

FINAL EVALUATION

**Mainstreaming tripartism across the Netherlands/ILO Cooperation Programme (NICP)
and product development for employers' and workers' organizations**

INT/06/63/NET

May 2007-April 2010

31 May 2010

**S. C. Cornwell
External Collaborator**

Table of contents

Acknowledgments.....	3
Acronyms.....	3
Executive Summary (separate document)	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	4
2. PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY.....	5
Limitations of the evaluation.....	7
3. FINDINGS.....	8
3.1 RELEVANCE AND DESIGN.....	9
3.2 PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS.....	12
Management.....	12
Attainment of objectives.....	16
Achievements and successful approaches.....	21
Coordination and alignment with NICP country projects....	23
Constraints and obstacles	27
3.3 IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY.....	29
4. POTENTIAL GOOD PRACTICES AND EFFECTIVE MODELS OF INTERVENTION.....	34
5. LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	36
6. CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	40

ANNEXES

1. Terms of reference for the evaluation
2. List of NICP Projects (2006-2010)
3. Persons interviewed
4. Documents consulted
5. Country tables (Summary of DWCP themes, country project outcomes, mainstreaming tripartism project outcomes, outputs and activities as of April 2010)
6. List of global products
7. Joint Statement “Social Partners' Platform for Action”, Joint ACTRAV/ACT/EMP Seminar for workers' and employers' organizations in West and Central Africa on “How and Why to get involved in Decent Work Country Programmes”, Dakar, March/April 2010

Acknowledgments

Special thanks are due to the evaluation managers of ACT/EMP and ACTRAV (Henrik Moller and Enrico Cairola); to the project managers/coordinators from ACT/EMP and ACTRAV (Ilka Schoellmann and Claude Akpokavie); to Sina Chuma Mkwandire (Director, ILO Office Abuja); to Patrick Anderson (National Project Coordinator for Social Dialogue in the NICP PREDEC project in Liberia); and to all those who generously gave their time and provided frank views and counsel in the interviews.

List of acronyms

ACT/EMP	ILO Bureau for Employers' Activities
ACTRAV	ILO Bureau for Workers' Activities
APINDO	Indonesian Employers' Association
ASK	National Confederation of Entrepreneurs (Employers') Organizations of Azerbaijan
COB	Confederacion Obrera Boliviana
CEPB	Confédération de Empresarios Privados de Bolivia
CETU	Confederation of Ethiopian Trade Unions
CTA	ILO Chief Technical Advisor
CTA	Confederação das Associações Economicas de Moçambique (Confederation of Business Associations in Mozambique)
DWCP	ILO Decent Work Country Programme
EFP	Employers' Federation of Pakistan
EMC	Employee Management Cooperation (Indonesia)
FNCCI	Federation of Nepal Chambers of Commerce & Industry
FYCCI	Federation of Yemen Chambers of Commerce and Industry
GFYWTU	General Federation of Yemeni Workers' Trade Unions
ILRTI	Indonesia Labour Research & Training Institute
LED	Local Economic Development
LCC	Liberian Chamber of Commerce
LLC	Liberian Labor Congress
NCEKR	National Confederation of Employers of Kyrgyz Republic
NICP	Netherlands ILO Cooperation Programme
PARDEV	ILO Partnership and Development Cooperation Department
PREDEC	Poverty Reduction through Decent Employment Creation (NICP country project in Liberia)
PRODOC	Project Document
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
RBTC	ILO Regular Budget Technical Cooperation
SIYB	ILO Start and Improve Your Business
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
TOR	Terms of Reference
TOT	Training of Trainers Programme

INTRODUCTION

This project represents one of four cross cutting components of a large multi-project programme established under the Netherlands/ILO Partnership Programme (NICP). The NICP included other cross-cutting components such as gender equality and knowledge sharing and 11 individual country projects¹ in various technical areas, as well as core support for selected ILO programmes.²

The Partnership Agreement was signed in June 2006 to cover programmes until 30 April 2010. The focus of the programmes was broad with a focus on Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) priority themes. These included child labour, employment creation, HIV/AIDS at the workplace, corporate social responsibilities and social dialogue. The priority countries were drawn from the IDA eligible list. Several guiding principles underpinned the NICP that were drawn from the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, adopted in March 2005. The thrust of the Declaration was to enhance national ownership and responsibility for aid effectiveness and ensure improved alignment and harmonization and mutual accountability among all partners, both international and national.

The aim of the mainstreaming tripartism and social dialogue project was to promote and enhance social dialogue and tripartism and build the capacity of and strengthen employers' and workers' organizations to participate in and benefit from the Decent Work Country Programmes (DCWPs). The underlying premise of mainstreaming that guided the project was as follows: securing stronger, independent and representative bodies is not only a fundamental prerequisite for tripartism and social dialogue but is also necessary to enable the social partners to participate fully in national development programmes, in ILO DCWPs, in the NICP country projects and to be of greater value to their current and potential members, which reinforces their viability. The project did not include a labour administration/dialogue component.

The overall strategy involved three levels of intervention: country level activities; product development (tools and materials) at the global level; and capacity building in thematic areas in tandem with the Turin Centre, which had a separate NICP project within the Partnership Agreement.

This project represented the first major technical cooperation project, designed jointly by ACTRAV and ACTEMP, that focused on mainstreaming. An innovative approach was essential as the project addressed both workers' and employers' organizations across 12 different countries. These organizations had different levels of needs and priorities. Moreover, the interface of the mainstreaming project with the individual NICP country projects was further compounded by the fact that each of these country projects targeted different technical themes and employed different types of interventions. The project design and implementation therefore faced a number of challenges as will be seen below.

The project was approved in May 2007. The initial budget was \$1,700,000, which was subsequently increased to \$1,850,000. Preparatory work, with separate ILO funding, in many countries

1 The 11 NICP country projects in fact covered more than 11 countries. The South Pacific project covered 5 countries and the project in Central Asia included both Azerbaijan and Kyrgyzstan.

2 A list of the projects included in the NICP is provided in Annex 2

was undertaken in 2007. In a few instances some activities were also launched that year. However, most activities were carried out in 2008 and 2009. Some activities were still on-going at the time of this evaluation.

The evaluation commenced the last week of March 2010. Desk reviews of documents and interviews continued during April and one field visit to Liberia was undertaken from 3-7 May. A draft report was submitted to the evaluation managers of ACTRAV (Bureau for Workers' Activities) and ACT/EMP (Bureau for Employers' Activities) on 19 May. The final report of the evaluation was submitted on 31 May 2010.

2. PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

According to its terms of reference the purpose of the evaluation³ is threefold: 1) assess in depth the impact of the ACTRAV and ACTEMP programme on workers and employers organizations in terms of their acquired capacity, on their bipartite relationship and on the enhancement of tripartism at the country level; 2) obtain a better understanding of the impact and results generated by the ACTRAV and ACTEMP programme on the overall NICP programmes in the 11 selected countries; 3) assess the validity of the strategy and approach to the programming of funds through the partnership agreement in order to mainstream tripartism with specific capacity building programmes and with an integrated approach with the Turin Centre.

Against these three purposes, the terms of reference specified that the evaluation should focus primarily on four inter-linked issues:

- i. an in-depth analysis of insights and lessons learned in at least two of the 11 countries
- ii. conclusions and recommendations on the impact of the project on the constituents in the remaining nine countries based on ACTRAV and ACT/EMP reports
- iii. conclusions and recommendations on the impact of the active involvement of the social partners on the individual country projects under the NICP
- iv. conclusions and recommendations on the effect of the Partnership Agreement and possible improvements for increasing the impact of ILO technical cooperation activities.

A review of the financial management of the project was not part of the TOR.

The beneficiaries of the evaluation are the employers and workers organizations who are the main target groups of the project, the two Bureaux (ACT/EMP and ACTRAV) together with PARDEV and the donor.

The final evaluation covers the period from May 2007, when the project document was approved, to 30 April 2010, when the project was completed, although information on activities for all countries was not uniformly complete at the time of writing. As noted in the Introduction, the project involved three levels of intervention: country level activities; product development at the global level; and capacity building in thematic areas in tandem with the ILO Turin Centre. The evaluation addresses essentially the first two levels of intervention as this information was systematically available in the ACTRAV and ACTEMP reports. The activities carried out with the Turin Centre have been taken into account, particularly as regards those dealing with employers' organizations for which information was available. It is recalled that the Turin Centre has a separate NICP project under the Partnership

3 See Annex 1

Agreement (see Annex 2) and a separate evaluation report is expected for that project.

In terms of geographical coverage, the project covered all the countries included in the 11 NICP country projects under the Partnership Agreement : Bolivia, Cameroun, Ethiopia, Liberia, Mozambique, Nepal, Indonesia, Sub-Regional South Pacific, Pakistan, Central Asia- Azerbaijan and Kyrgyzstan- and Yemen (Annex 2). The 11 country projects in fact included more than 11 countries: one project covered both Azerbaijan and Kyrgyzstan, and another one in the South Pacific covered more than 5 countries. In terms of this evaluation report, it is necessary to point out that the Mainstreaming Project presented a two-pronged approach in the sense that the activities for the employers' and the workers' organizations did not cover all of the same countries to the same degree. (This aspect of the project is highlighted below under the section on project management.) As regards country level activities, the evaluation therefore presents findings and assessments for those countries where activities actually took place. For the workers' organizations this included all of the countries in the Partnership Agreement. For the employers' organizations, country level activities were not carried out in the Cameroun, Ethiopia and in the South Pacific. These countries, however, did benefit from the other levels of intervention, that is product development, regional and interregional seminars and work carried out in thematic areas with the Turin Centre.

In essence the evaluation focusses on the challenges involved in mainstreaming tripartism and social dialogue in technical projects. The overall context of working in 11 country projects (involving even more individual countries) presented numerous complexities: the settings were diverse and often involved fragile environments (e.g. security or freedom of association problems); the subject areas varied; the levels of capacity and organization of the social partners differed; and ILO field and project management arrangements were not uniform. The evaluation examines some fundamental issues concerning capacity building on the part of the employers' and workers' organizations on the one hand and the approaches and recognition of tripartism by the technical projects on the other hand as well as the need to find appropriate strategies to ensure genuine entry points for mainstreaming.

The evaluation is structured in line with the outline cited in the terms of reference (Annex 1). The main findings address questions that are based on the guidelines provided in the detailed list in the terms of reference. They concern the (1) relevance of the project; (2) the validity of the project design (clarity and coherence of underlying concepts, objectives, strategies, the logical framework, and implementation plans); (3) project effectiveness in terms of (a) management arrangements, (b) the extent to which objectives and outcomes have been achieved, (c) specific achievements and successful approaches demonstrated by the project, (d) the extent of coordination and alignment of the project with the 11 NICP country projects, subject to the availability of information, (e) constraints and obstacles that affected project effectiveness; and (4) the impact and sustainability of the project's activities and outcomes.

Based on the findings, the evaluation illustrates a number of good practices and effective models of intervention that have emerged from a review of the project. These merit attention in terms of future work and replicability. Closely tied to the good practices, the evaluation further presents a number of lessons learned and recommendations. These draw on the good practices but also differ by highlighting suggested improvements or changes for future projects in the area of conceptual clarity, strategies, design and scope and management. The evaluation concludes with a limited number of specific issues for the attention of ACTRAV and ACTEMP.

The methodology used in the evaluation comprised: a desk review of relevant documents;

interviews (telephone, skype, email) with ILO field staff and some chief technical advisers; interviews with selected ILO Headquarters and Turin departments; and interviews with ILO constituents, which consisted primarily of one field visit to Liberia for 5 days. A second field visit had been planned for Kyrgyzstan in mid-April but was canceled when an abrupt overthrow of the government took place the week preceding the mission. A limited exchange of views, by telephone with social partners in Indonesia was also possible⁴.

The documentation included the project document and annual integrated progress reports for 2007, 2008 and 2009 submitted by ACT/EMP and ACTRAV to PARDEV (Partnership and Development Cooperation Department); individual country level work plans and progress reports when available; reports on the global products produced during the project; and selected country level activity reports for two countries – Kyrgyzstan and Liberia. Extra documentation on Kyrgyzstan and Liberia was sought in view of the two field visits and the in-depth analysis expected of the two countries.

Other NICP related documentation reviewed included the project documents and mid-term evaluations (where available) of the eleven country technical cooperation projects, as well as the gender mainstreaming project; the integrated progress reports prepared under the Overall Coordination and Knowledge-Sharing Project for 2007 and 2008; and the 2009 progress report submitted by the Turin Centre (INT/06/62/NET)⁵

Final evaluation reports from the country projects were not available at the time of writing. In addition only a few 2009 country progress reports had been completed by the end of April. Only the gender mainstreaming final evaluation report was available.

