mapping of ILO work on the informal economy had begun before the project started, it would have also been useful to carry out a substantive analysis of content, extent and coherence before starting the projects.
 - ☐ KS field-projects should have three stages: (a) situation analysis to serve as input at start, (b) support to and supply of KS techniques throughout implementation, (c) feeding of lessons learnt into future work;
 - ☐ if all projects start at the same time, it is difficult to identify useful information to share amongst projects early on. However, interaction with other ILO work was fruitful.

3.1.3 Second-year implementation

- ☐ Problems and constraints:
 - ☐ Organisers of the Knowledge Fair found that the biggest constraint in the implementation of it was financial in spite of considerable additional resources contributed by ILO's Policy Integration Department.
 - ☐ The organisation of the Knowledge Fair also suffered from the GB's slow decision-making process as the agreement from the GB could only be obtained slightly over 6 months before the activity took place. This reduced the preparation period significantly.
 - ☐ The third constraint in organising the Knowledge Fair was the organiser's own lack of experience and expertise in organising an activity of the sort.
 - ☐ Although project staff consider that the main goals of the project are being achieved in terms of formal achievements, there are still many obstacles to root KS in the ILO culture:

- from the beginning the project faced scepticism and a certain degree of suspicion from the field and from ILO partners and about the role of INTEGRATION - in this project and beyond;
- the project has achieved some awareness, but has not achieved an integrated programme of work or a real community of practice;
- competition for funds, concern with ownership of areas of work and lack of public evidence of upper management’s commitments to KS created serious and at times insurmountable obstacles.
- The complete novelty of the concept of community of practice was difficult to introduce and be understood by a traditional “silo” approach in planning and execution, even if project staff could build on past work done in the area of IE.
- Resistance to KS in the area of gender equality (staff appear to think that they are already doing it). However, the concept doesn’t seem to be understood and people tend to see it as additional work.
- High demand for and disorganised over-supply of knowledge, unclear knowledge management, uncoordinated sharing of project experience, expertise and knowledge generation.
- Difficulty to obtain consensus among staff to embrace the ILC conclusions on the IE delayed a broader outreach to constituents and the development community, with a negative effect on the process quality dimension and especially the identification of policy complementarities and incoherences, as well as the development of the IE section of the virtual forum and full open KS within the ILO. .
- Not having a fully developed KS culture within the ILO hinders the development of external processes, preventing valuable knowledge from being used at country or local levels where it is most needed and impairs efforts to encourage it at these levels.
- □ Lessons learnt:
 - the team organising the Knowledge Fair was pleasantly surprised by the interest expressed by staff from every sector and from both HQ and field offices, in sharing their good practices in spite of time and money constraints;
 - having the Knowledge Fair during the ILC has advantages and disadvantages:
 - the potential audience of well over 3000 persons;
 - delegates and NGO representatives are drawn to the Conference for reasons linked to its main agenda, and the Fair competes with it for delegates’ and representatives’ time.
 - it is estimated that 500 persons visited the Fair;
 - the Fair was worth a try since it produced valuable lessons for the future and for others wishing to organize a similar activity. These lessons were captured and documented in a review held two days after the event;
 - The biggest success (as evaluated by the staff) was the very professional, attractive and inclusive exhibit. The biggest challenge was in terms of communication and marketing which suffered due to lack of expertise, time and money;
 - the Fair proved that KS only works if staff see a benefit from it and adequate incentives are offered. This was an opportunity for the field projects to show their achievements to a large audience. Project staff contributions did not cost more than the time to prepare their submissions;

- there is still confusion, lack of coherence and lack of focus in relation to KS. Mechanisms to bring out messages do not yet exist. There is a need to find a way to preserve what’s been done by these projects and to bring it up to higher levels. KS should be facilitated, and funded;
- KS helps project staff to have a better idea of what others in the ILO are doing and to harmonize projects with other areas of ILO work. This is another reason that explains why funding KS is important;
- Given the short duration of the projects, drawing on experience from other countries is considered most important to ensure appropriate results;
- The use of the model of change proved to be a very good experience as it allowed staff to analyse the process and understand different impact perspectives;
- Effective interventions on DW and the IE require relationship with employers’ and workers’ organizations in order to develop an integrated approach through better understanding of the key roles such organizations play and identifying issues of common interest.
- On one hand, gender equality is not always the best avenue to use as an entry point for dialogue given the fact that other projects have been successful in developing gender mainstreaming strategies and many people no longer consider it as a value-adding process. However, on the other hand, KS has served as an entry point for social dialogue and cross-sectoral collaboration, including specific inputs required on the gender equality agenda.
- This project has demonstrated that linking KS with TC projects strengthens the coherence and visibility of ILO activities at field level: This DfiD-funded umbrella project served to facilitate informal exchange of ideas, information and best practices and it also triggered useful exchanges between IE and other knowledge sharing projects. Some of the most successful outputs include the Resource Database on the IE, the Knowledge Fair, the conceptual framework and the model of change. In addition, high levels of constituent engagement and use of opportunities and tools offered by the project has been noticed throughout the development community.
- Technically, many countries still need innovative tools. The need to develop a database containing main conclusions and recommendations on TC projects and lessons learnt is crucial, especially as a way to record institutional knowledge from those who leave the Organisation.

3.2 Survey³

As explained at the end of section 2.3, the results of the survey represent the responses of 30 (28.8%) of 104 field-project and HQ staff having direct or indirect involvement with the project INT/03/M57/UKM: “Knowledge Sharing on decent work and the informal economy in the context of poverty reduction” (Iris project 10838). This group is referred to as the “knowledge-cluster” in the survey.

3.2.1 *Project design assumptions*

The survey questionnaire was designed to measure respondents’ opinions about how true they perceived project design assumptions turned out to be through five questions providing check-boxes for the following alternative replies for each assumption: totally false, rather false, rather true and totally true.

³ Each bullet specifies the number of the statistical analysis chart in Annex I.

□ Chart 1 – How true or how false did initial Project design assumptions turn out to be?

An average of 76.7% (S indicator) of the knowledge-cluster replied to the five questions in this section of the questionnaire. Although the S indicator is high, it does not reach the level of significance desired to prove clear evidence of knowledge sharing intention or capability, for all assumptions made at the project design stage. Nevertheless, assumptions 1.a) and 1.b) do reach that level.

The distribution of replies shows a well distributed frequency bell and a K indicator of 71.7% suggesting that the level of KS within the knowledge-cluster, although fairly high, is not high enough to consider the overall knowledge-cluster opinion significant.

Given the high level of interest to collaborate, demonstrated by the members of the knowledge-cluster, the most plausible causes of the low S indicator may be unintentional ignorance of the project process and progress due to narrow or lack of information flow within the group and/or further underlying causes.

□ Chart 1a – Continued political support within the ILO to follow-up on the ILC 2002 conclusions on decent work and the informal economy

A respectable 87.5% S indicator demonstrates that a significant number of knowledge-cluster members do have an opinion whether or not this assumption is correct. The K indicator, at 80%, shows that the cluster’s opinion is indeed significantly positive but within a wide variance including an important number with negative opinions.

An assumption could be made that some of the negative opinions may be rooted in the variety of the ILO tripartite constituency.

□ Chart 1b – Growing appreciation among staff and constituents of the value of an integrated approach to work on this topic and the value of knowledge-sharing for themselves and the ILO

As a whole, this is by far the most significant reply in the survey. 90% of the knowledge-cluster have a clear opinion about the truthfulness of this assumption (S indicator) and within the respondents, the K indicator runs up to 93.6 % with a distribution that includes an 18.5% tendency towards “totally true”.

This result demonstrates that there are great expectations amongst those with knowledge and understanding of the current internal and external change processes and that integrated processes and KS are critical for the success of current and future ILO work.

□ Chart 1c – Acceptance by the Senior Management and the Regional Directors to examine recommendations emerging from this project, and to take action on them in future programme and budget exercises within the ILO

No significance of opinions with an S indicator at 63.3% and a K indicator only at 73.5%.

