



FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF

Education, Employability and Decent Work for Youth in Pacific Island Countries (YEP)

Project code:	RAS/06/53/NET
Donor:	Government of Netherlands
Project's budget:	USD 2,125,000
Project duration:	April 2007 to April 2010 (duration shortened from 3 to 2 years due to delay in project start up)
Implementing agency:	International Labour Organization
Managing ILO unit:	ILO Sub-Regional Office for Pacific Island Countries, Suva
Technical areas:	Youth, Skills & Employability, Enterprise
Geographical coverage:	Sub-regional covering 5 Pacific island countries of Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu
Date of evaluation mission:	28 February to 28 March 2010
Evaluator:	Tony Powers, Powers & Associates (Australia) Pty Ltd (www.powers-australia.com)
ILO Evaluation Manager:	Pamornrat Pringsulaka, ILO Regional Office, Bangkok
Date of Evaluation Report:	27 April 2010

Contents

ACRONYMS	3
1 ABSTRACT.....	4
2 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND LOGIC.....	10
2.1 Youth Employment in Pacific Island Countries	10
2.2 About YEP	10
3 THE EVALUATION	13
3.1 Purpose, Scope and Clients.....	13
3.2 Methodology.....	14
4 FINDINGS.....	16
4.1 Review of Implementation.....	16
4.1.1 Implementation in Kiribati	16
4.1.2 Implementation in PNG	19
4.1.3 Implementation in Vanuatu.....	25
4.1.4 Implementation in Samoa and Solomon Islands	31
4.1.5 Sub-regional Activities and Overall Assessment of Progress	34
4.2 Relevance and Strategic Fit.....	37
4.3 Validity of Design	38
4.4 Efficiency of Resource Use	41
4.5 Effectiveness of Management Arrangements	42
4.6 Impact and Sustainability.....	43
5 LESSONS LEARNT.....	47
6 CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS	49
6.1 Conclusion.....	49
6.2 Recommendations	49
6.3 Possible Future Directions	51
ANNEX A: Key Project Activities.....	53
ANNEX B: Terms of Reference	56
ANNEX C: About SIYB and CB TREE	65
ANNEX D: Consultation Schedule	66
ANNEX E: Main Project Outputs (with Changes Highlighted).....	68
ANNEX F: About the Countries Visited.....	69
ANNEX G: References.....	73

ACRONYMS

AusAID	Australian International Aid Agency
CB TREE	Community Based Training for Rural Economic Empowerment
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DWCP	Decent Work Country Program
ILO	International Labour Organization
KCC	Kiribati Chamber of Commerce
KIT	Kiribati Institute of Technology
KTUC	Kiribati Trade Union Congress
NAP	National Action Plan on Youth Employment
NICP	Netherlands-ILO Cooperation Program
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NPO	National Project Officer
NZAid	New Zealand International Aid and Development Agency
PICs	Pacific Island Countries
PNG	Papua New Guinea
SBDC	Small Business Development Corporation (PNG)
SIYB	Start and Improve Your Business
SME	Small and Medium Enterprise
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SCC	Samoa Chamber of Commerce
TALAVOU	Towards a Legacy of Achievement, Versatility & Opportunity through Unity
TEP	Transition Enterprise Planning
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
USP	University of the South Pacific
VAC	Vanuatu Agricultural College
VCC	Vanuatu Chamber of Commerce
VTUC	Vanuatu Trade Union Congress
YEN	Youth Employment Network

1 ABSTRACT

Education, Employability and Decent Work for Youth in Pacific Island Countries (YEP) was funded as a three year project, covering the period April 2007 to April 2010 through the Netherlands-ILO Cooperation Program (NICP). The project operated in five countries, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Vanuatu, Samoa and Solomon Islands. In essence, YEP aimed to do three things – increase knowledge of youth employment issues in each country; improve the capacity of stakeholders to address these issues; and run pilot projects designed to test different approaches to supporting youth to get jobs or start their own businesses.

Due to delays in the appointment of a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), YEP did not commence until April 2008. A reprogramming exercise was conducted at the end of 2008 and this led to some adjustments to planned project outputs and a \$US 375,000 reduction in the budget.

This final independent evaluation of YEP was undertaken between 28 February and 28 March 2010. Tony Powers, an independent consultant based in Sydney, Australia, conducted the research and field visits (to three of the five countries) and wrote the final report. The main findings were:

Relevance

The situation of young people in the Pacific Island Countries remains a critical issue, acknowledged by all the stakeholders. In its policy intent and objectives, YEP was therefore highly relevant to the labour market situation in the five participating Pacific Island Countries. It fitted well with the ILO's strategic framework, embodied in the Decent Work Country Programs (DWCPs), with each country's own priorities in the employment and youth affairs portfolios and with sub-regional plans.