Limitations of the evaluation

The evaluation exercise faced a number of limitations in terms of meeting the expected purpose and scope of the analysis. First, the absence of constituents' views, except in a few instances, constituted a major obstacle to obtaining a realistic assessment of results and impact. Only two field visits were foreseen; and understandably field visits to the 11 countries was not an option. In future, evaluation summaries (e.g. a short questionnaire) from the beneficiary workers and employers organizations as activities were coming to a close should be foreseen at the outset and aided by the field specialists.

A second hindrance was insufficient information that affected several aspects of the evaluation. While both ACTRAV and ACT/EMP have substantial information about the constituents' organizations, which are updated regularly, this data was not directly aligned with the specific objectives of the project. As such this information was not always relevant as baseline data. To address this gap, the evaluation relied to some extent on the situation analysis presented in the NICP country project documents, insofar as this was available, on the strategies envisaged in some of the Implementation Plans of the DWCPs and on the observations and technical views of ILO field staff – either Office directors or employers' and workers' specialists. An additional information gap has been the dearth of analytical information, with some notable exceptions, on the involvement of the social partners in many of the country projects. The information provided, either in some progress reports or in mid-term evaluations, refers to participation in steering committees or in training programmes, making it difficult to draw any conclusions on the

4 A list of persons interviewed is provided in Annex 3

5 A list of documents reviewed is provided in Annex 4

impact of this involvement on the organizations of the social partners or on the interactions between the mainstreaming project and the country projects.

Another drawback encountered in the evaluation was one of timing. This was a double-edged sword. The evaluation was carried out before the final evaluations of the country projects, which presented a major limitation. On the other hand, the evaluator was unable to benefit from the views of many Chief Technical Advisers (CTAs) who had either completed their assignments at the time of the evaluation or were too busy at the end of operations to provide information. The views of CTAs, the front-line managers, are an essential input for project evaluation in general; in this particular instance they are a valuable source of information about the interface of the NICP country projects and the NICP mainstreaming tripartism and social dialogue project. Again the views of ILO field staff were sought as an alternative to fill this gap.

A feature that characterizes mainstreaming projects, in particular, is that inputs are intended to meld into or reinforce other actions. Drawing clear lines between what can be attributed to a mainstreaming action as opposed to the effort it reinforces is not always possible.⁶ This point was also raised in the final evaluation of the gender mainstreaming project.

A final constraining factor in the evaluation relates to the design of the project, which is reviewed below.

3. FINDINGS

Before embarking on this section of the evaluation, a quick overview of the immediate objectives/outcomes, strategies and of the main type of activities are provided as a backdrop. Under the development objective of strengthening social dialogue and tripartism, the immediate objectives and outcomes were threefold:

- Stronger workers' and employers' organizations
- Employers' and workers' organizations are more valuable to their membership and to potential membership
- Social partners influence socio-economic and governance policies.

The strategy of the project was based on an underlying principle: the priorities and strategic needs of the employer and worker organizations as well as the support and resources available to them will determine the delivery of outcomes. Three levels of intervention were foreseen.

- Individual country programmes, with a primary focus on the priorities/needs of the organizations and a subsequent link to complement the 11 NICP country projects.
- Headquarter managed activities, including the development of tools and materials related to technical areas of the NICP projects, capacity-building material for the workers' and employers' organizations, and reinforcement and coordination with ILO gender activities.
- Headquarter managed activities in conjunction with the Turin project on capacity-building and training.

The activities of the project can be grouped into six broad categories: global product

⁶ Some constituents and ILO field staff have reported that distinguishing the inputs from different projects is not always easy. For many of the constituents the action was simply undertaken on behalf of the donor and the ILO.

development and interregional or regional training activities; institutional building through SWOTs, strategic planning exercises, review of management methods and staffing; supporting organization unity (mergers or revitalizing existing organizations); reinforcing information, research and training units or TOT programmes within the organizations; workshops on core issues (such as collective bargaining and freedom of association, lobbying and advocacy, DWCPs, gender, PRSs) and on specific issues (inflation and wages, free trade agreements); and support for providing specific services to members. These activities differed from country to country and differed between those for workers' organizations and those for employers' organizations.

Annex 5 sets out in summary form a chart listing, country by country, the DWCP main priorities (based on the Implementation Plan for 2008), the objectives and outcomes of the NICP country projects, the objectives and outcomes of the mainstreaming project and the outputs/activities implemented for workers' organizations and employers' organizations under the mainstreaming project. This overview gives a general idea of the linkages and interface of the country level activities under the mainstreaming project with the NICP outcomes and the DWCP priorities.

3.1 Relevance and design

The relevance of the project is viewed at several levels. From the broad perspective of the ILO Constitution, mandate and structure and the ILO Programme and Budget, it is a truism to note that tripartism and social dialogue are one of the pillars of the Organization. A project aimed at mainstreaming these concepts and practices is clearly highly relevant for all programmes of the Office. This relevance is reinforced in DWCPs where one of the mandatory priorities is “strong and representative employers' and workers' organizations influencing economic, social and governance policies.” The special task for this project was to reflect this overall relevance into particular settings through a process known as mainstreaming. This was a crucial challenge for the design, especially when the concept of mainstreaming in the field of tripartism and social dialogue seemed to be obvious for most officials involved, but surprisingly not parsed in the project document into different components and processes to demonstrate what is effective mainstreaming as opposed to participation or involvement.

The absence of labour administration component in a “tripartism” project is surprising. According to information received from PARDEV the project was intended for capacity building of the social partners and the issue of labour administration never came up.

At the level of the NICP country projects, the relevance of the mainstreaming project is rather clear since one of its purposes was to provide complementary support. The strategy set out general steps to facilitate interaction between the two. On the side of the NICP country projects, the need to strengthen the capacities of the workers' and employers' organizations in the relevant technical fields figures in most of the individual project documents. The quality of the analysis varies but there is a common concern that ILO programmes in technical areas can benefit from the support and involvement of the social partners, while benefiting them at the same time.

The relevance of the overall impact of the project on the organizations of the social partners and on the overarching development objective is reviewed under the section on impact below.

Design

The overall design process was marked by an excellent coordination mechanism introduced by PARDEV. A peer review group, including the project managers of all of the mainstreaming projects, reviewed the draft individual NICP country project documents as they became available. This enabled the project managers to take account of the possibilities for dovetailing and aligning the mainstreaming projects with the main projects on the ground. This exercise in itself helped to take account of the role the social partners could play in different technical areas, but the extent to which this process had a genuine effect on the implementation of NICP country projects should be reviewed in the individual final evaluations.

The project design of the mainstreaming tripartism and social dialogue project had several shortcomings. Admittedly the concept of a mainstreaming project in this field was and remains new. This novelty is compounded by the lack of clarity as to what exactly is meant by mainstreaming social dialogue and tripartism, in particular. The strategy outlined in the project document gives some indication of the different levels and targets for intervention, but doesn't specify how the actions lead to mainstreaming. For action at the country level, the project document seems to imply that the means to mainstreaming lies in strengthening and building the capacities of workers' and employers' organizations. How participation by the social partners in various technical project activities represents a significant building block of mainstreaming is not clear, nor is this issue developed in the project document. Whereas the gender mainstreaming programmes in the ILO have been developed over several years and have been subject to field testing, review, debate and adjustments, mainstreaming tripartism has not been through this process.

The project design also faced additional complications. Interventions were intended in 12 countries, in addition to the production of global products. The overall budget was too limited to allow for in-depth work in any one setting, which suggested the need for a strategic approach. The level of needs and priorities varied considerably among the different organizations. All of this argued in favour of a rather general document which could then be fine-tuned at the country level according to needs and according to the complementarity sought with the NICP country projects. This is what occurred.

Taking into account the special challenges facing the project design, several issues could none the less have been better addressed. The shortcomings comprised essentially 1) an absence of a compelling background and justification section; 2) absence of a comprehensive and rigorous logical framework; 3) Absence of guidelines or indications on how the project would plan the separate activities and how these would interface with the NICP country projects; 4) absence of a precise division of labour among the different actors in management and implementation.

Background and justification. A section on background and justification for the project would have helped to explain the basis for the objectives and outcomes overall and possibly the rationale for the interventions that eventually took place at the country level. In addition a cogent argument on how the outcomes would lead to mainstreaming would have been welcome. Since the country level activities varied according to the needs and priorities of the constituents, some justification of this approach would have been instructive at the outset. It should be noted that in many of the 12 countries involved there were either serious security/political problems, or dysfunctional social dialogue mechanisms or problems of freedom of association and collective bargaining. The selection of countries raises questions about the types of projects that are or should be considered and whether there are genuine opportunities for mainstreaming. This issue is raised in "lessons learned and recommendations" below.

Logical framework. The logical framework is presented in broad terms. The outcomes are presented at a very general level without specifying how these lead to mainstreaming. Moreover, the framework does not demonstrate a causal link between activities, outputs and outcomes in all instances. For example, for the outcome of stronger organizations, SWOT exercises are listed as outputs. As useful as these exercises and documents are, by themselves they are not necessarily indicators of stronger organizations, without an indication of the follow-up commitment and action taken. For the outcome on influencing socio-economic policies, the participation of the social partners in policy development is cited as an indicator. Participation does not necessarily equate with influence. This and other indicators are static and descriptive, rather than dynamic, which would permit tracking some changes. The listing of indicators varies in quality; in some instances targets are set, sometimes quite low (such as one new service provided), and at other times quite ambitious (case studies on women's entrepreneurship development and on skills training in 5 countries). Means of verification of the indicators are not always clear or easily obtainable, such as "membership changes statistics for all social partners," or "participation statistics for social partners in policy development" in a given country. While the final report of the project has not yet been made available to the evaluator, the progress reports to date indicate that data to verify these indicators is not readily obtainable. Either the indicators and the means of verification were not entirely appropriate for the settings, or the data was not sought at the country level.

Assumptions and risks. The project document also enumerated activities that would be carried out under each output, and provided a separate section on assumptions and risks. Both of these sections are helpful for a better understanding of the project, but could have figured in a comprehensive log frame. The work on product development and the global training programmes are not outlined, which is a pity since it turned out to be a significant component for the work aimed at employers' organizations. The assumptions and risks listed are well founded. They concern the capacity and interest of the social partners to be involved in the NICP country projects; the extent to which the organizations enjoy freedom of association in order to be able to participate fully in various project activities; increasing capacity deficits affecting the social partners that dominate their priority setting; and concerns about the inclusion of the social partners in the NICP country projects. These issues were indeed relevant and arise in the analysis below of project effectiveness, sustainability and in lessons learned.

Strategy. The overall strategy of the project clearly defined the different levels of intervention foreseen by the project. For those interventions dealing with product development and other global products such as interregional and regional seminars, coordination was foreseen with the Turin Centre and with the Gender Bureau for synergies with the Gender project. For the interventions at the country level, considerable coordination was foreseen among ILO Headquarters' staff, ILO field specialists, CTAs, ILO field offices and the employers' and workers' organizations in the countries concerned. Unfortunately the precise roles and responsibilities were not spelled out nor was an implementation plan established indicating how the actions of each partner could be dovetailed to work toward common objectives and build synergies. Even if it was premature to set out a precise implementation plan with roles and responsibilities at the time of design, an outline of the process to be followed with clear specific steps for coordination would have been most valuable.

The absence of a detailed implementation plan meant that there was no indication at the outset how the project would in fact complement and align with the NICP country projects. This argument may well apply to the NICP country projects also. The responsibility of mainstreaming and aligning the objectives and activities of the projects was supposedly shared across the board. The design did make a general reference to the fact that targets for each country would be determined according to the DWCPs

but did not provide further details.

Interviews with officials involved in the design and in the approval of the project document revealed that considerable leeway was accorded to mainstreaming projects at the time of project development because of the complexity involved. For the tripartism and social dialogue project individual country plans were expected as the project progressed.

3.2 Project effectiveness

Management

Organization, staffing and division of responsibilities. The management of the project, once it commenced activities, was split between the two bureaux, with each having responsibility for the programmes and activities for its constituency. Given the structure of the Organization and of the Office and the long and close experience of the bureaux working with the constituents, this division of the management was essential for the successful implementation of activities. A minor internal irritant arose with this arrangement: access to the central system for financial management was limited to one of the bureaux. Otherwise evidence indicates that the two bureaux collaborated closely throughout the project including the submission of joint reports.