This suggests that amongst the knowledge-cluster, although there is a majority but not significant proportion, of positive opinions about Senior Management’s and Regional Directors’ willingness to examine recommendations emerging from this project and to take action on them in the future and in budget exercises within the ILO, there is also a big enough group who believes the contrary. These inconclusive results would appear to show that Senior Management and Regional Directors, even if they are or were willing to examine results and take action, have not managed to convince staff clearly of these intentions.

□ Chart 1d – External development fora will agree to ILO participation in panels to showcase work done on the informal economy

An S indicator at 76.7% shows that there isn’t enough flow of information about this issue within the knowledge-cluster to enable a significant number of them to have a

formed opinion, although amongst those who have an opinion the K indicator runs at 95.7% showing a fair frequency distribution.

This could imply that if confidence is placed in those who apparently know what they are talking about it may be “rather true” that external development fora will agree to ILO participation in panels to showcase work done on the IE.

☐ Chart 1e – Field-based projects relating to the informal economy achieve the expected results

The S indicator at 70.0% shows that almost a third of the knowledge-cluster does not know or does not have an opinion. The K indicator just above the significance level, at 81.0%, represents an important group believing that this assumption is false or totally false.

Obviously, the knowledge-cluster does not have enough information to give a consistent opinion and the size of the group that dares to make a positive opinion is too small to prove that the limited significant level of positive replies is reliable, particularly as the frequency distribution curve shows a wide slant towards the negative extreme.

The opinion on the truthfulness of this assumption is therefore considered inconclusive.

3.2.2 *Role of constituents during implementation*

☐ Strengths

All questionnaire replies were first transcribed verbatim into the document entitled Survey text transcriptions, (See paragraph 2a). 53.3% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 2a) provided inputs on this issue. The paragraph below shows the evaluator’s interpretation of these opinions:

The answers to this question suggest that the role of constituents during implementation can be explained as an opportunity to participate which has been well taken advantage of by some including: encouraging ownership and social dialogue, increased visibility and focus, commitment in project areas, increased ability to customise tools and techniques, sustain responses and access to information.

☐ Weaknesses

All questionnaire replies were first transcribed verbatim into the document entitled Survey text transcriptions, (See paragraph 2b). 56.7% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 2b) provided inputs on this issue. The paragraph below shows the evaluator’s interpretation of these opinions:

Limited understanding of the extent and complexity of the IE and unclear definition of ILO’s role within it, probably due to attachment to traditional institutional roles of vertical and “exclusive” work-environments, limited understanding of the KS component and of its potential, inability to achieve efficient interaction with private sector resulting in lack of appropriate information and guidance for consistent and sustainable work.

3.2.3 *Effects of the Project’s management arrangements*

☐ Success

All questionnaire replies were first transcribed verbatim into the document entitled Survey text transcriptions, (See paragraph 3a). 70.0% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 3a) provided inputs on this issue. The paragraph below shows the evaluator’s interpretation of these opinions:

Those who were directly related to the project activities feel that management arrangements were quite successful and supportive, providing an efficient and cooperative

environment and the basis for a community of practice around the project objectives. They praised team management for their abilities in practically all aspects of project and team management disciplines. Project management helped build relationships amongst ILO staff working on aspects of IE in different countries and under different conditions, so that they could learn from each other. Participation in global fora was improved and the Knowledge Fair was a promising success.

□ Weaknesses

All questionnaire replies were first transcribed verbatim into the document entitled Survey text transcriptions, (See paragraph 3b). 60.0% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 3b) provided inputs on this issue. The paragraphs below show the evaluator's interpretation of these opinions:

Respondents who were not immediately related to the project activities were extremely critical of what they considered to be a lack of communications; this included regional staff who felt isolated from information about other regional projects and at times from HQ technical support. In general, criticism was aired about initial lack of communications about the project itself creating suspicion and lack of transparency in relation to HQ departments and a failure to involve other units effectively.

Project design and project management was considered weak, understaffed and lacking formal designation of critical roles for project management. This generated a number of weaknesses ranging from definition of objectives, clarification of KS concepts to lack of concrete plans to sustain achievements.

3.2.4 Contribution of the Project towards the achievement of ILO's operational objectives

This section of the survey questionnaire was designed to measure respondents' opinions about how well the project addressed ILO's operational objectives during implementation through ten questions providing the following alternative replies for each operational objective: extremely badly, badly, well, extremely well, don't know.

□ Chart 4 – Contribution of the Project towards the achievement of ILO's operational objectives

The average S indicator for the ten operational objectives is 47.7% within a range of 33.3% to 53.3%. This demonstrates that an important number of knowledge-cluster members did not feel they could provide an opinion about how well the project had addressed any of ILO's operational objectives.

These results demonstrate that there wasn't enough exchange of information between projects to allow others to provide an opinion about projects or project activities they were not involved with directly.

Another important cause for this situation is the fact that projects did not focus on all objectives at the same time and each had its own set of ILO operational objectives on which to focus. So, respondents who knew about one project or project activity specifically could reply only about that one. This situation reduced the size of the real-knowledge group, and in order to differentiate significant achievement with more accuracy, the 20/80 rule applied so far was tightened to 10/90, considering significant in this case only those variables with a K index equal or above 90%.

Thus, five sets of replies show significant K indicators in spite of the low number of respondents replying (S indicator). If we assume that in this case the actual respondents have accurate knowledge about how well the known project or project activity addressed its respective ILO operational objective, we could say that these projects have been successful in addressing the following ILO operational objectives:

ILO’s operational objectives

(from best to worse)

Indicators

K S

<input type="checkbox"/> Employment policy support	100.0%	53.3%
<input type="checkbox"/> Knowledge, skills and employability	100.0%	50.0%
<input type="checkbox"/> Employment creation	100.0%	43.3%
<input type="checkbox"/> Social partners	93.8%	53.3%
<input type="checkbox"/> Governments and institutions of social dialogue	93.8%	53.3%

Another difficulty to ascertain accuracy with small samples like these arises also from the fact that it is not possible to determine exactly whether the results rely more on subjectivity than on impartial professional perception. However, after experiencing the high level of professionalism in reporting and in discussion observed by the evaluator amongst the participants in the end-of-project seminar, the latter seems to be the most adequate alternative to value these results.

Following the same trend of thought, the following ILO operational objectives were not addressed adequately:

ILO’s operational objectives

(from worse to best)

Indicators

K S

<input type="checkbox"/> Normative action	70.0%	33.3%
<input type="checkbox"/> Child labour	75.0%	40.0%
<input type="checkbox"/> Standards and fundamental principles and rights at work	75.0%	53.3%
<input type="checkbox"/> Social security	78.6%	46.7%
<input type="checkbox"/> Labour protection	80.0%	50.0%

Greater technical collaboration between projects or peer auditing would most probably have increased the scope and significance of these results.

Specific analysis details on how well ILO’s operational objectives were addressed by these projects are shown on Charts 4a to 4j.

3.2.5 Contribution of the Project towards the achievement of Regional and/or Sub-regional priorities

This section of the survey questionnaire was designed to measure respondents’ opinions about how well the project addressed Regional and Sub-regional priorities during implementation through eight questions providing the following alternative replies for each regional priority: extremely badly, badly, well, extremely well, don’t know.

- ☐ Chart 5 – Contribution of the Project towards the achievement of Regional and/or Sub-regional priorities

The average S indicator for the eight priorities is 31.7% within a range of 20.0% to 43.3%. This demonstrates that an even more important number of knowledge-cluster members did not feel they could provide an opinion about how well the project had addressed these priorities.

The causes for this are mainly related to the respondents’ individual knowledge about the disciplines required to tackle priorities and their personal involvement in a particular regional or sub-regional project. These results demonstrate even more clearly that there was no exchange of information between projects to allow others to provide an opinion about activities they were not involved in directly.

In order to increase confidence in the differentiation of achievements, the 10/90 rule was applied once more. If we assume again that in this case the actual respondents have accurate knowledge about how well the known project addressed these priorities, we could say that only three regional priorities have been successfully addressed by these field projects:

Priorities (from best to worse)	Indicators	
	K	S
<input type="checkbox"/> Europe - Governance	100.0%	20.0%
<input type="checkbox"/> Asia & Pacific – Informal economy	92.3%	43.3%
<input type="checkbox"/> Asia & Pacific – Social inclusion	91.7%	40.0%

As explained in the previous section, the difficulty to ascertain accuracy with small samples like these remains, as well as the difficulty to ascertain confidence on the choice of whether or not to rely on demonstrated professionalism.