Design

The operational and geographical scope of the project design was too ambitious – particularly given the small size of the ILO's Country Office for the South Pacific in Suva and that office's lack of experience in running multi-location projects. Running multiple activities in five countries (and managing these from a sixth) placed a heavy strain on project staff in terms of understanding local issues, building relationships, identifying appropriate project partners, running local activities and, in particular, monitoring and reporting on progress. With the project starting a year late, there was an opportunity to revise the project design, but this did not occur until the end of 2008. This reprogramming seems to have been driven by the fear of budget cuts rather than by the need to re-think what could be realistically done and achieved in the remaining time.

The primary tools chosen for the pilot projects were CB TREE (Community Based Training for Regional Economic Empowerment) and SIYB (Start and Improve Your Business). CB TREE was a completely new tool in the context of the Pacific and little or no expertise or technical backup were available for it from the supervising ILO office in Bangkok. Project staff themselves had no experience in the use of this methodology. SIYB was more established in some parts of the Pacific, but its materials needed to be updated. Technical backup for SIYB was available from Bangkok.

The performance indicators included in the project document and used for monitoring and reporting purposes were inadequate. There were indicators of input and throughput (e.g. numbers trained) but no real indicators of outcomes and sustainability (e.g. results of training;

income earned by CB TREE project participants). A mix of qualitative and quantitative data were needed but such indicators were not built into the original project design or into subsequent monitoring or reporting frameworks.

Implementation

Considering the condensed timeframe in which the project has been operating, YEP has quickly initiated project activities in the five participating countries and has organised a number of Pacific sub-regional workshops and projects. The speed of implementation, however, sometimes came at the cost of quality and the provision of adequate support and follow up. Key outputs of the project were:

- **The development of National Action Plans on Youth Employment (NAPs)** in some of the participating countries. Relating to both Objectives 1 and 2 of the project, the ILO's intent in promoting these plans is to help countries deal with youth employment challenges in a coherent and more integrated and coordinated way. Through YEP, expert assistance has been organised to assist Vanuatu and, possibly, Kiribati to develop their NAPs. Other countries may follow.
- **Research and desk studies.** These were intended to improve regional knowledge of youth labour market issues (Objective 1). A five-country desk review conducted by the University of the South Pacific was completed, but not distributed widely. It was presented at a Pacific sub-regional workshop, but country representatives were not happy with certain elements of it, claiming it was dated and inaccurate. An assessment of youth labour market information and analysis was undertaken in November 2008, which helped to further highlight the inadequacy of the current arrangements, but has not as yet created much momentum for systematic improvement.
- **Advocacy work** at the sub-regional and national level continued throughout the project. This took many forms. While difficult to assess the impact of this work, there was general agreement among those consulted in the evaluation that YEP had focused attention on youth employment issues, raising the profile of the ILO in the process. The presence of National Project Officers (NPOs) in the participating countries greatly assisted this.
- **Institutional capacity building** (Objective 2) took the form of targeted Pacific sub-regional and national workshops initially. While these were well attended and focused on issues of relevance to government ministries, employer organizations, unions and youth organizations, follow up in some instances was patchy.
- **SIYB** (YEP pilot projects - Objective 3). 17 SIYB trainers were accredited (12 male, 5 female) across the five countries and 376 participants (195 male, 181 female) were reported to have undergone the training under YEP. The SIYB training materials were updated and contextualised for use in the Pacific. In Vanuatu SIYB has been formally accredited as a course in the national training system. Follow up and tracking of course participants has, however, not been done systematically, so SIYB outcome data for YEP is largely unavailable.
- **CB TREE** (YEP pilot projects – Objective 3). 15 people were trained in the delivery and management of CB TREE across the five countries. 313 project participants (approx 204 males, 109 females) received short duration skills training (e.g. 2 or 3 days) in four countries. 278 participants (approx 179 males, 99 females) received basic training in basic business planning (Transition Enterprise Planning or TEP). 22 projects were started in total - 8 in Kiribati, 3 in PNG, 6 in Vanuatu and 5 in Samoa. A Pacific CB TREE

manual is currently being developed. At the time of the evaluation, the Kiribati and PNG projects were still in their very early implementation stages. In Vanuatu, where the projects started earlier, 4 of the 6 projects had collapsed and the remaining 2 were barely viable. The Samoan projects were reported to be doing well and providing livelihoods for their participants, but these projects were not visited. They were also embedded in a much bigger UNDP project (TALAVOU) which seems to have provided extra support.