The project budget (\$1,850,000) did not permit extensive or in-depth activities in a given country, nor did it allow for substantial management and administrative support. ACT/EMP opted to balance its allocations between country level activities and product development and interregional and regional seminars. This meant that institutional building activities did not take place in all countries, such as Ethiopia, the South Pacific and the Cameroon. The production of tools and materials and most of the seminars were implemented in conjunction with the Turin Centre NICP project, which also leveraged resources from the Dutch Employers' Cooperation Programme (DECP). Some funds were set aside for technical inputs, such as the SWOT exercises, programme development for seminars and case studies. Very few resources were devoted to managing the programme. The programme manager at Headquarters, who had other duties at the same time, estimates that the project could only compensate about half of the time she spent on it. As for the field specialists, while they were requested to implement the country level activities, their time was not provided for in the budget. To assist the field specialists, a limited amount of resources was allocated for national project coordinators in 5 selected countries for short periods of time, between 3 to 12 months. This was particularly important in countries where the ILO did not have an office, the so-called non-resident countries (Liberia, Yemen, Mozambique), but was also critical in other countries where Area Office directors have confirmed that the project would not have progressed without them. Where possible, the costs of the national project coordinators were shared with other on-going ILO projects.

ACTRAV devoted essentially most of the funds for country level activities. Product development and regional seminars were also undertaken with the Turin NICP project, but the main input from ACTRAV was technical rather than financial. Funds for management were equally limited and neither the Headquarters' programme manager, who also had other substantial duties, nor the field specialists were compensated adequately for the time they devoted to the project. Through cost sharing arrangements with other ILO projects, only resources for one and a half national project coordinators at the country level for workers' activities were available.

Both programme managers feel strongly that they did not have sufficient time to plan, coordinate and manage the project. They both believe that a project of this nature would require at least a half time position for each of the bureaux. The field specialists, on the other hand, did not raise the subject in the various interviews conducted by the evaluator. This issue will be raised in the recommendations.

For the country level activities, field specialists for workers' and employers' activities covering the countries concerned were requested to consult the social partners, assess needs and priorities and then draw up work plans. This was fully in accordance with the principles of stakeholder ownership and field-based approaches. The field specialists were primarily responsible for implementation with support and financing from Headquarters. Funds were limited to between \$40,000 and \$60,000 per country on average for each of the constituents' organizations. Once these operational modalities had been determined, and taking into account the restricted funds and the short time frame, the programme managers might have taken the opportunity to review the outcomes and the logical framework to adjust the project to reflect more realistic and concrete goals. As will be seen later, the project was not able to achieve all of its objectives, especially in the area of addressing UN reform.

Guidelines, briefing and coordination. The evaluation sought to determine the extent to which the approach outlined in the strategy of the project document in terms of briefing and coordination among all the actors as well as assuring complementarity and alignment with the NICP country programmes was followed. The following steps were foreseen:

- contacts and briefing of the CTAs of the NICP country projects
- discussions with national workers' and employers' organizations on their roles contributing to the success of the country projects
- discussions with the field specialists and the CTAs on capacity building related to the issues addressed in the country projects and on promoting tripartite and bipartite processes within the country projects
- collaboration with DIALOGUE on product development
- collaboration with the Turin Centre
- support for the implementation of the gender equality policy

The above steps were only partially followed. CTAs were briefed in two regional meetings convened by PARDEV and GENDER in 2007.⁷ Tripartism and social dialogue were part of the agenda and ACT/EMP and ACTRAV headquarters and field specialists attended each seminar. Unfortunately the workers' and employers' specialists responsible for implementing the country level activities were not included. This may have been a missed opportunity to define the alignment of the mainstreaming project with the country level activities.⁸ The evaluator was able interview three CTAs who were appointed after the meetings. They had not received specific briefing on social dialogue and tripartism nor were they aware of the briefing materials cited in the prodoc. The CTAs did receive guidance from the field specialists (this was particularly appreciated in the Cameroon and in the South Pacific) and from ILO Office directors. In the end the necessary briefing may have transpired, but it did not appear to have been systematic.

Another missed opportunity for the field specialists, programme managers and the CTAs to align

⁷ Decent Work and Gender Equality 2-6 July 2007 in Addis for Africa and the Arab States and 2-7 December 2007 in Jakarta for Asia and Europe.

⁸ According to one project manager, the costs involved could not be justified in view of country level needs.

strategies and activities occurred when the Gender Bureau and PARDEV organized another meeting in Turin for the CTAs on evaluation and sustainability in December 2008. ACTRAV and ACT/EMP were represented at this meeting by their training directors in Turin. It would have been an ideal opportunity for the specialists to attend and to interact with the NICP country projects with two purposes: (1) to identify the entry points for the mainstreaming project in each NICP project and (2) to identify how the NICP country project intended to promote and enhance social dialogue and tripartism.

Social partners. Except for discussions with the constituents in Liberia, the evaluator was unable to determine to what extent the workers' and employers' organizations were briefed on their roles in the NICP country projects. Certainly the involvement of the social partners was significant in many of the projects; whether this was a result of the mainstreaming project or of the management of the country projects is difficult to say. In projects where activities dovetailed and complemented one another to a greater or lesser extent (Bolivia, Kyrgyzstan, Azerbaijan, Liberia, Indonesia and the South Pacific), despite serious shortcomings in coordination in some instances, it is probable that the two projects worked together to forge mutual support. This issue may be raised in the evaluation reports of the country projects. In other instances where the social partners were active in the implementation of the project (Ethiopia, Nepal and Pakistan) there seems to have been little connection between the mainstreaming project and the country project.

Liberia is a special case. This NICP country project had as one of its main outcomes the strengthened capacity of the Liberian labour administration, the workers' and the employers' organizations to fulfill their mandatory and consultative role in the design and implementation of social-labour policies. Staffed with a full-time national project coordinator for social dialogue, the project devoted considerable priority and resources to building the capacities of the social partners, primarily in the areas of institution building and training on core labour issues. However, even in this setting, involvement of the social partners in the other two components of the project (job creation and solid waste management) was not extensive. Neither the project staff nor the mainstreaming project focused their attention on building the capacities of the social partners in the other technical themes of the project. The reasons for this approach were understandable as the challenge to institution-building after 14 years of civil war dominated the work. At later stages of the project, greater coordination could have been introduced. Indeed, the Liberian labour Congress (LLC) informed the evaluation mission that on their own initiative they decided to inspect the working conditions of the labour intensive road works as part of the job creation component and explore organizing possibilities.

Workers' and employers' specialists in the field. ACTRAV consulted the field specialists who identified country specific priorities in line with the project document. Subsequently national action plans were prepared and where possible were linked to complementary sources of funding (RBTC, Turin and other projects). ACTEMP experienced some delays from mid-2007 until the spring of 2008 due to a staff vacancy. In order to redress this situation and to build coherence into the programme, ACT/EMP convened a meeting in December 2008 of all of its field specialists (7 of 8 were able to attend) involved in the countries concerned. This meeting provided a comprehensive briefing on the aims of the NICP agreement; on the mainstreaming project with ACTRAV and Turin participation; briefings on gender equality and on selected technical issues such as local economic development; and information on DWCP and UN reform and trends in technical cooperation with other projects. A significant part of the seminar devoted time to the work plans, including peer reviews and adjustments to strategies. The ACT/EMP approach proved to be an excellent management initiative. With hindsight it provides a valuable lesson for the future: joint meetings of ACTRAV and ACT/EMP specialists and Turin staff

together with CTAs and ILO Office directors to plan and align country level strategies and activities.

The mainstreaming project coordinated and collaborated well with the Turin Centre. On the other hand, there is little evidence of liaison with DIALOGUE as foreseen in the prodoc. Collaboration with the Gender Bureau was satisfactory. The mainstreaming project did include gender equality in many of its programmes and provided support to seminars organized by the Bureau. Joint activities could have been stronger had the mainstreaming project devoted some resources for cost sharing the seminars.

ILO field offices. There is no evidence of briefings on the mainstreaming project for ILO field offices. These offices were closely involved in the project development for the NICP country projects, but apparently were out of loop as far as the mainstreaming projects were concerned, unless concerted actions were taken, as the Gender Bureau did. It could not be confirmed in PARDEV whether the mainstreaming project proposals had been sent to field offices for comment or review. Several ILO office directors informed the evaluator that they were unaware of the mainstreaming tripartism project; others had a vague idea. A complaint often heard from ILO office directors was the poor communication channels between the specialists and their offices. The exception to this was where the workers' and employers' specialists were assigned to a country office that was overseeing a given NICP country project. This briefing/information gap was unfortunate and is addressed in the recommendations.

The overall picture on guidelines, briefings and coordination projects different images. There were excellent practices; others were unstructured; and missed opportunities slipped by. The impact on project effectiveness is therefore mixed as discussed later.

Monitoring and reporting. The programme managers in ACTRAV and ACTEMP oversaw the reporting process, which proved effective for following developments. The format of the progress reports was standard and comprehensive. These formats were not always followed by the workers' specialists or the NPCs for workers' activities working on the projects with the result that reporting was weak in some instances. That the reporting format for all projects included a section on mainstreaming for both gender and tripartism was a positive development in general.

Constraints to effective management. Aside from the long vacancy in ACT/EMP at Headquarters at the start of the project, a number of field positions were also vacant during the following years. In addition, field specialists transferred from one duty station to the next, meaning that one official may have launched a programme, which was then picked up by the successor, who had to build relations with the constituency before becoming effective. Several challenges arose when projects or activities were carried out in ILO non-resident countries (Bolivia, Mozambique, Liberia, Yemen), particularly when the ILO office is in one country and the field specialists are assigned in yet another country. Mozambique is an example of this: the ILO office responsible is located in Lusaka, the employers' specialist was in Pretoria and the workers' specialist was in Harare. This dispersion of ILO staff is not in itself a cause of little coordination. But in the absence of prior arrangements and set procedures, the geographical distance did not help solve communication problems. Effective coordination among ILO staff dealing with Azerbaijan and Kyrgyzstan, on the other hand was not hampered even though both are non-resident countries, since the CTA and the specialists were all located in the Moscow Sub-Regional Office. A final constraint arose with political instability in certain countries. Security measures prohibited visits from field specialists to those countries where non-essential travel was curtailed. This was the case at times for Pakistan and Nepal. In Bolivia activities were often postponed because of political unrest.

Overall review. The NICP programme as a whole did not have a coordinating or review mechanism to make adjustments in strategies or approaches among the various projects. PARDEV rigorously monitored delivery, but this was not a coordination issue. A few projects brought together different Headquarter technical departments to review progress and ensure alignment, but the tripartism mainstreaming project was not systematically involved in these meetings which tended to focus on strictly technical issues. With the management and technical backstopping of projects decentralized for the most part, immediate solutions at Headquarters to review issues of alignment and coordination between country programmes and mainstreaming projects are not necessarily appropriate. However, PARDEV could take some initiatives. ILO field office directors, for example, might be called upon by PARDEV to play a key role by bringing different departments around a table, together with the CTA and field specialists, perhaps through video-conferencing.

Attainment of objectives

As indicated earlier, the objectives set out in the project document are framed in very broad and general terms. This is compounded by the lack of specific baseline data that is directly aligned with the outputs and the absence of constituents' views. None the less it is possible to analyze to some extent how successful the project was in achieving its outcomes as well as moving towards the development objective of strengthening tripartism and social dialogue. A multitude of activities was carried out in various settings, including the development of tools and training materials and the holding of major interregional and regional seminars on key issues related to DWCPs and PRSs. These latter activities, produced in collaboration with the Turin Centre for the most part, were not included as such in the original logical framework and have subsequently been reported on separately in progress reports. They represent an important component of the capacity building objectives of the project and demonstrate one of the successful approaches adopted by the project.

The first of the three main outcomes of the project as set out in the log frame, together with the planned and the accomplished outputs, is set out below.

Outcome 1: Stronger workers' and employers' organizations

Outputs	Employers' Organizations		Workers' Organizations	
	no. planned	no. accomplished*	no. planned	no. accomplished*
1. SWOTS	All (9)	8 (only Indonesia not undertaken)	-----	-----
2. Strategic plans	-----	5 (Bolivia, Liberia, MOZ (country project) Ethiopia(RBTC))	3 countries	Programme manager reports undertaken in all countries
3. Attract new members	1 in one country	4 (Bolivia, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia)	1 in one country	4 (Liberia, Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan, Nepal)
4. Gender equality				
Capacity building programmes	3 countries	Gender equality issues addressed in Regional workshops covering 50 employers' organizations	3 countries	Programme manager reports mainstreamed in all countries
Gender mainstreamed in structure and policies	---	----	3 countries	idem

*Data summarized from ACTRAV/ACTEMP progress reports 2007,2008,2009, as of 30/04/2010

Institution building was a primary focus of the project. This was based on the premise that unless workers' and employers' organizations are strong, independent and representative they will not be

able to participate meaningfully and strategically in ILO DWCPs, in other NICP programmes or influence national, regional and local policy formulation. Different approaches were used to achieve this objective: organization and management support (SWOTS and strategic plans); assistance in consolidating and revitalizing organizations through mergers and expanded mandates; training in core labour issues where the organizations were particularly weak; and assisting in capacity building to increase membership.