According to the same analysis approach, five projects did not address regional or sub-regional priorities adequately:

ILO’s operational objectives (from worse to best)	Indicators	
	K	S
<input type="checkbox"/> Americas – Employment promotion	75.0%	26.7%
<input type="checkbox"/> Africa – Governance	80.0%	33.3%
<input type="checkbox"/> Africa – Poverty reduction	83.3%	40.0%
<input type="checkbox"/> Americas – Poverty reduction	85.7%	23.3%
<input type="checkbox"/> Americas – Women & Youth	87.5%	26.7%

As is the case with the previous section, greater technical collaboration between projects or peer auditing would most probably have increased the scope and significance of these results.

Specific analysis details on how well the project addressed ILO’s operational objectives are shown on Charts 5a to 5h.

3.2.6 *Contribution to ILO’s shared policy objectives in the context of Poverty reduction and informal economy*

An average of 60.7% of the knowledge-cluster gave opinions about the project’s contribution to ILO’s shared policy objectives. Proportions vary according to objective probably depending on how involved the respondent was with activities contributing to one or another objective. The opinion frequency range varies from 20.0% to 70.0% depending on the objective. This confirms the fact that only people who were close to the implementation of activities related to a specific objectives felt in a position to provide an opinion about it. This situation could have been different had there been more exchange of information and more horizontal collaboration between projects.

a. Decent work:

- ☐ Greatest achievements: (Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 6ai)

60.0% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 6a.i) provided inputs on this issue.

Opinions: Visibility for ILO, global relevance of and advocacy for DW; integrated view; link to IE and poverty reduction; beginning of dialogue with governments; initiation of further research; elaboration of model of change; awareness raising; inclusion in the global agenda.

- ☐ Most important failures: ([Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 6a.ii](#))

36.7% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 6a.ii) provided inputs on this issue.

Opinions: Limited information-sharing within the ILO; lack of research; limited concrete actions; lack of marketing DW; insufficient work on DW in the IE; weak plan of action; limited interaction with social partners; need for more successful experiences of collaboration work with social partners.

b. Poverty reduction and social inclusion

- ☐ Greatest achievements: ([Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 6b.i](#))

26.7% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 6b.i) provided inputs on this issue.

Opinions: Provision of jobs to the vulnerable; information for relevant programme implementation; model of change; alignment of strategies with PR & SI & local and national PR; policy development; assistance to retrenched workers and home workers; creation of jobs for lower socio-economic strata; increased awareness about the interaction between the IE, poverty and social exclusion

- ☐ Most important failures: ([Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 6b.ii](#))

20.0% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 6b.ii) provided inputs on this issue.

Opinions: No policy advice or instrument to apply at large scale; local development models for employment generation not replicated; inability to document impact; no impact on casual labour; lack of effective interaction and coordination on employment development policies and PR, still too weak; lack of systematic approaches, research and citizen participation.

c. Gender Equality

- ☐ Greatest achievements: ([Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 6c.i](#))

53.3% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 6c.i) provided inputs on this issue.

Opinions: Significant breakthroughs in Africa for women in PR; good handling of “hidden” work issues; strong gender emphasis throughout; involvement of all ILO staff; advice on PR; inclusion of gender in public debate; high participation of women; demonstrated project management commitment; training to entrepreneurs; greater participation in decision making and labour market; gender equality principle integrated in political discussion and regional agenda.

- ☐ Most important failures: ([Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 6c.ii](#))

26.7% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 6c.ii) provided inputs on this issue.

Opinions: Little information about the variety of activities in different regions; GE still faces obstacles due to remaining social and cultural barriers; social partner mobilisation; weak monitoring to ensure gender mainstreaming in project cycle; women’s inferiority complex, cultural barriers, concept still weak.

d. Partnerships

- ☐ Greatest achievements: ([Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 6d.i](#))

46.7% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 6d.i) provided inputs on this issue.

Opinions: Workers’ and employers’ support; internal ILO dialogue and partnerships; attempts to link local and national operations; project networks and information-sharing; tripartite partnerships; focus on the IE to address PR; work with TUs; impact of Knowledge Fair strengthening partnerships between constituents and field-projects; drawing on various sectors; formalised contracts under PPP arrangements; intensified promotion of the need for SD in some field-projects.

- ☐ Most important failures: ([Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 6d.ii](#))

30.0% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 6d.ii) provided inputs on this issue.

Opinions: Not open enough to bring in inputs from other agencies and NGOs; very limited external partnerships; too selective and closed internal partnerships; too many studies and reports; social partners not ready to play active role in the IE; informal and unclear agreements with or between SMEs and CBOs; fragile institutionalisation of SD; lack of method and strategies for public policy and for managing interventions.

e. Knowledge generation

- ☐ Greatest achievements: ([Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 6e.i](#))

50.0% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 6e.i) provided inputs on this issue.

Opinions: Well-written working papers with a chance of impact; useful materials especially model of change and IE Knowledge Fair; enhanced methodologies on employment; data collection and database; virtual forum; policy research; advocacy to raise awareness on the IE; efforts to find appropriate responses; 17th ILC adoption of statistical guidelines on definition of informal employment; sharing of field experiences; produced literature on issues; labour protection outputs for the IE; research on and share of performed practical interventions; transferability of documented experiences.

- ☐ Most important failures: ([Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 6e.ii](#))

36.7% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 6e.ii) provided inputs on this issue.

Opinions: Valuable literature produced not translated and not well disseminated; sometimes papers not well presented and not responding to demand; too slow progress in developing baseline data, monitoring systems and impact measuring methods; exclusion of social protection and standards; too short a time to produce substantial field results; disregard of research papers; lack of clear goals; overestimation of the value of “micro” solutions, inability to analyse results and package information; inability to meet high demand for knowledge, lack of synthesis of results; lack of networks to multiply successes.

f. Knowledge-sharing

- ☐ Greatest achievements: ([Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 6f.i](#))

60.0% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 6f.i) provided inputs on this issue.

Opinions: KS with ILC; creation and maintenance of tools; KS sensitisation; well-structured and well-organised meetings and workshops; exchange between field and HQ; database on the IE; constructive dialogue throughout and share of experiences; network established; field-project work accomplished on PCU guidelines on OSH with MoPH; developmental effect of bringing field-project staff together; effects of promotion of KS amongst local governments; Knowledge Fair on DW and the IE and virtual forum as strong tools for collective learning.

- ☐ Most important failures: ([Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 6f.ii](#))

50.0% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 6f.ii) provided inputs on this issue.

Opinions: Dissemination of the meaning of KS; very limited translation and dissemination of good materials; diversity of field-projects was a constraint for efficient KS; 17% of attendance to Knowledge Fair from potential public is not a success; lack of common indicators for common issues in field-projects; sceptical attitude at the beginning; lack of effective links between two projects and technical units; group too informal and not sustainable; limited scope; lack of ILO staff participation in virtual

forum; too short in time to produce significant results on the IE; not meeting demands from grass-root levels; lack of dissemination of Knowledge Fair at regional level; lack of participation of regional experts in virtual forum; lack of strategy to socialise knowledge.

g. Visibility of ILO work on Poverty Reduction and Informal Economy

- ☐ Greatest achievements: (Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 6g.i)

53.3% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 6g.i) provided inputs on this issue.

Opinions: Project generated HQ interest beyond the level four field-projects would have achieved independently; attention and resources from HQ technical units; increased visibility through Knowledge Fair; being No. 1 on Google search for "informal economy"; attempts to make ILO's involvement in the IE visible; inclusion of governmental agenda into ILO language; local field-project interventions,

- ☐ Most important failures: (Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 6g.ii)

33.3% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 6g.ii) provided inputs on this issue.

Opinions: ILO's structural inability to link work-place interventions with PR and policy level; ILO's inability to involve influential decision-makers on a relevant small-scale project with high potential impact; higher management commitment on the future of ILO work on the IE not secured; PR needs not yet widely recognised; inadequate ILO marketing tools and methodologies; weak synergy within the ILO; no follow-up to Knowledge Fair; no visible rural village; model of change not sufficiently disseminated at regional level, however needed for unifying activities.