- In YEP, there are some signs that CB TREE was implemented “on the cheap” without sufficient resources and attention provided for monitoring and follow up. It seems that most of the energy was devoted to getting projects off the ground rather than on running successful pilots that would effectively demonstrate the potential of the program.
- **Other pilot projects** were also supported through YEP. In Kiribati a Temporary Work Placement scheme was funded that provided work experience to unemployed youth. In Vanuatu a Youth Employment Service run by an NGO was supported.

Efficiency

The most significant resource lost by the project was time. Considering that a whole year was lost, YEP managed to initiate an impressive and diverse range of project activities in a significantly reduced timeframe. In this sense, the project has been efficient and productive and has maintained a high delivery rate.

Running the project in five countries and managing it from a sixth had the advantage of better linking YEP activities to broader sub-regional and ILO activities, but also meant that the CTA was required to spread her time and support thinly across multiple locations and to spend much time travelling.

National Officers were used to good effect in the locations visited and, considering the high level of skill and experience that they brought to their roles and the relatively low NO salary costs involved, represented a very efficient use of program funds.

Management

The YEP project was managed from the ILO office in Suva, where a CTA, one NPO, an SIYB support officer (working on an *ad hoc* basis and not funded through the project) and an administration officer were based. National Project Officers were at various times based in Kiribati, Vanuatu, Samoa, and PNG. These field officers indicated that they received good support and regular visits from Suva, though were sometimes frustrated by the emphasis on improving the “delivery rate” at the expense of project monitoring. As most were previously senior managers, they found the work required in chasing project acquittals and receipts frustrating and said it distracted them from development and monitoring work.

In all of the countries visited, the project received good political, technical and administrative support from its national partners. A national project steering committee is active in Kiribati (it is also the DWCP committee) and has a good grasp of YEP and what it is trying to achieve. The TALAVOU project oversees project activities in Samoa. The other three countries do not have active steering committees.

The project had some difficulties in the area of technical backstopping and project staff may not have fully understood this role. Staff in Bangkok indicated that project staff were reluctant to engage with them, seek their advice or share key planning documents. Geographic location hindered communication between YEP and the ILO Regional Office in

Bangkok and the Head Office in Geneva - missions to Suva are extremely costly and there are no common working hours between Suva and Geneva.

Although a project work plan or implementation plan was developed early in the project, it was apparently not adhered to very closely. The “delivery rate” seems to have driven project activity. Because of the late start to the project, the priority was to get things happening and to spend the project budget.

Impact

The project has done a lot in two years (maybe too much) and there are some concrete outputs that will remain such as the SIYB and TREE training package. However, many areas of project activity represent just the start of a process and there is a real risk that the gains made in institutional capacity building and in introducing new tools and methodologies will soon be lost if there is not a continuation of ILO support in some form. Outcomes include:

- National Ministries of Labour and Youth in Kiribati and Vanuatu have benefited greatly from YEP and are now well placed to develop NAPs that will provide a strategic framework for youth employment initiatives and a mechanism for coordination.
- The workers’ organization in Kiribati is involved in youth employment issues. Following the Samoa workshop, Kiribati has established and registered the youth wings (at both the peak level and individual union level). The President of the Kiribati Youth Wing is now sitting in the DWCP committee and in the Trade Union Board enabling young workers voices to be heard and be involved in decision making process. A youth wing in PNG was reported by project staff to have been established in March 2010 (after the evaluation mission). Little or no progress has been in Vanuatu and Solomon Islands and Samoa.
- Employers’ organizations are also involved in youth employment initiatives – for example, in Kiribati they are running a work experience program, in Kiribati and Vanuatu they are delivering SIYB, and in PNG and Vanuatu they are promoting gender equality.
- In most cases, it is too early to tell if the CB TREE pilots have had an impact on youth employment and income levels. In Vanuatu, where projects started earlier, most fell over with a few months due largely to a lack of resources and support. In Samoa, the projects were reported to be doing well, but seem to have had some advantages (better support and being built on existing individual businesses activities).
- The impact of SIYB on youth in the participating countries is largely unknown. Little or no post-training follow-up was done and information was not systematically collected on the number, type and nature of new businesses created or of existing businesses that may have been expanded or improved. Trainers reported that, in general, participants reviewed the training delivery very favourably. They were able to describe some anecdotal success stories, but had not been resourced to track participants.
- Through YEP, SIYB and TREE training materials were tailored to the needs of Pacific countries and this is an important legacy of the project. The SIYB package was regarded by trainers as very good and appropriate to local needs while the TREE training materials are being finalized for later distribution.
- Of the other pilot projects implemented, the Kiribati Temporary Work Placement Project has had some good results. 8 of the 33 participants of the project were offered full time jobs at the end of their placements. The Vanuatu Youth Employment Service now has over 1000 young people registered for its services.