As can be seen above, not all outputs were delivered, but most were and some exceeded the planned target. The promotion of gender equality among employers' organizations was not successful. Reports from the employers' activities specialists have indicated that the issue has been a challenge in many countries. The SWOT exercises, if carried out in a participatory manner and followed by strategic plans, implementation plans and budgets, have played a crucial role in assisting the employers' organizations to build for the future. It might behoove the workers' organizations to undertake these exercises, prior to embarking on strategic plans.

These different outputs under the objective of achieving stronger organizations, coupled with training in core labour issues (which are not specifically outlined in the logframe), have been considered by the evaluation as building blocks for institution building. The question as to whether the organizations are stronger after the project intervention should be addressed after all of the objectives and the question of sustainability have been reviewed. Indeed the three major objectives are inter-related and have a direct impact on the strength and capacity of the organizations. Specific significant examples are provided in the section below on "achievements and successful approaches." As regards the result of the work accomplished under the first objective, the evaluation has concluded after numerous interviews with field staff and CTAs as well as a field visit to Liberia and discussions with a few constituents elsewhere, that those organizations which received support gained strength and increased capacity, some to a greater extent than others. The interviews attempted to determine if the institution building blocks were new or added value to the organizations. In addition, the interviews also sought to clarify whether the building blocks had contributed to enhanced performance on the part of the organizations, for example in defining priorities, representing their members' interests, in organizing membership drives and in reducing structural fragmentation. The result of the interviews, as well as a review of the outputs achieved, underpinned this assessment, which none the less should be accompanied by a number of qualifications or reservations.

The first qualification is that the responses by those interviewed naturally varied according to the country concerned, but did confirm that value was added and that the performance of roles was enhanced. However the different views expressed lead to a second comment. The extent of the increased capacity or strength of the different organizations was not uniform. Country level activities for employers' organizations were not carried out in the Cameroun, Ethiopia and the South Pacific; therefore no conclusions can be drawn for those organizations. The employers' organization in Azerbaijan has been through a recent leadership change which makes assessment difficult. Likewise the status of the employers' organization in Yemen after the project is not known. Evidence is also lacking to assess increased capacity of workers' organizations in Ethiopia and Mozambique, although both of these organizations benefited from assistance to reach out to the informal sector, which is normally considered as an asset for institution building.

Examples of how workers' and employers' organizations have been strengthened is set out below. The area of increased capacity is provided for each organization. Due credit also goes to the NICP country projects as they provided considerable assistance in many instances. It is in fact difficult in some

cases to separate out the direct impact of the mainstreaming project when work was carried out in tandem with the country projects.

The workers' organizations that have been strengthened include those in Liberia (which is highlighted separately below); Bolivia, where a strong new women's wing was established; Azerbaijan, where unions were started up in transnational enterprises; Kyrgyzstan, where sectoral textile workers unions were established and strengthened; Yemen, where gender equality was reinforced permitting an input into the NICP country project; Kiribati and Papua New Guinea, where youth wings were established; Nepal where a joint trade union committee was formed to bring together the 4 separate trade union federations in a difficult political environment; and Indonesia and Pakistan with enhanced policy development capacity. For the workers' organizations in the Cameroon, where fragmentation is problematic, the creation of joint platforms for research and policy development has certainly strengthened the organizations to some extent.

Employers' organizations that can be considered stronger after the project include those in Liberia (discussed below); Mozambique with provincial business councils in place to increase membership; Bolivia with a viable structure and programme; Kyrgyzstan where the NCERK's organizational and representational capacity and visibility were increased; Pakistan and Nepal with new units on information and research; and Indonesia with enhanced research and training capacity especially related to dispute settlement at the enterprise level.

The sustainability of the project's intervention on the enhanced capacity of the organizations is discussed below in part 3.3.

Outcome 2: Organizations are valuable to their membership and potential members

Outputs	Employers' organizations		Workers' organizations	
	no. planned	no. accomplished*	no. planned	no. accomplished*
1. Increased capacity to introduce new and improved services to members	1	7 (Indonesia EMC; Bolivia-2-competitiveness obs and sme; Azerbaijan info and tr'g service to register business; Pakistan and Nepal -research and info units; Yemen -sme.	1	4 Bolivia and Cameroon women's sections; Pakistan - OSH; Nepal protection of rights under the constitution
2. Case studies on WED for employers' organizations	5 countries	None. Not undertaken TOT programme launched in Nepal for 33 women on SIYB	----	----
3. Case studies on involvement of employers' organizations in skills training	5 countries	None. Not undertaken. 3 draft case studies prepared on LED	-----	-----

- Data based on ACT/EMP /ACTRAV progress reports for 2007,2008,2009 as of 30/04/2010

Regarding the second outcome as outlined above, the project was successful in assisting the organizations develop new services for their membership. The most impressive of these appear to be in Bolivia. The competitiveness observatory established with the employers' organization in Bolivia is designed to provide up to date information on the business climate in the country for the promotion of sustainable enterprises able to provide quality jobs and decent work. The women's section of the Bolivian workers' organization was at the genesis of the national gender strategy and the national tripartite body on equality of treatment and opportunity.

Work on the case studies in skills training and women's entrepreneurship development were not

undertaken for the employers' organizations. They were replaced by other activities at the global level. As regards women entrepreneurs, however, a training of trainers programme was launched by the employers' organization in Nepal. Thirty-three women trainers have been trained in the ILO Start and Improve Your Business programme (SIYB) in 30 districts and have conducted training in to another 50 women entrepreneurs at the time of writing, with another 50 trainees targeted. This in itself is a significant achievement, although not planned at the time of design but included in the work plan in Nepal after the needs assessment. Given the close association of employers' organizations with local economic development (LED) activities in the NICP country projects in Nepal, Cameroon, Indonesia and Kyrgyzstan, three draft case studies on employers' involvement in previous LED programmes in South East Asia were prepared. The LED technical unit at Headquarters was pleased with this initiative, even though the eventual use of the studies in employer capacity-building programmes has not yet been determined. The collaboration between the mainstreaming project and the LED activities in some of the NICP projects had a beneficial spin-off effect: the LED team subsequently prepared a discussion paper on the involvement of workers' organization in LED, which is yet to be discussed.

The outputs for the third outcome (social partners influence socio-economic governance policies) are listed below. This component seemed to represent the most challenging task for the project, especially as regards UN reform and training plans for capacity building related to mainstreaming and social dialogue. Taking stock of participation can be measured; determining how this participation influenced the policies is not so simple. As noted in the discussion on design above, the indicators for this outcome were not sufficient and did not provide for tracking dynamic change.

The examples of participation in policy development cited in the chart below represent policy areas that were addressed with the constituent organizations during the duration of the project. In Liberia this included the Decent Work Bill and the national employment policy for both organizations; in Indonesia this was the labor law reform and the response to the global financial crisis and social security issues (for the workers' organizations); in Nepal the workers' organizations engaged in the energy policy, whereas the employers' focused on labour issues; in Pakistan the workers' organizations addressed policies concerning occupational safety and health, and the employers addressed employment issues; in Yemen the employers' organization has been engaged in labour issues; and in Bolivia the workers' organization has addressed social security and gender policies.

Outcome 3: Social partners influence socio-economic governance policies

Outputs	Employers' organizations		Workers' organizations	
	no. planned	no. accomplished*	no. planned	no. accomplished*
1. participation in labour and employment policy development at national/local level	In at least one country	5 (Liberia, Indonesia, Nepal, Pakistan, Yemen)	In at least one country	5 (Liberia, Indonesia, Nepal, Pakistan, Bolivia.)
2. contribution by social partners in pilot countries for more UN cooperation; info and tr'g on UN reform	Explicit role of social partners in at least 2 pilot countries Info and tr'g provided to social partners in at least 2 countries	Not undertaken -UN reform addressed in interregional and regional seminars but no explicit training on EO contribution to UN reform. ACTRAV/ACTEMP joint seminar on DWCP in March 2010 addressed UN reform	Explicit role of social partners in at least 2 pilot countries Info and tr'g provided to social partners in at least 2 countries	1 country – Pakistan ACTRAV/ACTEMP joint seminar on DWCP in March 2010 addressed UN reform
3. capacity building needs with respect to mainstreaming tripartism identified	Training plan identifying needs in at least 3 countries	Not explicitly undertaken. SWOTS identified capacity training needs, but plans not developed.	Training plan identifying needs in at least 3 countries	Programme manager reports that all countries identified training needs
4. increased capacity of organizations to influence policy through articulation of member needs	EO influence policies to improve enterprise performance and competitiveness in at least 1 country	Azerbaijan EO influenced introduction of “one stop service” for registering business Liberia: influenced policies on taxation of investments	WO influence socio-economic policies in at least 1 country	Bolivia- gender equality policies and social security policy Liberia, organization and collective bargaining for civil servants (in progress)
5. Effective participation of workers' organizations in PRS			Labour friendly policies are mainstreamed in PRS in at least one country	Programme manager reports that in all countries proposals submitted to government on PRS and inclusive development model

*Data based on ACT/EMP and ACTRAV progress reports for 2007, 2008, 2009 as of 30/04/2010

The work of associating the employers' and workers' organizations with UN reform has not been accomplished. The project reported that activities in Pakistan with the workers' organization undertook some research work on inflation and wages to facilitate their involvement in the UNDAF. However documentation on the role of the organization in the UN reform process in Pakistan has not been provided. Training for both organizations in at least two pilot countries was not specifically undertaken. Two countries where this might have been possible were Mozambique and Pakistan. The situation in Mozambique was not propitious given the problems confronting the NICP country project itself. For Pakistan, the employers' programme started late and was then interrupted by travel restrictions for the specialist. The project did address UN reform in a major bipartite meeting held in March 2010 on “How and why to get involved in Decent Work Country Programmes” for employers' and workers' organizations in West and Central Africa.

Training plans to enhance the capacity of employers' organizations to mainstream tripartism were not specifically prepared. The project reports that plans do exist for the workers' organizations in all countries. These documents have not been reviewed by the evaluator.

The work undertaken on Poverty Reduction Strategies by the workers' organizations was mainly handled by the product development and training activities carried out by the Turin Centre in collaboration with ACTRAV. This information is available in the final report of INT/06/62/NET. The

mainstreaming project reports that in all countries proposals have been submitted on PRS. Information on the content of the PRSs, however, and whether they are labour friendly has not been provided. At the country level under the mainstreaming project, the only training activity on PRS that occurred was in Liberia, and that was in preparation for the review once the PRS had been completed. The NICP country project and the ILO office responsible for Liberia devoted considerable attention to the PRS with the social partners which no doubt resulted in a labour friendly policy in the strategy.

In summary, the project achieved certain objectives, but important gaps remained at the end of activities. The project did make significant strides in terms of strengthening the workers' and employers' organizations and in assisting them with providing new services. The most challenging component was enhancing the capacity to influence policy development in some areas. Certain obstacles contributed to this shortfall, as will be seen below, in addition to the late start of activities.

Achievements and successful approaches

In line with the objectives of the project, a few examples of significant achievements that were attained in building independent and representative workers' and employers' organizations are presented below. The most striking example is Liberia due in large part because of the daunting challenge left after 14 years of civil war in which institutions and the social fabric were seriously damaged. Enormous credit for this accomplishment goes to the NICP country project (PREDEC) which had a dedicated objective to build the capacities of the social partners as one of its main components. The mainstreaming project, on the workers' side, facilitated the formation of a single unified trade union movement so that a viable social partner would be operational at the start of NICP operations. The PREDEC project also contributed to this effort. On the employers' side, the mainstreaming project, in collaboration with PREDEC, provided organizational, management and technical assistance to the Liberian Chamber of Commerce and facilitated its revitalization into a fully-fledged employers' organization.