3.2.7 Project results

An average of 60.7% of the knowledge-cluster gave opinions about the project's results. Proportions vary according to category of results depending on how involved the respondent was with related activities. The opinion frequency range varies from 20.0% to 50.0% depending on the category. This confirms once more the fact that only people who were close to the implementation of activities relating to a category of results felt in a position to provide an opinion about it. Again too, this situation could have been different had there been more exchange of information and more horizontal collaboration between projects.

a. Efficiency (most efficient performance against Project plans)

From Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 7a

20.0% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 7a) provided inputs on this issue.

Results proposed by respondents:

- ILO's direct technical intervention for national policy formulation
- Information delivery
- Many projects were able to attain their intended results
- OSH Improvement for farmers in 7 provinces
- Knowledge fair
- More jobs and SMEs created than originally planned

b. Effectiveness (most effective method used to achieve objectives)

From Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 7b

33.3% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 7b) provided inputs on this issue.

Results proposed by respondents:

- Involvement of TUs & EOs at national level was a success.
- Nurturing KS
- Technical specialists' expertise and existing ILO tools

- Support to programme/projects on time
- Practical, action-oriented tools (learning by doing)
- Integrated methods were quite useful to achieve objectives
- HQ-field workshops in Turin
- WIND Training
- Meetings (but they should have been longer and more frequent)
- Provision of relevant training, skills and enabling environment

c. Greatest project impact so far

From Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 7c

33.3% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 7c) provided inputs on this issue.

Results proposed by respondents:

- Some visibility for ILO.
- Model of Change on IE
- Increasing ILO's recognition in the region, establishing trust with constituents
- Establishment of network and KS amongst projects
- Contribution to PR and preparation for large-scale intervention in the IE
- OSH improvement among farmers
- Training for TU on legal rights of retrenched workers
- Learning process among projects
- Creation of jobs and income generation opportunities for jobless women, men and youths

d. Relevance to poverty reduction

From Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 7d

33.3 of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 7d) provided inputs on this issue.

Results proposed by respondents:

- The KS project managed to influence the four field-projects.
- Poverty reduction achieved through macro-micro linkages
- Establishment of baseline for poverty monitoring indicators
- Employment and income generation
- Income-generation improvement for the retrenched workers
- Attendance of different units and sectors to meetings; facilitating contact
- Jobs for vulnerable women and men

e. Relevance to strengthening the ILO's internal knowledge-sharing

From Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 7e

50.0% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 7e) provided inputs on this issue.

Results proposed by respondents:

- A lost opportunity since only some privileged few could benefit from KS.
- Knowledge among staff has certainly increased through the database, workshops and publications.
- The project has provided staff with inspiration, ideas and know-how on the IE.
- Attempts for thematic coordination by INTEGRATION and CODEV.
- Fast response to queries on a given problem
- Organisation of KS opportunities (workshops, database)
- The project can serve as a model to extend KS to all TC projects beyond the IE.
- Much unrealised potential
- Labour Administration, Social Security Scheme, and TU roles

- IE database is a valuable resource that brought together all of ILO's documented efforts over the past years to one place.
- Mapping exercise.
- Socialisation of knowledge as a working method for the ILO.

f. Method or achievement for sustainability and future linkages

From Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 7f

31.0% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 7f) provided inputs on this issue.

Results proposed by respondents:

- Model of Change
- Database
- Further fund-raising efforts, while trying to establish more sustainable mechanism
- Continued support to collect information and dissemination
- Partnership with social partners
- Embedding the actions started into government activities
- Not clear; no sustainability
- Too short a time-frame
- Linkages which should lead to strengthen future interaction
- Identified the need to organise the IE
- Effectiveness of certain outputs encourages their continuation whether through the same ILO unit or through another.
- To achieve the objective of collective construction and socialisation of knowledge a methodology containing specific indicators in each project and participatory management models must be included.

g. Achievement in gender-sensitivity

From Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 7g

37.9% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 7g) provided inputs on this issue.

Results proposed by respondents:

- Some interesting interventions could not have happened without the KS Project support.
- Achievement through the RER project, through the model of change, highlighting the protection of the vulnerable.
- Work did take into account the gender differences in the informal economy.
- Achievements were made, but more efforts at micro-level needed for gender-sensitisation.
- Gender mainstreamed in projects, especially in Latin America project in which gender and race issues were mostly addressed.
- 60-70% of participants are women.
- Records and monitoring system in place to ensure that gender has been taken into account.
- Greater effort could have been made to share lessons from individual projects on gender mainstreaming successes and failures.
- GET Ahead training.
- Stock with valuable materials and training-trainers methodologies that require greater use by ILO consultants and specialists in the various areas of intervention such as employment, social security, standards, etc.

h. Most important lesson learnt

From Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 7h

43.3 of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 7h) provided inputs on this issue.

Results proposed by respondents:

- Much better internal Office knowledge-sharing, needed to get away from just a few individuals knowing what is happening, monthly general information meetings that need only be one hour long, more publications that cut across regions and across topics; some general PRSP papers were drafted for ILO/GB meetings, but not widely disseminated afterwards.
- Electronic means of knowledge sharing (i.e. virtual forum) unfortunately is not always the most efficient method since ILO staff do not use them frequently and bringing together CTAs from different projects has actually proved to be more efficient. The knowledge brought out from each workshop should be used to promote future integrated methods for TC work.
- How to implement projects under political instability.
- It is important to have a M&E plan and a baseline study for impact assessment.
- KS was an efficient tool to improve effectiveness of projects (share of experience, tools, etc.)
- Learnt to be practical, action-oriented, people centred.
- It is difficult to fully implement concepts of DW in IE in such a short time.
- Sharing of field experiences is crucial for policy development
- TU training on the IE has increased TU awareness
- KS should be institutionalized and should not be powered merely by external funds.
- Too short and not enough resources (human & financial) to do an in-depth work.
- Employment is a first step out of poverty
- In addition to its direct effects in terms of KS, the Knowledge Fair added valuable systematisation methodologies for pilot programs on which the ILO should do further work.

3.2.8 Project completion targets

From Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 8.

50.0% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 8) provided suggestions that have been grouped according to area of activity:

Immediate priorities

- ☐ An assessment of demonstrated and potential achievements should be made immediately to identify critical financial needs for completion against unused funds or projects without capability for further implementation in order to share allocations as needed to maximise impact;
- ☐ All efforts should be made to complete activities planned within the remaining time span;
- ☐ Dissemination of Project results should be decentralised through tripartite constituents;
- ☐ Field projects and KS project management should define plans for consolidation of achievements before the end of the project.

Internal processes

- ☐ A major internal Office information-sharing meeting should be held, headed by INTEGRATION Department & DfID staff, with simple slide presentations highlighting countries and themes of successful interventions and GB responses so far, and posing challenging questions such as: (i) Why not more overall integrated Office inputs? (ii) Why not better public visibility?

- ☐ The strong roles of TUs and EOs need to be emphasised to highlight their key role in PR and the IE.

Documentation & dissemination

- ☐ Tools, manuals and documents from all projects should be collected and shared;
- ☐ Lessons learnt should be compiled to be disseminated to support future advice.
- ☐ The Knowledge Fair experience on DW and the IE should be repeated taking advantage of national situations at the closing of each project;
- ☐ Suggestions on how field-based projects can sustain their own knowledge-sharing activities should be documented and disseminated before the end.
- ☐ Tangible methods and operational frameworks should be developed for policy development work and for achievable project interventions;
- ☐ A synthesis of the experience gathered and published.

Development

- ☐ Identification of knowledge gaps to assess country needs for TC should prevail over theoretical ILO units' concerns
- ☐ Further development of the model of change is required to help sectors adapt it according to their own assessment of needs and perspectives, to eventually then bring approaches together for further integration of results and continuous improvement.
- ☐ Concrete action areas for on-the-ground impact are needed.
- ☐ Based on the lessons learned in the current phase, outcomes and achievements should be fed into the follow-up process;
- ☐ The project should be continued and expanded in a new phase, especially because many concepts are new, staff and stakeholders are learning;
- ☐ There is a need to improve the sustainability of the systems that has been developed as well as to have a tested model that can be recommended to others with confidence.
- ☐ Country experiences should be researched both amongst these four field-projects and beyond in order to identify worthwhile methods, approaches and activities that can be replicated and potential funding beyond DfID mobilised.