The Liberian Labour Congress (LLC)

One of the major achievements of the project was to assist the merger of two separate unions to forge a unified labour movement after the 14 year civil conflict had decimated both unions. The mainstreaming project was able to build on substantial previous work funded by ILO RBTC to assist the workers' organizations define their goals and prepare formal merger documents. In addition, ILO financed solidarity visits from the Ghana workers' organizations to assist with defining programmes, particularly the PRSs. With funds from the mainstreaming project the ILO was a major contributor to the preparatory meeting for the merger and to the formal congress that endorsed the formation of the LLC. The NICP country project (PREDEC) was also a key player in

The Liberian Chamber of Commerce (LCC)

The mainstreaming project was also instrumental in the revitalization of the LCC to become a fully-fledged employers' organization and to be recognized as the most representative employers' organization in Liberia following the civil war. The NICP country project (PREDEC) in collaboration with ILO ACTEMP, facilitated the reorientation of the LCC by releasing an ILO ACTEMP specialist to Liberia for 6 weeks in 2007 to work with the social dialogue component of PREDEC and the LCC. Joint efforts sponsored by PREDEC and the mainstreaming project, with the employers' specialist from Pretoria, have provided subsequent support to strengthen the organization through SWOT exercises, strategic plans, development of a new website to facilitate information

supporting the merger. The LLC is recognized as the most representative workers' organization in Liberia and participates fully in tripartite bodies in the country. During the field visit to Liberia, the LLC confirmed to the evaluation mission that the mainstreaming project had been instrumental in its formation and expressed its appreciation to the Government of the Netherlands and the ILO not only for this support but also for additional expertise in formulating a strategic plan and for briefing on PRSs. The mainstreaming project had completed its work with the LLC in Liberia in 2008. Continual support to the LLC to enhance its capacities and to strengthen its organization has been provided through the NICP country project which had a specific component on social dialogue.

dissemination, management reviews of systems and procedures, membership drives, study tours and training in advocacy. The employers' specialist has also assisted LCC with a new draft constitution which would enable it to further reinforce its activities and its reach to all sectors of the economy and build its secretariat. The LCC participates fully in national tripartite bodies. During the field visit, it also expressed its appreciation to the Government of the Netherlands and the ILO for the support it has received from PREDEC and the mainstreaming project.

As a complement to the general strengthening of the organizations achieved by the project, several particular developments at the country level merit attention:

- Bolivia: the employers' organization (CEPB) developed a competitiveness observatory which provides quarterly updates on the business climate in Bolivia. This has proved to be such a valuable service that it has attracted new members to the CEPB as well as resources from other organizations. A second service was also developed on small and medium enterprises, which will be listed as a good practice.
- Bolivia: the workers' organization (COB) prompted the adoption of a national gender strategy and the formation of a national tripartite body on equality of treatment and opportunity, which is the only functioning tripartite body in Bolivia at the time of writing. This work was carried out with the help of the project, in collaboration with the gender focal point in the Lima Office and the gender specialist in Santiago.
- Kyrgyzstan: new unions have been formed in the textile sector and the informal economy. The process included seminars and discussions with employers' organizations in a spirit of bipartite recognition of the value of social dialogue in the informal sector. This exercise had several spin-off benefits, in collaboration with the NICP country project, that will be highlighted below.
- Nepal: as mentioned earlier, the employers' organization (FNCCI) initiated a training of trainers programme for women entrepreneurs and has trained 33 trainers in 30 districts. The approach has the multiplier capability to train and encourage women entrepreneurs to become active economically, not to mention the potential impact on gender awareness within the FNCCI itself. (Gender equality would have been a fruitful entry point for bipartite work for the workers' organizations and the FNCCI according to one of the employers' consultants.) As regards the trade unions, the establishment of the JTUCC in a difficult political environment can be considered as an achievement.
- In several countries (Bolivia, Liberia and Mozambique) the employers' organizations have

also established interactive websites for increased communication and outreach to members.

The production of guides, manuals, modules for training sessions and training workbooks⁹ produced under the project, both for workers' organizations and for employers' organizations, in collaboration with the project in Turin has provided valuable material that will continue to serve the organizations, as well as others not covered in the project, well beyond the project life. This proved to be a valuable investment. Also at the global level, a number of interregional or regional seminars highlighted issues that were at the heart of the NICP programme as a whole and enabled the project to reach a wide audience. Examples were the seminars on New Opportunities for Employers Organizations in the framework of DWCP, including gender; Employers addressing youth employment challenges in the Pacific, cost shared with the NZ employers' organization; the bipartite seminar on How and Why to get involved in DWCPs, which also covered technical cooperation and national development frameworks; Trade Union training on research and youth employment policies and Poverty Reduction Strategies in the informal economy.

A number of different approaches used by ACTRAV and ACT/EMP and their specialists in project execution have contributed to the achievements and provide potential blueprints for future application. Briefly these include:

- strengthening information and research capacities, so vital for policy formulation and groundwork for social dialogue and collective bargaining as well as for advocacy. Examples in the project included work for trade unions in the South Pacific, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Nepal and Indonesia; and for the employers' organizations in Pakistan and Nepal. Pitfalls do exist with this approach, a point raised in lessons learned below.
- Using research and information units as a means to bring together competing workers' organizations in order to build solidarity and to create joint platforms for action.
- Strengthening organization and management practices/methods of the institutions through SWOTs, strategic plans, reviews of processes and procedures, systematically introducing modules on effective employers' organizations (communications, lobbying, advocacy) prior to developing new services. This was the general approach of ACT/EMP.
- Study tours to more experienced workers' or employers' organizations
- Outreach to the provinces and regions and the informal sector to build membership
- Systematically including gender equality in the agenda of major meetings
- Working together in a bipartite fashion when interests converge (organizing the informal sector in Kyrgyzstan; freedom of association and collective bargaining, common statement on PRSPs, leading to engagement in the global jobs pact in Indonesia)

Coordination and alignment with the NICP country projects

The primary strategy of the mainstreaming tripartism project to build strong, independent and representative workers' and employers' organizations was also intended to see how the social partners could participate in and benefit from the NICP country projects, as well as the DWCPs and national policy formulation.

⁹ Guide and training package on communications for employers' organizations, cost shared with ACT/EMP, Guide on DWCP for employers; toolkit for workers' organizations on the informal economy and PRS.

The potential entry points for coordination with the country projects depended to some extent on the objectives and outcomes of the latter. The approaches were quite distinct: in two projects specific outcomes were dedicated to strengthening the capacities of the social partners in overall social and labour policies – Bolivia and Liberia. Other projects expressed the desire to involve the social partners in the planning and implementing of the project; capacity building was focused on the technical subject of the project. Thus in Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Azerbaijan and the South Pacific capacity building was directed to youth employment policies and strategies; in Pakistan to bonded labour; in Nepal to Local Economic Development (LED); Mozambique to jobs, gender equality and HIV/AIDS; in Cameroon to child trafficking in vulnerable communities; in Ethiopia to specific sectors; and in Yemen to gender equality.

Complementarity and coordination were successful in several projects. In Liberia, where the mutual support of the two projects should have been optimal, internal communication failures, mostly on the part of the mainstreaming project, impeded a smooth implementation of the activities for the workers' organizations. While this did not adversely affect the overall positive result, some missed opportunities occurred. On the other hand, activities for the employers' organization were well coordinated and the technical support provided by the mainstreaming project was underscored in many instances with financial support from the NICP country project. A most useful proposal on advancing social dialogue in Liberia has been prepared by the country project staff which could serve as a basis for further work by the ILO in this country, bringing together the different social dialogue units.

In Bolivia, the mainstreaming project and the NICP country project successfully implemented the gender equality activities in joint action, with the remarkable results cited earlier. On the employers' side in Bolivia, the mainstreaming project collaborated with the NICP project in launching a small enterprise services unit within the CEPB that would work in tandem with the initiatives of the country project in El Alto. As this development was taking place at the end of the project, no further information on its impact on the country project was available. In both countries, both projects none the less carried out separate activities in accordance with their work plans, without prejudice to the other project.

The collaborative work carried out in Kyrgyzstan deserves attention. The NICP country project aimed at creating an enabling environment for integrated youth employment strategies on the one hand and on the other institutionalizing employment and self-employment services packages through demonstration pilot projects. On the workers' side, in the mainstreaming project, efforts concentrated on organizing workers in the informal textile and sewing sectors, which was one of the largest growth areas for employment. This sector fit in with one of the NICP country project's pilots on youth employment. Through a combination of joint efforts, which included a tripartite study tour to the Netherlands and subsequent support from the Dutch business community, this sector is now being considered as a possible area for value chain upgrading and future technical cooperation work. The work in this sector, particularly the business to business relations between Kyrgyzstan and the Netherlands, has also created some unexpected spin-off effects for promotion of the tourism and hotel sectors and of women entrepreneurs, who produce local products. The study tour to the Netherlands also spawned a technical report on the situation of social dialogue in Kyrgyzstan.

On the employers' side in Kyrgyzstan, the national confederation (NCERK), which had received considerable support from the mainstreaming project, was also active in the NICP country project. As a result of this work and through its participation in the LED in the districts, the NCERK established branch offices in two regions. The chairperson of the NCERK has openly stated in a tripartite evaluation seminar that this experience has helped the local constituents acquire social dialogue skills and to discuss

local development issues from the bottom up.

In the South Pacific, the NICP country project worked closely with the trade unions and the employers' organizations to identify avenues for them to promote youth employment. To support these initiatives, the mainstreaming project collaborated by facilitating national and sub-regional workshops with the trade unions to set up youth wings. The sub-regional seminar for the employers' organizations held in New Zealand on youth employment under the auspices of the mainstreaming project was organized in conjunction with the NICP country project. According to the CTA work on this project enhanced bipartite collaboration in the sub-region.

More limited coordination and complementarity occurred in Indonesia. The NICP country project cooperated with the mainstreaming project's action to assist the workers' organizations with the management of the information and research centre, the Indonesia Labour Research and Training Institute (ILRTI). On the employers' side, APINDO, the employers' organization, has participated in most training events, conferences and workshops of the NICP country project. They have also participated in the LED forums in the regions. In collaboration with the work of the mainstreaming project on the APINDO programme for employee management cooperation (EMC), the NICP country project assisted a training of trainers programme.

In Ethiopia the country project was based on certain sectors, which meant that the social partners participated to the extent that they were represented in those sectors. The links with the mainstreaming project were rather weak. The mainstreaming project assisted the workers' organization CETU with research capacities in an area that would be relevant to the NICP country project, the flower sector. In addition it supported some training activities on freedom of association and collective bargaining also in the flower sector as the workers were not unionized and unaware of workers' rights. The work of the mainstreaming project was completed for the most part by the end of 2008, when the NICP project was still in full swing. The country project did have objectives and activities that were highly relevant to the social partners: these included improved industrial relations in the cotton/textile and floriculture sectors through the use of collective bargaining and social bargaining and compliance with international labour standards and improved national labour legislation. Workers and employers participated in a number of training activities on negotiation and mediation, on collective bargaining and dispute resolution, on social dialogue and labour standards. As the 2009 progress reports notes, however, progress toward introducing improved industrial relations in the flower sector has been slow and difficult. There are few examples of collective bargaining and the mechanisms for effective social dialogue do not really exist, although some unions have been formed. In the textile sector the project notes that more work on strengthening the capacity of the training departments of the concerned unions is still required.

In Yemen, the approach of the mainstreaming project was similar to that in Ethiopia, at least as far as the workers' activities were concerned. Activities were concentrated on strengthening the unions and familiarizing them with core issues of freedom of association and collective bargaining, the role of trade unions in the context of national labour law and identifying decent work deficits, with a special focus on gender. The workers' organization, the GFYWTU, was a key partner in the NICP country project, which was on promoting decent work and promoting gender equality. At the time of the evaluation several years had passed since the activities had taken place. However, there does not seem to be any documentation demonstrating alignment and collaboration between the two projects. While the employers' activities under the mainstreaming project were held later, and were still on-going at the time of the evaluation, the links with the NICP country project were not identified.

In Nepal and Pakistan the workers' and employers' organizations were active in the projects, but there were almost no contacts or interchanges with the mainstreaming project. In Nepal, with the focus on employment creation through Local Economic Development in two districts, the employers participated in the LED forums in both districts, whereas there were no unions in one of the districts. While LED might be an entry point for employers to enlarge their local base and to encourage local SMEs to join the federation¹⁰, there does not seem to be the same “natural” interest for the trade unions. This highlights the timeliness of the LED initiative at Headquarters to propose a working paper on workers' organizations and LED. As the mid-term evaluation pointed out, it was difficult to assess the capacities and the commitment of the individual LED member organizations in terms of the relevance of their mandates to LED. The final evaluation should shed light on this crucial issue.

The Pakistan country project targeted bonded labour. Again the workers and employers organizations were very active in the project, both as agents of delivery and as beneficiaries. There was no coordination or alignment with the activities of the mainstreaming project, despite the seemingly high relevance of the country project to both social partners. One of the outcomes focused on organizing workers in bonded labour as well as promoting corporate social responsibility for the employers. Numerous training activities were held, and some key outputs included social dialogue mechanisms in brick kiln sectors, model contract by the Brick Kilns Owners Association and legal aid services and counseling for freed bonded labor families.

In the Cameroon, the project was located far from the major cities in the northwestern part of the country. It addressed child trafficking in vulnerable communities through job creation and poverty reduction using a LED approach. It had intended to include the social partners as key actors at the community level. Given the fractured trade union movement and the difficult rivalries among them, the project decided not to engage the workers' organizations in the project. There were no employer related activities under the mainstreaming project in the Cameroon. Again, in this case, the mainstreaming activities that were carried out for the trade unions were done independently of the NICP project.

The NICP country project in Mozambique presented good openings for coordination and alignment with the mainstreaming tripartism project. Unfortunately this did not take place. At the outset of the country project, objectives and work plans of the mainstreaming project were not shared and activities appeared to occur independently. The fact that the project was in an ILO non-resident country, with the ILO Office located in Lusaka and the specialists in Harare and Pretoria, did not facilitate matters. Improvements in communication did come about with the appointment of new employers' specialist. However by this time, the NICP project itself had faced insurmountable difficulties and operations were curtailed.

The above details on the interface of the mainstreaming and the NICP country projects have been provided because they shed light on key issues surrounding the mainstreaming tripartism project. First, it is clear that the coordination and alignment of the mainstreaming project and the country projects were significant in several countries. The synergies that were created led to substantial achievements with some added serendipity. While it is difficult to state with precision how the mainstreaming project contributed to the outcomes of the NICP country projects, in those instances where there was effective

10 Internal ILO report by F. Amerasinghe on a mission to Nepal to advise on the work plan for the mainstreaming project, Dec. 2008. Mr. Amerasinghe also points out that the outreach to the districts would have to be accompanied by the provision of some relevant services for the SMEs, such as guides on start-up, financing and management.

collaboration this did ensure that the country projects benefited from the cooperation of stronger and more stable social partners with whom initiatives could be taken, such as in Kyrgyzstan. In those cases where initial work to strengthen the unions, in particular, preceded the main interventions of the NICP projects (Yemen, Liberia, Ethiopia), some groundwork had been laid for subsequent action by the NICP country projects. Admittedly in some of these cases the lack of coordination was frustrating. The final evaluation reports of the NICP country projects should be able to draw more precise conclusions on the impact of the mainstreaming project on the other projects.

A second issue concerns the involvement of the social partners in the NICP country projects. It is also clear that the social partners contributed to them as agents of delivery and also benefited from training in specific technical areas. The question arises as to how much this involvement represents “mainstreaming tripartism and social dialogue”. According to the ILO Resolution concerning tripartism and social dialogue, adopted by the International Labour Conference in 2002, tripartism and social dialogue are dynamic processes. They impact on setting priorities and policies and on determining programmes of work and national action plans. For these processes to be effective, the resolution calls on governments to ensure that the necessary preconditions exist (respect for fundamental principles and the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining) and calls on workers' organizations to empower workers where representation is low and on employers' organizations to support the development of a business environment in which tripartism and social dialogue can flourish. Information provided so far by the NICP country projects gives some limited indication on how the processes of tripartism and social dialogue have worked in the various technical fields. Pakistan, Kyrgyzstan, the South Pacific, Yemen and Indonesia are examples. For others it is less clear how the involvement of the social partners in the steering committees or in the LED forums or in the training programmes contributed meaningfully to the processes of priority setting, adjustments to strategies and work plans, as well as to the interchange among the social partners, which is vital to tripartism and social dialogue.

A third issue, related to the above, concerns entry points for interfacing between projects. If country technical projects are carried out where there are no unions or where employers' regional branches are loosely affiliated with national institutions, or where basic fundamental principles and rights at work are not respected or where social dialogue mechanisms do not function or where political instability is rampant, entry points may not exist. This issue is addressed below.

These issues may be addressed in final reports or in the final evaluations of the country projects. In any event, it would behoove PARDEV, ACTRAV and ACTEMP, together with DIALOGUE, to reflect on the the different components of “mainstreaming” and on genuine “entry points” and how these can be best addressed in technical cooperation programmes.

Constraints and obstacles

The mainstreaming tripartism and social dialogue project encountered numerous constraints and obstacles that hindered its effectiveness. Several other constraints also affected the optimal involvement of the social partners in the NICP country projects as well as an effective articulation of objectives and activities between these projects and the mainstreaming project.

The project operated in an unsettling environment in several countries. Political instability and security issues hampered project operations in four countries to varying degrees, but enough to cause delays and limit contacts with social partners: Bolivia, Nepal, Pakistan and recently Kyrgyzstan. In other

countries there existed or still exist serious issues concerning the independence of the social partners' organizations and/or their ability to exercise fully freedom of association and collective bargaining: Azerbaijan and Kyrgyzstan, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Indonesia and Mozambique. The trade union movement was or is not unified with a multiplicity of unions and their federations: Cameroon, Indonesia, Nepal, Mozambique. Social dialogue mechanisms, such as national tripartite committees, are weak or do not function: Cameroon, Bolivia, Ethiopia, Pakistan. There may be others that were not brought to the attention of the evaluation team. DIALOGUE, which was unfortunately not a partner in this mainstreaming project, should be invited to confirm. A further complicating factor was that when activities were carried out in the provinces, the appropriate governmental agency may have been the ministry of local government as opposed to the ministry of labour, which has a firmer grasp in most instances of the concepts of social dialogue and tripartism.

A fundamental challenge that faced the mainstreaming project as it undertook its needs assessments to define country level action was the appreciation of just how weak the social partners' institutions were and how much support would be required to help them participate effectively across the board in DWCPs, the NICP country projects and in national, regional or local policy formulation. In a sense this was not a constraint to the project itself since this recognition reaffirmed the strategy to build the strength of the organizations as a fundamental prerequisite for further work on tripartism and social dialogue. This weakness, however, did have an impact on the effective participation of the social partners in some of the NICP country projects.

According to the mid-term review of the country project in Ethiopia, the social partners are unable to cope with the multitude of demands on their time for consultations and meetings. Interviews with field staff confirmed that the social partners were overstretched and did not have time to come to the steering committee meetings or technical working groups. The staffing levels of the workers' and the employers' organizations in many countries are slim and the secretariats are not able to cope with increase demands, such as in Pakistan, Liberia, Kyrgyzstan. When projects operate in outlying regions, as in several of the NICP country projects, the participants representing the employers' organizations may well be loosely affiliated local chambers of commerce. The links between these entities and the headquarters of the national employers' organization may not be strong and the impact of the project on the capacities of the organizations as a whole may be limited. This insight underscores the strategic importance of the outreach to the regions by the employers' organizations under the mainstreaming project. As was noted earlier, in some regions trade unions do not have affiliates, as was the case in Nepal, Pakistan (aside from brick kilns) and Ethiopia. The secretariats of the workers' organizations are likewise not strong. In some instances even in the mainstreaming project the activities were delayed because there was insufficient support staff to oversee the work (as in Indonesia). This was also the case for the work on employers' and workers' activities in Nepal.

The social partners' lack of involvement in policy development within the UNDAF exercises may be attributed to different causes.. In some cases this was linked to the weakness or the lack of recognition of the ministries of labour. Bolivia was cited as an example where the ministry is particularly weak vis à vis its counterparts. In Pakistan, for instance, having the Ministry of Labor included in key UNDAF or UN reform discussions had been a challenge; even more difficult was gaining the approval of the other ministries for the role of the Employers' Federation of Pakistan in broader socio-economic discussions. In Nepal, the ILO office had worked hard to have the social partners included in UNDAF discussions, only to have them report absent at the time of the meetings. The relevance of UNDAF to the social partners, and how to address it, emerges as a follow-up issue that goes beyond the mainstreaming

project.

The assumptions and risks outlined in the project document on the potential obstacles proved to be well-founded. In retrospect, the difficulties encountered serve to reinforce the principle outcome of the mainstreaming project to strengthen the organizations of the social partners. Even in some of the country projects, such as Ethiopia, it was decided to provide training in core issues such as freedom of association and collective bargaining. When technical work is undertaken in sectors or regions without a grounding in social dialogue, the basic building blocks related to fundamental principles and rights at work need to take a front seat in training activities.

3.3 Impact and sustainability

Difficulties in assessing impact have been referred to earlier, especially the limited contact with the constituents. Moreover as a mainstreaming project, results are sometimes difficult to attribute to one project or another, especially when optimal complementarity was achieved. It should also be borne in mind that the resources were limited in terms of focusing on any one country or social partner. Indeed the risk existed to spread the resources too thinly, across 12 countries, over a relatively short period of time. Given the delay in start-up, compounded by political problems in some countries, the effective time period for many of the interventions was about two years or less in the case of employers' activities. Project implementation also took the form of advisory services by the specialists, with the assignment of additional consultants on occasion. This meant that advice and support were intermittent over a year or so, or more intensive during a very short duration.

Taking into account these factors, expectations on the impact of the project should not be high. With these reservations, the evaluation based its assessment on wide-ranging discussions with ILO field staff, including ILO office directors, some CTAs and in-depth discussion with the constituents in Liberia, brief discussions with the constituents in Indonesia and a limited number of documents testifying to the impact of the work undertaken.¹¹

As a first comment, the impact of the work undertaken on the global products and through the interregional and regional training programmes will not be known for some time. It is none the less contended that the investment in tools, training modules, guides and other materials will prove to be a wise investment for the future because of their potential to have a multiplier effect. The sustainability potential of this work is also high.

The sections on objectives and achievements outlined the major accomplishments of the project. Turning first to the work undertaken to strengthen the workers' organizations, the positive impact was clearly visible in Liberia. While much of the credit goes to the NICP country project, the initial work to assist the two former unions to merge, which was undertaken by previous ILO assistance and the mainstreaming project, proved essential. The Liberian Labour Congress executive committee confirmed the importance of this support, as well as the subsequent assistance on a strategic plan, a workshop on PRSPs and developing policies on youth and gender.

¹¹ In the case of Bolivia, a letter from the Chairman of the Employers' Organization, CEPB, highlights the impact of the project on the CEPB. An evaluation seminar for the projects in Azerbaijan and Kyrgyzstan held in February 2010 also provides evidence of constituents views on the impact of the projects. Unfortunately documentation of this nature has not been foreseen in most instances.

The LLC today is a full partner with the ILO in determining the DWCP; it is a full partner in the National Tripartite Committee; it enjoys full recognition and appreciation by the government (confirmed in meetings with the Minister of Labour and with the chair of the National Tripartite Committee); it engages meaningfully in bipartite forums with the employers' organization –for example, together they reviewed the first drafts of the labour reform bill (Decent Work Bill) prior to entering discussions with the government; it is capable of developing policies as it has done on youth, gender and HIV/AIDS; it is a member of the Presidential Commission on HIV/AIDS; it participates actively in debates on employment policy; it has the technical capability to organize workers and has been a driving force in seeking recognition and the right to collective bargaining for civil servants; and it has taken initiatives to reach out to other non-unionized workers, especially the contract labourers involved in other components of the NICP country project. The sustained support provided by PREDEC and the national project officer on social dialogue should not be underestimated. The complementary technical advice to the LLC provided under the mainstreaming project was an important input.

The outlook for sustaining the progress and impact achieved in Liberia appears good, basically because the foundation is strong. None the less, the needs of the LLC are immense. There are still some internal divisions. Funds are short. At the moment the officers are not paid and LLC estimates that 5 more staff to run the secretariat are required. Despite new premises and office equipment provided under PREDEC, security remains a huge issue; until the premises can be protected or fenced off it is not certain how quickly they will be used. Funds are needed for electricity, for transport for organizing and membership drives, and for mobility into Monrovia because the LLC centre is about an hour from town. Technical support is required for a final review of the constitution and for workers' education on the new labour law reform bill. While the impact of the two projects has been great and while the LLC has a solid foundation and is well informed on policy issues and participates fully in social dialogue in the country, the medium-term and long-term sustainability is fragile. The need for continued support to the LLC stood out starkly in the evaluation exercise.

The impact of the project on the other workers' organizations involved in the mainstreaming project cannot be identified with precision. The evaluation noted that in those countries where trade unions faced freedom of association or collective bargaining difficulties or were not independent and in those countries where social dialogue mechanisms were weak or were severely strained by political unrest, the impact of the project was difficult to measure. In these countries priority was given to providing basic workers' education on fundamental principles and rights at work or to promoting greater trade union unity in the face of a divided union movement. In these situations enabling the workers' organizations to continue to function was considered an achievement (Nepal, Pakistan, Ethiopia and Cameroon).