3.2.9 Respondent comments and recommendations

From Survey text transcriptions, paragraph 9.

70.0% of the knowledge-cluster (Chart 9) provided inputs on this issue. The types of suggestions and ideas were as diverse as in the above sections. No particular trend could be identified as the same idea was rarely suggested by two respondents, although they can be grouped around generic paragraphs as shown below.

Project design

Respondents suggested that there are needs for better identification of knowledge-clients, knowledge-products and type of knowledge-delivery means. Greater number of models is desired on various themes such as labour law, social protection and trade unions.

On gender, it is felt that projects would not be complete or of expected quality if they do not integrate analysis and a policy management methodology on gender issues. This approach, it was felt, should be promoted all the time.

It is also felt that KS is in its early stages for project design, that more resources should be allocated for future projects on KS development, and that pilot activities should always be

inserted to allow testing of innovation and improvement. All key departments in the tripartite scheme should be involved in the design and planning of projects for balanced and effective impact.

A two-year implementation period is not sufficient to establish sustainable mechanisms at local level: there needs to be more time and resources to be able to do more in-depth work. It was suggested that future projects should have a duration of at least 5 years and a coherent priority-setting process to avoid resources being spread too thinly. Furthermore, projects on the IE need to be managed by a unit whose mandate and expertise is the IE.

Documentation

Results demonstrate that projects like this: (1) add value to country-level activities; (2) improve the relationship with the donor and the donor’s understanding of ILO approaches as well as of specific field activities; (3) are effective in enabling cross-regional learning. This project should be documented as a model for future HQ/Field collaboration.

The impact of the KS projects should be analysed and a ToR for future KS projects should be developed.

Process

More regular and open communication is needed throughout all parts of the ILO in a more explicit way, especially for projects linked by similar objectives. This requires that KS mechanisms be set up and used. The design of the IE database and virtual forum could be used as an initial model.

Improving the communications flow requires an inclusive PAC, more frequent information meetings with clear agendas, and a constant search for opportunities to highlight IE interventions and successes on PR to build a real sense of partnership. They are a necessary support to projects sharing the same mission and objectives.

More participation of stakeholders, more generation, more exchange and more sharing of knowledge, added to management of decentralised efforts and inputs require an “integrated”, “institutional” response. This should create a sense of ownership both at field-project level as well as at technical support and project management levels.

Resources

It is a fact that there aren’t enough resources for KS or for the IE allocated within the ILO, and institutionalised support is required at field level for both: internal and external partner resources are needed to improve baseline research, evaluation, impact assessment, identification and development of tools and monitoring of current activities and results.

Pursuing integrated approaches requires drawing upon ILO expertise in different technical areas and at different locations within the ILO system. There is a role for INTEGRATION in continuing what it does now and beyond, establishing productive linkages, in creating venues for knowledge and expertise-sharing and setting up the ground for integrated responses.

Policy

There is not yet a clear ILO message or identity on the IE and therefore no effective coordination of work in this respect. However, the 2002 ILC conclusions call for a highly visible programme of work.

Achieving DW objectives requires a multifaceted approach both at micro as much as at meso and macro levels. The ILO must transform its business processes in order to “formalise” its work with the “informal”, including types of partnerships such as with civil society and NGOs.

While the IE is not a primary objective of KS, KS can certainly be a determining catalyser, as proven by its contribution to the DfID-funded field projects dealt with in the project being evaluated here. For coherent impact however, KS needs to be part of the project formulation. At present, most ILO staff are bringing in knowledge of their own, but often also gained through their work within the Organisation. Sharing that knowledge is not easy for various reasons such as lack of channels of communication, lack of motivation, lack of time, personal fears, etc, and many times is impossible on a large scale, while at the same time critically needed.

Institutionalisation of KS should be only the starting point. It must evolve into a knowledge management (KM) system to ensure a safe repository of up-to-date and needed information, dynamic generation and flow of knowledge, and dynamic access to specificity. A KMS should also ensure real-time interactions, reliable research processes and teams and face-to-face interactions as well as transparent measurement of results for continuous improvement.

Outcomes

The IE varies from one country to another and multiform solutions fit realities better than rigidly standardised ones. At the same time, one respondent felt that, marginal inconsistencies during implementation of the KS project had unfortunate negative impacts on specific field-project contributions to the overall ILO operational objectives.

Nevertheless, outputs from the end-of-project workshop are consistent and show the positive extension and depth even a small community of practice can achieve. Comments and recommendations provide valuable potential alternatives that the ILO can incorporate to transform itself into a more effective organisation in responding to the needs of today's changing world.

The true success and relevance of the knowledge fair will only become evident when it is taken to further fora and or events outside the typical ILO audience, allowing everyone also to see how the ILO experience is perceived and received by others. Although scepticism still exists about the success and internal ILO impact of the overall KS, it does appear to have been very helpful for the CTAs of the four field-projects.

Peer perceptions indicate that the project has been highly beneficial in terms of information, experience and knowledge exchange, especially for regional offices. It is perceived particularly successful for having created virtual fora for the exchange of information on the IE within the ILO, although a tool as yet remaining relatively discreet and not widely publicised.

Marketing

Internally, there is a need to incorporate KS into all ILO Offices as a key support to transformation processes and be widely advocated. At least one of the selected respondents did not even know that the KS project existed. The same respondent suggests that “If such projects wish to have an impact, they need to be publicized much better within the ILO and share their information and findings openly. The organizers will be surprised at the relevance of activities so discovered that would otherwise remain unknown to them.”

4 Conclusions

- ☐ The project proved a consistent and urgent need exists for KS not only in the IE but throughout the Organisation's areas of work and disciplines of expertise.
- ☐ Without a doubt there are concrete successes, replicable experiences and useful tools developed for KS.

**Independent evaluation of project INT/03/M57/UKM: “Knowledge Sharing on decent work and the informal economy in the context of poverty reduction”
- Iris project 10838 -**

- ☐ Project results suggest two major avenues for immediate and urgent work with long-term impact: (1) KS is an institutional responsibility implying the need to manage knowledge generation and delivery as a continuous service to constituents, staff throughout the organisation and stakeholders. (2) The IE is a socio-economic phenomenon with deep impact on the labour market demanding an integrated and consistent response from the ILO and will require a profound transformation in the way the Organisation manages its operational processes. (While KS can become a key resource for impact in the IE, IE projects and interventions can be managed independently from KS)
- ☐ Staff from field-projects have benefited substantially from KS activities organised under the DfID-funded umbrella project. They show increased understanding of the micro-level situations and their interdependence with meso and macro policy levels.
- ☐ At micro-level, the four field-projects have reached a peak in their project life trends for a two-year intervention, and the sustainability of their achievements will be impaired considerably and in proportion to the time required for follow-up action or a second phase if process continuity is not pursued.
- ☐ DfID's and ILO's investment has been considerable in human, financial and other resources both in field and KS projects.
- ☐ Regardless of the levels of success or failure of field-projects and of the KS umbrella project, it is clear that the KS project has created considerable expectations amongst constituents and stakeholders for an integrated approach from the ILO to tackle the problems arising from the complexities of the IE, the needs for PR solutions and global achievement of DW for all.
- ☐ The project results will be worth the investment only if the lessons learnt are used to develop a consistent institutional response by the ILO to tackle the needs created by the IE.
- ☐ The KS discussion amongst project staff has shown that KS is related not only to DW and PR initiatives but to practically all aspects of any organisation aiming at a significant social and economic impact in today's world.
- ☐ The relationship between project design and project implementation is weak in terms of project management requirements as there is no documented project management system. The management responsibility was not clearly established and no specific project manager role ever documented or appointed. Project management now depends on a small number of HQ staff with already-existing full-time responsibilities.
- ☐ General observations:
 - ☐ Efficiency:

The planning objectives, according to the initial project formulation, are rather general and it was difficult to measure performance against planned actions with precision, although the number of outputs is considerable.
 - ☐ Effectiveness:

The effect of having a knowledge-sharing project coordination team of committed staff imbedded with the INTEGRATION Department organising active sharing amongst HQ/field staff, and coordinating the flow of KS had a great impact on the success of the project.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Impact: | The realisation of the need to institutionalise KS as a global institutional service of the ILO to its constituency and staff is critical for the future of ILO's performance in a continuously changing world that is moving the labour market away from its traditional operational environment. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Relevance to poverty reduction: | The KS nature of the project contributed significantly to the improvement of the four DfID-funded field-projects on DW and the IE in the context of PR as well as strengthening ILO's internal sharing within the context of the projects and related HQ departments. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Relevance to strengthening the ILO's internal knowledge-sharing: | See Impact above. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gender-sensitivity: | Gender sensitivity was fully integrated into the implementing team interactions and their exercise of KS. Specific activities related to the field-projects are being evaluated separately. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sustainability and future linkages: | Depend on the institutional approach the ILO will take in relation to the four field-projects and on the application of the lessons learnt and the recommendations stemming from this evaluation. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lessons: | The project activities, especially its annual team workshops generated a profusion of lessons on replicable applications of field-project experiences in the IE. Overall KS lessons are discussed in this document. |

4.1 Survey population

The survey population proposed by the INTEGRATION Department was diverse both geographically and structurally, throughout the ILO. The proportion of responses proves that the project was not known throughout the Organisation as only 46.1% of all questions were replied to (see Chart C). If a motivating information-sharing process had existed during the implementation period, it is assumed that a much higher response would have been obtained.

The proportion of the replies according to the type of questions was also worth analysing. It shows that not all respondents had the same level of involvement in or knowledge about the different areas of operation. Only in three areas – accuracy of initial assumptions, recommendations for the future and effects of project management's arrangements – did more than 50% of the groups feel they knew enough to give an opinion (see Chart D). Because respondents had been initially asked to reply only to the questions about which they felt they had knowledge of the subject, the evaluator has given more weight to those who actually replied.

It is regrettable that 9.6% of the targeted survey population were either absent during the survey or due to IT problems did not receive the survey request or did not manage to send questionnaires back. 3.8% of the target population's e-mail addresses were wrong on the list provided by the INTEGRATION Department.

4.2 Project design

Although there are flaws in the actual project document, the major design flaw is process design and timing within the process. The KS project was added to already-planned projects which did not have a KS component in their original form. It is estimated that it took approximately 8 to 12 months of extra effort to reach the desired operational level which would have probably not been necessary if the KS component had been foreseen within the field-project designs.

The project's LOGFRAME is vague and does not provide the specificity required to measure progress or verify achievements easily: immediate objectives are not specific enough, are not easily measurable, it is difficult to assess how realistic and acceptable for the organisation and the donor they are, and are not time-bound in their statement. Similar flaws affect the proposed progress indicators and means of verification.

However, from the stand-point of a pilot intervention to assess the benefits of KS on a specific sample of field-projects, regardless of the degree of commitment for sustainability of the field-results or sustainability of the project's achievements in triggering a KS process within the ILO, the project was sufficiently well designed.

4.3 Impact

The end-of-project workshop⁴ is a very good reference for assessing impact and projection of impact. It demonstrated how a small community of people with a complementary range of expertise can become extremely motivated to tackle a complex array of problems and achieve team results they could not have attained as individuals independently attached to unrelated field-projects.

The difference from other multidisciplinary team approaches experienced by ILO in the past is that in this case, there were three common and new technical dimensions: firstly, a separate budget (although small) to secure the interdisciplinary links on one of the dimensions (KS); secondly, an established objective to apply the first to specific projects in the context of the IE and PR, funded with a common vision, and thirdly, an institutional and operational structure to secure a network that allowed individuals with similar responsibilities and/or equivalent technical expertise in each of the related field-projects to exchange experiences, extrapolate approaches and on one hand improve their own outputs locally as well as contribute to the improvement of applicable models on the other.

An issue that will have an impact on ILO's organisational culture is the realisation that KS is an operational principle in the culture of an organisation that cannot be associated in isolation with only one aspect of the organisation's activity. The principle of KS is applicable to all disciplines and activities and the impact of its application depends primarily on the level of competence with which the whole organisation is managed.

4.3.1 *Successes*⁵

- ☐ Being the first project on KS and KM in the ILO, it has been considered a success in itself by many. This project started the flow and provides an exceptional opportunity to

⁴ The End-of-project workshop report is being published by the INTEGRATION Department parallel to this evaluation.

⁵ Sections 4.5.1 to 4.8.2 are based on the analysis of the topics brought up by project staff and technical staff interviewed during the evaluation period.

- ☐ build upon it. It has provided the ILO with external visibility where field-projects have been implemented and promoted internal awareness of the need for KS in many areas of work.
- ☐ In spite of distance, the project brought people together around shared concerns, helped to organise coherent sample-activities in the context of the IE, DW and PR and KS, with immediate impact at micro levels in various parts of the world.
- ☐ Once-a-year workshops for major face-to-face exchange of information between those technically responsible for the project appeared to be the most adequate means to strengthen the continuous opportunity for exchanges offered by other methods of communication. The informality of the approach while at the same time maintaining a high level of professionalism in content created positive motivation, triggering dynamic intellectual activity and outputs of synthesis with benefits beyond the field-projects.
- ☐ The Virtual Forum and data bank created and expanded by the project are initiatives of high importance with a great potential for identification and dissemination of knowledge.
- ☐ Most field-project staff's willingness to establish KS, to set up a KS network to obtain collaboration, solve problems, obtain/provide guidance on the application of methodologies, or simple feedback to consolidate project achievements constitute a solid intellectual capital on which to build future developments.
- ☐ The Model of Change and the tools provided were particularly useful for project staff in the field not only for planning and implementation but also for self-evaluation.
- ☐ The triangular interaction between implementing field-projects, the INTEGRATION Department and the various technical units was particularly beneficial for the success of field-project activities and interventions. HQ support both from technical units as well as from the INTEGRATION Department helped to build confidence. Field-staff expressed appreciation of the INTEGRATION Department support that they qualified as mature, dedicated and hardworking.
- ☐ In some regions meso-level activities were particularly successful in empowering regional and sub-regional structures, especially on issues related to policy, employment strategies and national planning including building capacity at ministerial levels.
- ☐ The Knowledge Fair proved to be a replicable event with a high potential for bringing the attention of and information to key target audiences about issues and knowledge they would not otherwise have access to, and for providing visibility to both concrete field-work being carried out as well as to the ILO's achievement and current or further potential impact.

4.3.2 Lessons learnt

KS

- ☐ One of the initial lessons learnt was to realise how difficult it is to identify sources of up-to-date knowledge in an organisation like the ILO and how challenging it is for the ILO to put KS in practice, while at the same time realising how great the need is for developing KS throughout the organisation as a fundamental condition to maintain a comparative advantage today.
- ☐ The need for a specific programme of KS requires the leadership of competent staff with experience in KS and KM. Such a programme would strengthen ILO's corporate culture, reinforce staff's confidence in sharing knowledge, asking questions and learning, as well as improve project and programme management processes.
- ☐ One of the most important lessons is having realised the need to establish a knowledge baseline inventory and to build indicators for the flow of KS on each domain. This may

- ☐ require considerable effort and external technical support in disciplines that are not necessarily the expertise of the ILO but are essential to consolidate its transformation into a fully knowledge-based institution.

IE

- ☐ While KS is not the mainstream in IE and IE needs its own firm structural set up within the ILO, KS should be one of its major features.
- ☐ There is a strong demand for tools that field-projects require on formulating national IE policy and strategies on PR, DW and SD particularly in the IE evolution in many countries as well as a need to use technical and comparative advantages and expertise.
- ☐ Many of the target-groups and the approaches designed to influence change in relation to these groups have proven to be successful entry points for further development within the IE of countries where initial field-projects have taken place.