The establishment of the Joint Trade Union Consultative Committee in Nepal facilitated work among the disparate factions to arrive at common positions on the key issue of the role of trade unions under the new constitution. According to the ILO workers' specialist overseeing this effort, this joint work would not have occurred without outside assistance. The sustainability of the JTUCC for continuing to work in other areas remains to be seen. The research and information committees set up among the different trade union confederations in the Cameroon and in Indonesia also promoted trade union unity and served to demonstrate the importance of information as a basic element in policy formulation. This was also the case for research initiatives in Ethiopia and Pakistan, although the union movements are unified. The sustainability of these initiatives is not certain. According to information provided to the evaluator, the ILRTI in Indonesia is not well budgeted and staffed. Once project support

ends, there is a concern that the work may not continue.

In Bolivia the fact that there is now a national gender policy as well as national tripartite committee on equality of treatment and opportunity, which resulted because of work undertaken by the mainstreaming project together with the gender focal point in Santiago and a specific gender specialist in the Lima office, indicates that the impact has gone beyond the workers' organization itself (COB) to the national policy level. The enhanced capacity on gender equality in a number of workers' organizations besides Bolivia, including Cameroon, Yemen and Mozambique is another foundation stone for changes in the organizations as a whole. Insufficient time has elapsed to note durable impact.

Support for organizing and registering new unions will undoubtedly have an impact in the future on national workers' organizations. This was the case in Kyrgyzstan (sectoral textile workers' unions) and in Azerbaijan (multinational enterprises). Similarly for workers' organizations that provided services and tried to reach out to the informal sector (Mozambique, Indonesia and Ethiopia), there is some cause for optimism that the trade union movement will expand. However, it is too early to determine just how these various situations will evolve.

As regards policy issues, undertaking the research and setting and adopting a policy greatly enhance the chances of a durable follow-up. The workers' organizations in Pakistan have demonstrated consistency in pursuing their policy on occupational safety and health; the trade union in Indonesia are pushing for their social security policy with the government and are also engaged with the employers' organization (APINDO) on fair trade agreements and in tripartite forums on the Indonesia job pact; the LLC in Liberia is active on national employment policies and on freedom of association and collective bargaining for public servants.

Assessing the impact of the project on the employers' organizations encounters some of the same reservations as those outlined above. An important distinction in the project implementation, however, was that the employers' organizations did not face divisions to the same degree or similar difficulties in terms of freedom of association and collective bargaining as the workers' organizations in most cases (Kyrgyzstan was an exception where several employers' organizations exist). This meant that direct support to institution building was more prominent. As noted under the achievements most of the employers' organizations benefited from programmes to strengthen them and enhance their capacities. The impact of this work is notable in Liberia. The Liberian Chamber of Commerce (LCC), had existed before the civil war, was revitalized with the support of the NICP country project PREDEC) and the mainstreaming project to become a fully fledged employers' organization. The two projects coordinated their work and cost shared many interventions: membership drives; SWOT and strategic planning; study tours to sister organizations with more experience. The mainstreaming project was instrumental in providing technical expertise for the above as well as reviewing management systems and processes, job descriptions, providing training in lobbying and advocacy and helping with the drafting of the new constitution. The LCC today is a dynamic and growing organization. It has expanded its membership; it has introduced services to its members (resource centre for African Growth Opportunities Act, has started a business environment survey and influenced national taxation policies); it is fully engaged in national tripartite discussions and freely engages in bipartite discussions with the LLC; it has forged relations with several different ministries to advance its advocacy role; it is active in national policy development on HIV/AIDS and employment; it is a full partner with the ILO and is involved in the DWCP formulation.

The results of these achievements give every indication of being sustainable. The new president of the Executive Council and the Secretary General are both enthusiastic and have a vision for the LCC. The LCC, none the less, faces a number of challenges. The Chairman's priority is to continue to build the institution and the secretariat. The Executive Council, however, is reluctant to increase the staffing levels. New full-time staff are needed for industrial relations and for trade and industry questions as well as for information and communications. Passage of the new constitution should facilitate some of these changes. The membership drive to the regions needs to be intensified to reinforce the viability of the organization. Despite these challenges, the outlook is positive for the LCC to continue as a strong voice for employers and a credible social partner in Liberia.

Another employers' organization where the project results appear to have had a significant impact and where the sustainability is sound is in Bolivia. The mainstreaming project undertook a number of exercises with the CEPB. As a result the CEPB, in keeping with its strategic plan undertaken with the employers' specialist, introduced several viable services for its members: the Competitiveness and Development Observatory, websites and interactive intranets and a micro-finance products and services unit for small enterprises. These services have attracted new members and new financing. Letters of commitment from financial institutions have been obtained for the SME service. According to the employers' specialist, the change in the CEPB from 2007, when he first analyzed its situation, to 2010 has been substantial. In his view the CEPB has become much more focused and has adopted a service oriented and professional approach to its role. As indication of its commitment, the CEPB has engaged a full time staff member to continue the work.

The impact and sustainability for the other employers' organizations is less clear. In general, the exercises of participatory SWOT analyses and strategic planning exercises, as well as the modules on "Effective Employers' Organizations" have impacted all of the organizations. Indications of this impact has been the introduction of selected services for the organizations' members. For example, in Mozambique the employers' organization (CTA) reached out to the regions and established a strategic plan for the southern region. The training of trainers programmes established in Indonesia (APINDO) for the employee management cooperation (EMC) and in Nepal (FNCCI) for women entrepreneurs appear to have good potential. It is too soon to assess the impact and to determine whether the programmes will continue after the mainstreaming project support ends. APINDO seems to have some budget difficulties for its programme; and in Nepal the programme depends on the commitment and dynamism of a key female board member. Nevertheless, just the fact that the TOT programme for women entrepreneurs exists in Nepal is a good sign of impact on gender awareness among the employers in that country.

The information and research units established in Pakistan and Nepal are too new and inexperienced to have had much of an impact so far. Similarly the units established in the employers' organization in Yemen are too new for any impact to be assessed. The units in Nepal and Pakistan have provided the organizations with an insight into the importance of information for policy formulation and for lobbying and advocacy. The unit in Nepal will benefit from continued outside support according to the employers' specialist, which will increase its chances of sustainability.

In Azerbaijan and Kyrgyzstan the project strengthened very new organizations. Unfortunately after a most successful start, the organization in Azerbaijan experienced a large leadership change, and work will have to recommence with the new leadership. In Kyrgyzstan, the impact of the project has been that the NCERK has expanded its services and membership. The recent civil unrest there, however,

may call into question the progress achieved. In both of these countries, the NICP country project played a substantial role in promoting social dialogue in tandem with the mainstreaming project.

It is too soon to assess the project's impact on the ability of the social partners to participate in DWCPs. The seminars held for the employers' organizations specifically targeting DWCPs and the joint bipartite workshop represented major contributions to increased capacity in this area.¹² According to interviews with ILO field staff, the social partners have been closely involved with DWCPs through the work of the ILO country or sub-regional offices and changes over the past three years in the way the social partners participate in DWCP exercises are mixed. In some countries, there has been a marked improvement to more focused demands and needs assessment (Bolivia, Ethiopia, Liberia, Kyrgyzstan and Indonesia); in others no change has been noticed (Nepal and Mozambique). There is no evidence that the changes or lack of change were related to the project's work.

Overall the project has had an impact on promoting and enhancing social dialogue, which was the overarching development objective of the project. The question of promoting tripartism is less clear in the absence of a component to strengthen labour administration. While other government authorities were involved in the NICP projects, the extent of their commitment to tripartism and social dialogue was not reviewed by this evaluation. Final evaluations of the country projects should shed light on this important part of mainstreaming.

The participation of the project managers of the mainstreaming project in the peer review group at the time of the formulation of country project documents was a key factor in ensuring that country projects would recognize the issues, and at a minimum ensure that the social partners were implicated in the projects. Fully fledged social dialogue and tripartism may not have occurred in all of these projects, but the role of the social partners was highlighted. One technical unit, EMP/LED, informed the evaluator that the mainstreaming project had prompted his unit to focus on the interest and role of workers' organizations in LED, which had not been addressed before. In those instances where there was good coordination between the mainstreaming project and the country project, social dialogue (with some limitations in certain cases) was one of the means of addressing other objectives (Bolivia, South Pacific, Kyrgyzstan). Support for new organizations or for units in an organization (such as the youth wings in the trade unions in the South Pacific) clearly served to promote social dialogue and tripartism. Likewise, support to organizations in countries that presented problems in respecting fundamental principles and rights at work kept the participation of the social partners active. The result of strengthening the existing organizations has brought more responsible, articulate and informed partners to the social dialogue arena. The work on information and research, by both the employers' and the workers' organizations in many countries, demonstrated that the views of the social partners could be a significant input into national policy debates. The project would have had an even larger impact had it included DIALOGUE to play a part in strengthening social dialogue mechanisms.

An impressive example of how the concept of social dialogue has been embedded in Liberia, beyond the traditional tripartite partners, was demonstrated when the evaluation team met with a task force composed of government officials, the LLC and officials of the civil servants association. The task force is charged with finding a solution for the trade union rights of civil servants. The representatives of the Ministry of Justice and of the Ministry of Finance defended the rights of the civil servants to organize

¹² See Annex7 for a joint bipartite statement adopted at the ACTRAV/ACT/EMP Workshop on "How and Why to get involved in DWCPs" Dakar, April, 2010.

and expressed their support for promoting social dialogue in all sectors.

As the project was implemented by the workers' and employers' specialist in the field, the work in each country became a part of their biennial work plan. The ultimate impact of the project may well depend on how their efforts will be pursued. Plans for the future and follow-up activities have not been made available. Some specialists have indicated that since the results were successful there are now rising expectations to continue. This issue will be addressed in the recommendations.

4. POTENTIAL GOOD PRACTICES AND EFFECTIVE MODELS OF INTERVENTION

The project has illustrated a number of good practices in terms of management and implementation as well as some initiatives to address key issues. Some of these have been possible thanks to the excellent coordination with the NICP country projects, and may be cited again in the projects' final evaluations. Others are examples of tried and true practices that are not necessarily novel, but bear mention. Finally, some of these practices also provide lessons for the future. This section and the one below should be considered together.

Design and preparation

- The peer review meetings organized by PARDEV proved to be an excellent means to ensure that the social partners were involved in the country projects. This, of course, cannot be attributed to the mainstreaming project, but merits attention and top marks. The process could be strengthened which will be suggested below.
- The workshops bringing together the CTAs and some HQ officials on Decent Work and Gender Equality, organized by PARDEV and GENDER, are further examples of means to promote key issues and ensure coherence and coordination of the cross cutting themes with the country projects. ACT/EMP and ACTRAV participated, which was necessary, but a wider participation would have been desirable (see lessons learned).
- The ACT/EMP workshop for specialists and selected HQ departments followed the above line of action and was instrumental in briefing those responsible for implementation and in laying the groundwork for coordination with the country projects. Again, with hindsight, this action could have been more comprehensive (see recommendations below).
- The decision by ACTEMP to divide its allocation of funds among several different types of interventions added value to the project. The work on global products has left durable, tangible and re-usable training materials for a wider public. By focusing on an existing package "Effective Employers' Organizations", the new modules built on previous work and contributed to a more comprehensive tool kit. The effective partnership with the Turin Centre on this work is commendable and illustrates how synergies can be maximized. ACTRAV did some similar work, but to a lesser degree.

Leveraging funds and cost-sharing

- As funds were limited, efforts throughout the project in different settings spurred the specialists and the programme managers to seek cost-sharing and dovetailing of activities to a maximum extent. While this unfortunately did not or could not happen with all of the NICP country projects, there was excellent cooperation with other ILO technical cooperation projects. National project officers or activities were funded through cost-sharing in Nepal,

Indonesia, Mozambique, Yemen, Liberia and the South Pacific.

- Partnership with the New Zealand employers' organization for a sub-regional meeting on employers' roles in youth employment gives an example of how both expertise and resources of sister organizations in a region can complement the work of the ILO.
- Partnership with the Dutch Employers Cooperation Programme (DECP) was widespread, both in Turin for product development and for training events, and in individual countries, such as Kyrgyzstan and Indonesia.
- The work undertaken by the mainstreaming project in Mozambique is being used as a foundation for a future project funded by the Flemish government (social dialogue and tripartism), illustrating again that leveraging funds can open greater opportunities than remaining in the confines of one project.