Process management

- ☐ A project of this nature could not have happened without the role ensured by the INTEGRATION Department and DfID's financial support and initial guidance.
- ☐ The triangular operational scheme (field-project, INTEGRATION Department, Technical unit) proved very effective to draw expertise from the most adequate sources. This way appears to be significantly more effective than the traditional field/Technical unit relationship, while not disregarding its value in its own right.
- ☐ The KS role played by the INTEGRATION Department proved to be most effective, but sometimes misunderstood by internal units. In fact the INTEGRATION Department's role added value to the relationship and at times created a relationship that otherwise would not have existed. The INTEGRATION Department played a key role in KS by ensuring basic KM functions, in spite of limited managerial resources in staff time, limited amount of technological support and limited KM training received by staff. An extrapolation of the situation in a scaled-up setting to suit the KS requirements of the whole of the ILO will require that a specific KM unit be created with a fully cross-sectional mandate and sufficient resources in staff, infrastructure and expertise.
- ☐ A thorough KS programme would add to ILO's capabilities, help to elaborate applicable approaches; create synergy; facilitate interaction and respect amongst specialists; open ways for effective interactions within the Organisation and for the Organisation with stakeholders and the rest of the world; trigger motivation towards continuous improvement.

Lessons learnt on field-projects

- ☐ The evaluation process identified a number of lessons learnt related to the field-project objectives, implementation process and future needs. Since these are not part of the evaluation ToR, they have been omitted in this report. It is also felt that field-project staff, in collaboration with technical units, are in a much better position to evaluate their own processes and it is expected that they will produce their own end-of-project reports.

4.4 Failures & causes

The major failure is the project-design itself and its presentation to the larger audience, created expectations beyond its realistic potential, especially in relation to ILO's current capacity for KS impact on the improvement of its field services to constituents. While field-project staff appear to have understood initially the limitations, in spite of them, they seized the opportunity to begin a change process. As the project reached the completion stage, the unrealistic expectations reduced the perception of achievements even for those most intimately involved in the day-to-day implementation process.

A number of opinions were proposed as failures, which represent some of the unfulfilled expectations referred to above. For instance: not enough time to implement; virtual forum not successful; no incentive from senior management; line managers not promoting KS amongst staff; people working on a one to one basis only; ILO being an institutional failure; IE not becoming visibly global in ILO; PR not achieved; too limited discussion of activities and application of tools; no understanding of the meaning of “integration”; changes in political situations not foreseen; capacity building requiring more time than planned; etc.

There are two immediate causes for the design failure: firstly, the weak planning document (see comments on LOGFRAME in section 4.4 above; secondly, inadequate progress monitoring system which is already an effect of the first.

The underlying causes of these failures appear to be that the decision to carry out the project was based rather on institutional assumptions both by the ILO and DfID than on analysis of the specific KS needs of the four already-funded projects at the time. A project with multiple objectives of KS related to IE and with impact on PR and DW, could have been put in operation with a more reflective analysis of ILO concerns and activities on the IE at that moment in time, and including coordinated design of the chosen field project. Both, the LOGFRAME and project document being weak, gave little help to staff for setting up a fully-fledged project management system.

Finally, the root cause for this chain of failures is the short time provided to design the project.

The above, however does not diminish the evaluator’s admiration for the valuable and considerable number of outputs produced more out of staff’s individual and team motivation than on quality of the project design.

4.5 Future sustainability

4.5.1 *Threats & risks*

- ☐ While the continuation of KS efforts is seen as a must, KS is not well embedded in the structure and operations of the ILO. A major threat for the ILO is seeing KS as a marginal activity without strong support from upper management.
- ☐ Another major threat is the shifting of responsibilities to another unit, without taking responsibility for what has been done so far. The possibility that new people may want to do things differently could be positive but with great risk of leaving gains already made behind.
- ☐ The shift of responsibilities may also affect the clear guidance received so far, and cause delays in selecting and putting in place the adequate staff. This includes the danger of not getting someone on board on time to head the current limited resources to implement the project’s next phase.
- ☐ There is a risk of partial and fragmented application which would impair the effective transformation process of the organisation into a real knowledge institution according to the requirements of the times. So far the process is still incipient within the ILO, people tend to step back to their old practices. The ILO must support these initiatives more effectively and institutionalise KS if the organisation is committed to progress. There will continue to be a risk as long as KS remains without a clear and consistent allocation in the P&B.
- ☐ The current project risks losing ILO’s gains in visibility, related activities, staff capacities and the investment already made, unless a concerted effort is made between the ILO, its constituents and funding organisations to salvage this project’s positive results and their intrinsic potential.

- ☐ The new TC RAM may require new efforts to adapt project design and formulation. Time is critical to ensure that the next round of interventions in the IE and KS development do not leave already-started processes idle, or create new redundant ones.

4.5.2 Current weaknesses

- ☐ KS is seen more as an issue for HQ and there is little involvement at regional levels, directors do not support its development firmly and this is emulated at national levels. There is clearly a perception of lack of managerial and institutional support throughout the Organisation in respect to KS.
- ☐ KS techniques are not known by the ILO staff and therefore not applied. Dialogue from HQ with field-projects is not fluid, contrary to dialogue at field activity level. In HQ issues get “departmentalised” and decisions taken tend to be detached from the field-project reality or set of objectives.
- ☐ Although the project is being completed, field staff and constituents do not have information about the future of ILO’s position and perspective in relation to the IE, and there is a great level of restrained frustration in this respect with the perception that the Organisation does not yet have a clear understanding of how the labour market has changed.
- ☐ Field perceptions indicate dissatisfaction with the limited presence of HQ in the field, suggesting that face-to-face interaction is much more effective than impersonal electronic communications.
- ☐ The way the organisation is set up is considered to be a major weakness by practically all people with whom the evaluator interacted, particularly at HQ. The “silo” approach was mentioned many times, as was imbalance in the distribution of resources, unhealthy competition, unhealthy perceptions and lack of trust, added to a huge lack of awareness about what KS is and how it can contribute to the work and success of the ILO.
- ☐ The two year project duration, was also considered one of the major weaknesses. In two years people can share some successes with other countries and some knowledge but major change-interventions cannot be implemented or readjustments achieved within such a short time span. Most areas where the project took place do not yet have the capacity to sustain the change process they started, there isn’t yet full understanding of those processes and there are important needs for financial resources.

4.5.3 Solutions to current failures, problems and weaknesses

The essence of the solutions proposed in this section originate with the population surveyed and the officers interviewed. The results of these two evaluation activities are coincident and support each other. However, given the diversity of topics and variety of approaches proposed the evaluator used his knowledge of the ILO and of the disciplines involved to cluster solutions in the following series of paragraphs:

Future project planning should include a period of time for the project design process prior to the time allocated for writing project formulation. Methodologies should be defined, for the operational processes in project formulation documents. KS must eventually supply the support required to improve project design and formulation. There are a myriad of techniques being applied within the ILO and it would be useful if a KS process could be set up to identify the most effective applications in this respect. Furthermore, IE projects and KS support cannot be crammed into two-year projects if tangible results are sought after.

Projects aiming at an impact on the IE should include bottom up and horizontal processes. There is a significantly large perception that senior management is not sufficiently aware of the need to support knowledge generation and KS. Suggestions were given to study UNFPA’s experience which included involving all staff and translating the KS value into all operations,

adapting improvements to operations of the organisation and developing the required organisational tools, job descriptions, annual plans, efficient management processes, etc.

In relation to project funding and resource allocations, the following suggestions were made: establishment of clear guidance on criteria for funding and resource allocations; definition of criteria to assess proposals; definition of mechanisms for process appraisals and project appraisals; improvement in the process and transparency of TC round mechanisms.

The continuation of the KS process of developing networks of people and departments within the Organisation, appears to be an effective method to resolve the dichotomy between HQ and the field.

A need to resolve sudden lack of financial resources necessitates improvements in the allocation of funds to reach a more balanced and secure interaction between the regular budget and external cooperation funding.

A KS component is necessary in every project from the beginning, including existing tools and sufficient time and inputs to empower project teams to become sufficiently acquainted with them, to use them efficiently, and to multiply their capacity to produce further tools or improvements to the existing ones.

Increasing interactive work with partners should allow greater visibility, together with providing the opportunity to draw from those who are linked to the problems being tackled on a day-to-day basis. This could include bringing government or other officials into project activities regularly, involving them in frequent advisory committee gatherings around policy issues or more informal set ups such as communities of practice or peer groups.

The need to strengthen mutual trust between the Organisation and its staff (be they regular or temporary) seems to be important to accomplish positive effects and project achievements.

Immediate actions that could be taken could be to: identify processes that are working effectively and that can be scaled up; identify all projects that could benefit from current developments; link KS with technology development, e.g. IRIS, and develop a critical mass.

4.6 Roles

4.6.1 ILO/HQ

The role of HQ is to bring coherence and an integrated approach and to become a global forum and a resource platform and stay in touch with other global fora. Also to become the depository of knowledge on human labour and master of the forces that influence it. Ensure global access to knowledge through the most effective technologies for maximum global coverage.

Lead the search for knowledge, and generate new knowledge by supporting research and KS, assigning responsibilities for the flow of information towards the centres of activity where it is needed. Operate as a continuous service to the organisation facilitating integration of people, organisational structures, techniques and technologies to respond to the labour market requirements wherever social, economic and cultural change and human development drives it.

Ensure that the impact of all activities benefits the field client through ensuring that macro policies are effectively translated into meso strategies and activities that benefit the micro level and lead the mobilisation of resources of all kinds to meet the Organisation's operational priorities.

Be continuously aware of global changes and pre-empt problems by strengthening and raising the quality of TC. As projects are being increasingly decentralised the need for information on process evolution becomes constant as well as that for preservation and best use of resources, and network schemes to facilitate coordination.

At the operational level, ensure that all new initiatives have a solid management team to lead them; transform the role of CODEV adapting it to the needs of the new environment increasing its dynamics of transparent communications and effective interaction with field structures, project management units and technical units; involve all in newly developed communities of practice with programme officers.

4.6.2 DfID

While practically all staff that produced inputs for the evaluation are extremely grateful to DfID for giving ILO the opportunity to start a new and needed set of activities in KS and the IE, they all agree on the need to maintain and strengthen interactions with DfID, particularly in identifying opportunities for collaboration together.

Analysis of inputs and discussion suggest that strengthening the involvement of local DfID staff in initial phases of projects and improving project design by establishing early operational links between project implementation teams and local DfID offices and giving local DfID staff an opportunity to assist in identification of weaknesses or implementation problems on time, would improve project implementation during operational cycles.

While maintaining the current interaction on TC funding is desired and recommended, ensuring measurability of returns on investment is not yet widely exercised by the ILO. Improvement is desired and would require DfID allocating highly trained human resources to the project design and commensurate financial resources to the project planning and organisational periods. This would imply a shift from the traditional project formulation process to more intense partnership work on project design and the design of projects of greater scope and longer implementation periods. The latter should include establishing the appropriate institutional links and building trust and efficient interaction with all stakeholders (clients and suppliers), before active implementation is started.

The secondment of a well trained professional to operate within ILO HQ to ensure an effective partnership interaction is desirable.

5 Recommendations

Recent global socio-economic developments demonstrate that the labour market together with being more vulnerable than ever, is moving rapidly and easily out of control.

Project results demonstrate that KS within the ILO and between the ILO and its constituents and partners is a must if it intends to stay abreast of the rapidly changing labour market – with all its implications – and wishes to continue to be considered the leader within the labour environment. The achievements of the project must be sustained and the numerous lessons learnt translated into a consistent follow-up in the form of a second phase as suggested during the end-of-project workshop. At the same time, KS must be scaled up to support the implementation of ILC decisions towards long-term impact.

In this perspective, KS requires a clear and committed engagement by upper management in KM aiming at a qualitative transformation of all levels and all units of the Organisation through KS and its impact from macro policy development to field implementation at country level.

KM at the same time cannot be effective without a properly developed KMS covering the whole of the Organisation and ensuring adequate investment of resources in quality of research, of knowledge generation, of knowledge storage, of knowledge retrieval, of knowledge packaging, of knowledge delivery and measurement of results.

The development of a fully-fledged knowledge-management system is recommended therefore, to be put in place immediately and be made fully operational in 18 months, through gradual and interlinked development of five components:

1. KS service for the Organisation at large establishing ILO’s policy for KS and allocating the resources to realise this recommendation;
2. KMS in compliance with existing standard requirements for quality management systems;
3. Rapid development of a global network for KS and KM’
4. Marketing/advocacy process presenting the ILO as a “knowledge” organisation, with a strong image, high level of visibility and an efficient KS network;
5. Efficient KM “review process” based on reliable measurement of impact, supported by evidence-based monitoring of impact and change indicators.

The results of this process would show the following outcomes:

- ☐ Integrated knowledge databases, library services, research and project outcomes and links to informal new knowledge;
- ☐ A network of communities of practice related to operations contributing to the achievement of each ILO operational objective and inFocus activities;
- ☐ A KM service assuring the global KS process flow, validity of data, information and knowledge, and continuous renewal of knowledge databases.

6 Bibliography

- Policy Integration Department: Organization and responsibilities, Circular of 11.03.2002
- Effect to be given to resolutions adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 90th Session (2002), GB.285/7/2
- Guide to prepare a Logical Framework, Turin Workshop on Informal Economy 10-12 February 2003
- Guidelines concerning a statistical definition of informal employment,
Report of The Director-General, Working Out Of Poverty, ILC 2003
- Report of the Committee on Technical Cooperation, GB.292/14(Rev.)
- A new policy and strategic framework for evaluation at the ILO, GB.294/PFA/8/4
- <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/integration/index.htm>
- <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/program/index.htm>
- <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/knowledgefair/index.htm>
- <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/knowledgefair/model/>
- Knowledge Sharing on Informal Economy - Logical Framework January 2004
- Measuring the informal economy: From employment in the informal sector to informal employment, Ralf Hussmanns, December 2004
- Project-RAF03M53UKM – Employment creation in municipal service delivery in Eastern Africa – improving living conditions and providing jobs for the poor
- Project-RAS03M51UKM – The project will focus on Cambodia, Mongolia and Thailand with links through knowledge sharing and capacity building to other countries in the sub-region
- Project-RER03M53UKM – Reducing Poverty by Promoting Employment of Youth and Other Vulnerable Groups in the Informal Economy of Central Asia and Caucasus
- Project-RLA03M52UKM – Poverty Eradication, Employment Creation and Gender Equality Policies for the Informal Economy in Latin America
- Report First Workshop on Knowledge Sharing for DfID-funded project on the Informal Economy, Turin 28-30 October 2003
- Report on the Turin Workshop on the Good practices - Decent work and the informal economy, Turin, 30-31 August 2004
- Report on the Turin Workshop on Development of a Model-of-Change for the informal economy, Turin, 1 – 3 September 2004
- Report on the Turin Workshop on the Follow-Up to the ILC Conclusions on Decent Work and the Informal Economy ILO International Training Centre, Turin, 10-12 February 2003
- Progress Report – July-December 2003
- Progress Report – January-June 2004
- Progress Report – July-December 2004
- Progress Report – January-June 2005
- Draft End-of-Project Workshop Report – December 2005

7 Glossary of acronyms and abbreviations

ACT EMP	Employers’ activities
ACTRAV	Workers’ activities
CBO	Community-based organisation
CODEV	Development cooperation
CTA	Chief technical adviser
DfID	Department for international development – United Kingdom
DW	Decent work
EO	Employers’ organisation
GENDER	Gender bureau
GET Ahead	Training package promoting the economic and social empowerment of women alongside men in enterprises.
HQ	Headquarters
IE	Informal economy
ILC	International labour conference
KM	Knowledge management
KMS	Knowledge management system
KS	Knowledge sharing
MDG	Millennium development goals
MoPH	Ministry of public health
OSH	Occupational safety and health
PAC	Policy advisory committee
PCU	Primary care unit
PPP	Public-Private Partnerships
PR	Poverty reduction
PRSP	Poverty reduction strategy papers
P&B	Programme and Budget
RAM	Resource allocation mechanism
RER	Regional economic research
SADA	Sustainable Alternative Development Association - Thailand
SI	Social inclusion
SME	Small and medium-size enterprise
TC	Technical cooperation
ToR	Terms of reference
TU	Trade union
WGIE	Working group on informal economy
WIND	Work improvement in neighbourhood development