Institution building

- A systematic approach to needs assessment and strategic planning has been applied by ACT/EMP and to a lesser degree by ACTRAV. SWOTs, undertaken in a participatory manner with the constituents, followed by strategic planning workshops, the development of strategic plans, implementation plans and budget plans are some of the building blocks of strengthening institutions. All of these components should be completed, as was done in Bolivia with the employers' organization. In other countries, some of the components were undertaken separately, but experience indicates that unless there is an implementation plan and a budget, programmes may not materialize.
- The work in Bolivia with CEPB highlighted another good practice: requesting the CEPB to assign a staff member to work with the project. This gives ownership and firms up the commitment of the constituent. (As noted above in other countries national project officers were funded by the project: this practice has advantages in terms of cost sharing, but disadvantages as will be seen below, and in the end cannot necessarily be considered a good practice).
- Twinning arrangements, study tours and advisory services by sister organizations, often in the same region, have proved essential for building capacity and creating relationships and links that can continue in the future or expand to other areas. Examples include advisory services by the Ghana trade unions and the Nigerian employers' organization in Liberia, study tours for the LCC to Kenya and Mauritius, study tour for a tripartite Kyrgyz delegation to the Netherlands and an Azerbaijan delegation to Spain (both funded by the country project). The Kyrgyz study tour led to potential business ties with the Netherlands, expanded areas of action (upgrading value chains, tourism and small enterprise development) and to a technical document on social dialogue by Dutch experts.
- An example of the credibility and viability of new services introduced by the social partners' organizations was the micro-financing for small entrepreneurs within the CEPB in Bolivia. This service was underwritten by formal commitments of financial institutions to be partners, without which services of this nature should not be launched.

Delivery methods and training interventions

- The decisions by both ACTRAV and ACT/EMP to request the field specialists to implement the activities were sound. These specialists were familiar with the situations on the ground, had the necessary competencies, had already established relations with the constituents, in

most cases, would be able to track progress as part of their on-going work and would be in a position to carry out follow-up work. An additional advantage was that this was cost efficient as project resources were too limited to permit additional staff resources, except in a few limited instances for national coordinators for short durations. The extent to which specialists can be expected to implement a larger programme would have to be examined since the technical cooperation work does represent an additional work load.

- The assignment by ACT/EMP, with financing from the country project, of an employers' specialist for 6 weeks to Liberia at the outset of the project laid the foundations for revitalizing the LCC. The specialist had previous experience in Liberia and had enjoyed the trust and confidence of the constituents from the outset.
- Grouping the constituents into interregional or regional training programmes is an effective way to address common issues such as DWCPs, PRSPs, UN reform.

Entry points (addressing social dialogue and tripartism and strengthening organizations)

- Entry points for bringing the social partners together or for facilitating and strengthening social dialogue need to focus on areas where common concerns and objectives can be identified. Gender equality has proved to be an effective entry point for building social dialogue in Bolivia. Common concerns about labour law reform (Liberia), fair trade agreements and dumping (Indonesia) and employment creation have spurred the social partners to work together.

Technical papers/case studies (These were not necessarily part of the work-plans at the outset but have resulted from project implementation and provide valuable information or guidance for the future)

- A discussion paper on the involvement of workers' organizations in LED was prepared by EMP/LED, motivated by the existence of the mainstreaming project and work of the employers' organizations in their programmes.
- Case studies on employers' organizations and LED have been prepared in draft form, partly funded by the mainstreaming project.
- A technical study on social dialogue was prepared by independent experts under the auspices of the NICP country programme in Kyrgyzstan. This study highlights the complexities involved at the national level and points to ways of overcoming certain obstacles.
- A draft case study of social dialogue in Liberia has been prepared by the national project officer under the auspices of the NICP country project.
- A potential good practice put forward in the Nepal and Pakistan work plans was not accomplished, but is mentioned here because it represents an excellent initiative: case studies on social dialogue in Singapore and Ireland were to have been discussed together by both the workers' and employers' organizations as a means of fostering common objectives and improving social dialogue.

5. LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section complements the one above. An additional focus here, however, is on the lessons that might be drawn from a new type of project which aimed to mainstream social dialogue and

tripartism across a variety of different projects in diverse settings.

Project conception and strategy

- Any project on mainstreaming “tripartism” should include a component for labour administration and for reinforcing tripartite social dialogue forums.
- Mainstreaming projects face difficult challenges in terms of design because they intersect across multiple partners, settings and themes. The novelty of formulating a mainstreaming project on social dialogue and tripartism, in particular, presents special challenges. There is little experience or guidance on which to base this new approach. It is therefore not surprising that concepts and strategies have not been honed sharply.
- Clarity as to what is meant by “mainstreaming” would help identify the outcomes that are expected across the board. In other words, the components of “mainstreaming” need to be parsed into outputs that can be assessed as contributors to enhanced social dialogue.
- The project demonstrated the complexities of defining a strategy for mainstreaming to deal both with different types of interventions and with such diverse settings. On the type of intervention, the primary strategy was to work directly with the constituents and strengthen their organizations. This strategy proved to be valid. The work during the project revealed that all of the organizations faced compelling needs and that in many countries they operate on fragile ground. There is little doubt that the social partners need continued support, and sustainable respect for and practice of social dialogue will not be accomplished in two years.
- Additional strategies (or a more comprehensive strategy), however, were required: (1) to identify entry points for the mainstreaming project to connect with the country projects ; and (2) to define how the NICP country projects would be able to contribute to enhanced social dialogue and tripartism. Mainstreaming is, after all, a shared process.
- A more comprehensive strategy or alternative strategies should take account of different settings:
 - In most countries the employers' and workers' organizations were weak in many respects and the strategy to strengthen the institutions was a correct one.
 - This was particularly true where problems of freedom of association were present or where a social dialogue culture was weak, justifying basic training in core labour issues. It should be recognized that in some circumstances, valid entry points for mainstreaming social dialogue and tripartism do not exist, which means that strengthening the social partners' organizations becomes a fundamental prerequisite.
 - Additional strategies were needed for interfacing with NICP projects that were operating in provinces or regions where the employers' and workers' organizations were either not present or were represented by loosely affiliated branches that were not well connected to the national leadership of the social partners.
 - Another set of strategies for enhancing social dialogue and tripartism was required for projects that addressed technical issues that did not necessarily correspond to a priority concern of the social partners.

- Further strategies were necessary for those situations where the social partners were overstretched with commitments to attend various ILO project meetings. This occurs when there are several ILO projects being run simultaneously or there are multiple consultative mechanisms within project structures.
- Future projects on mainstreaming tripartism and social dialogue should take account of the above considerations and include:
 - components on capacity building on both technical subjects and on core labour issues
 - all capacity building components focusing on the social partners should be coordinated with the national leadership of the constituents' organizations
 - strengthening the constituents' organizations as more effective institutions capable of engaging in comprehensive social dialogue exchanges.
- The selection of countries for projects involving tripartism and social dialogue should involve consultations with DIALOGUE, ACT/EMP and ACTRAV to ensue viable entry points for mainstreaming possibilities.

Design and scope

- Poorly designed projects are difficult to implement and adjustments should be made at the earliest opportunity. In the event of broadly constructed project documents with general objectives, the need for implementation plans with precise roles and responsibilities, together with clearly delineated outputs for both the mainstreaming project and the NICP country projects, becomes crucial.
- In order to fill in information gaps that may exist at the design stage, some proxy information needs to be sought in order to evaluate the impact of a project. Evaluation questionnaires or self-evaluations with the constituents should be envisaged, say six months before the end of operations.
- With limited financing available to cover both social partners in 12 countries plus global products, the lesson emerges that the project's objectives and outputs were too ambitious. Alternatives would have been to reduce the outcomes or leverage resources more effectively, or to consider the outcomes/outputs as a broad menu to be specified later. As this seemed to be the case, this should have been spelled out more clearly.
- The services in information and research introduced in the different organizations were new and rather fragile at the end of the project. To the extent that they depend on national project staff, funded by the project, their sustainability can be called into question. Sustainable inputs (staff and/or resources) should accompany new services as was the case for the CEPB in Bolivia, if at all possible. Clearly this needs to be determined on a case by case basis.
- Assistance with membership drives in the provinces has proved to be strategic, not only to boost the numbers but also because stronger ties between affiliates and regional councils are building blocks for enhancing social dialogue throughout the country.
- Although not able to transmit capability or expertise, some very short term training

programmes were carried out with the employers' organizations on advocacy and lobbying which proved useful for several reasons: (1) they created awareness among the employers of what an organization can do to improve the business environment; (2) they helped to clarify concepts of what collective action is and what it can accomplish; and (3) they demonstrated how a few small changes could be effected, such as organizing campaigns. This approach has demonstrated that, although far from ideal, effective results can be achieved with limited resources.

- On the policy front, the social partners engagement in DWCPs and in PRSs appears to be progressing. This does not seem to be the case for UNDAF and UN Reform issues. How to address this issue with the social partners requires some fine-tuning.

Management

- Drawing on the expertise of the ACT/EMP and ACTRAV specialists proved effective for country level activities with the social partners. Future capacity building projects should continue to involve them.
- If Headquarters' officials are called upon to manage or coordinate mainstreaming projects, they would require either more resources or an adjustment in their work load in other areas.
- The scope for jointly managed activities by ACTRAV and ACT/EMP and the subsequent bipartite action at the country level depend to a great extent on identifying issues that are of common concern. At the project level this was demonstrated by the workshop on DWCP held in April 2010. At the country level, this was illustrated by joint action on PRSs, on labour law reform and on fair trade, for example. Future mainstreaming projects should endeavour to pursue the avenues for bipartite action that were opened by the present project, particularly as regards socio-economic issues.
- The absence of systematic coordination meetings or processes contributed to the uneven alignment of the mainstreaming project with all of the NICP projects. Some measures are required on an on-going basis, recognizing that coordination meetings with CTAs, field specialists, ILO office staff and Headquarters staff are essential for fine-tuning mainstreaming projects.
- An option to be considered would be to have ILO field offices convene country level meetings at the outset of a project and at specific intervals. Objectives, strategies and work plans should be shared. ILO field offices must be kept fully informed in any event as projects are implemented. PARDEV should take the lead to set out the modalities for increased coordination and knowledge sharing across projects.
- Reporting practices should be strengthened. NICP country project reports were often vague about how their action were contributing to tripartism and social dialogue, aside from involving the social partners as agents of delivery. ACTRAV should also tighten its reporting procedures.

Specific issues for follow-up

- ACTRAV may find it helpful to use the SWOT exercise as a first step in needs analysis, and certainly before assisting trade unions with strategic plans.
- ACTEMP may wish to consider ways to engage the employers' organizations in promoting gender equality. The training modules developed so far are impressive and one on gender equality would be helpful, if it does not already exist.
- The training materials developed by the TURIN project for both employers' and workers' should be shared among the colleagues in the field and in Headquarters.
- Meetings of the specialists who worked on the project might be called to allow for sharing experience and good practices.
- ACTRAV and ACTEMP may wish to obtain the views of the social partners on the mainstreaming project as well as on the country project in their respective countries. This information would be a valuable input for future project development.
- The project produced a number of technical documents, ranging from the outputs of the information and research units in both workers' and employers' organizations to the reports on social dialogue drafted for Kyrgyzstan and for Liberia and working documents in technical units. A review of these papers should take place to determine how their use can be maximized in other settings.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The initiative to include a project on mainstreaming social dialogue and tripartism into the Netherlands/ILO Cooperation Programme is commended. The issue is of high relevance to the Organization and to the accomplishment of DWCPs. While not well described in the project document, the need for promoting and enhancing the processes of social dialogue and tripartism is felt strongly in many member States. This has been confirmed in many of the separate project documents prepared under the NICP as well as in DWCPs. Social dialogue and tripartism cannot exist without the participation of strong, independent and representative workers' and employers' organizations, and of course effective government ministries as well. Hence building the capacity of these tripartite partners is at the core of promoting social dialogue and tripartism.

The project represents a new approach on a rather large scale. Mainstreaming social dialogue and tripartism is a complex matter going beyond including workers' and employers' representatives in various project activities. There is little experience or guidance on which to base this new approach. The project admittedly faced a number of shortcomings both in design and in implementation as has been detailed above. Some genuine achievements were attained, while some outcomes were not met. The alignment with the NICP country projects was uneven, whereby coordination and dovetailing was effective in some instances, and in other cases seriously lacking. The impact of the project is mixed across the various countries, but overall the conclusion is that the project has contributed to the overarching development objective of promoting social dialogue and to some extent tripartism.

Future work will need to draw on the lessons learned in this project. The main thrust of change should focus on clarifying concepts and strategies. If the future is to include partnership agreements, and if mainstreaming is to be retained as an approach, then some thought should be devoted to specifying exactly what is expected as outcomes (by and for whom) and what outputs lead to these results. Strategies need to take account of the type of intervention as well as the setting in which projects operate.