Key Lessons Learned

- At project commencement, planned activities should have been comprehensively reviewed and chosen on the basis of what would best achieve the project's objectives - not on the basis of budget preservation. This project planning exercise should be collectively reviewed by project team and the backstopping unit and other ILO technical service units with wide consultation with ILO constituents and national stakeholders.
- Too much emphasis can be placed on maintaining project "delivery rates" at the expense of achieving effective and sustainable outcomes.
- Projects suffer when the ILO "borrows" project staff to do other things.
- Project steering committees need to be established and active in each project location. They should make recommendations on which projects are funded, but ILO should retain the final decision on expenditure.
- Workshops have their place, but it can be frustrating for partner organizations to be simply shown what they are not doing without being given practical follow up assistance (e.g. the Labour Market Information and Analysis workshops).
- "Pilot projects" are by definition designed to test the effectiveness of different approaches. To do this, there is a need to put in place processes to gather outcome data that relate to the project's objectives including quantitative and qualitative information.
- It would be far better to run a few projects and resource them well than to run many projects on a shoestring budget.
- Technical backstopping is vital to the success of multi-disciplinary projects like YEP. ILO enterprise specialists (e.g. for SIYB) and skills specialists (e.g. for CB TREE) needed to be better used in the delivery of the project. Technical backstopping in Youth Employment would also have been helpful at an earlier stage of the project. At project commencement, technical backstopping support (roles and responsibilities) should be clarified with project staff and be well-planned and well-resourced.
- More care needs to be taken in selecting organizations to manage activities. In some cases, they had neither the resources nor the expertise to effectively support the activities they were contracted to manage (e.g. CB TREE in Vanuatu).
- SIYB may need to be adapted to better meet the need of young people and embedded in a broader program of support (including mentoring and microfinance). SIYB needs to be linked to TREE.
- A project exit strategy needs to be developed at least three months prior to the project conclusion. Where activities are expected to continue beyond the project completion date, alternative support and monitoring mechanisms need to be put in place. (It was reported that a Project Completion Partners Dialogue was organized from 14-16 April 2010 to chart the way forward to sustain and continue the activities and achievements of YEP in all five countries.)

Conclusion

YEP was handicapped by a reduced operational timeframe and, under pressure to increase its "delivery rate", some aspects of project quality and follow up clearly suffered. Under these

circumstances it was very difficult to run the project effectively in five locations and manage it from a sixth.

In terms of raising the profile of the youth employment challenge and preparing the stakeholders with the capacity to better plan and coordinate policy and program responses, YEP has generally had a positive effect. The stakeholders have appreciated the ILO's support in introducing new tools and methodologies and in giving them an active role in their management.

The pilot projects were not managed very well. The project spread itself too thinly and it would perhaps have been better to have run fewer pilots, but to give them more attention and resources.

Key Recommendations

- Ensure that all YEP-initiated CB TREE projects that are still operating have access to ongoing technical support and business advice. Ideally, a national partner organization should oversee this process, receive ongoing technical advice on the project and report on project progress to the ILO on a regular basis.
- Encourage (and, if necessary, fund) SIYB training providers to make contact with all young people who have participated in SIYB training to gather more data on quantitative and *qualitative* data on outcomes.
- In any future CB TREE projects funded in the Pacific, more care needs to be taken in the assessment of project ideas, the selection of project participants, the delivery of appropriate technical training, the delivery of training in business awareness and business planning (possibly through SIYB rather than CB TREE's TEP process), the choice of capable partners to manage the projects and the provision of continuous and accessible support. Expert technical assistance should be obtained from the Skills and Employability division of the ILO and projects need to be adequately funded.
- The Bangkok office of the ILO should commission a research project to examine the effectiveness of SIYB in meeting the specific business start-up needs of young people (aged 16 to 21). Models for the provision of ongoing support for this group (e.g. mentoring) need also be identified or developed.
- For all future ILO projects of this size, an independent mid-term evaluation should be completed, even if on a relatively small scale.
- Project work plans need to be kept up to date and shared with ILO backstopping staff.
- In any future youth employment projects, gender initiatives should ideally address issues relevant to the project's primary theme (e.g. the employment needs of young women). The gender-related activities of YEP, while worthwhile, did not specifically address youth issues.
- Incorporate the lessons learned in YEP's pilot delivery of CB TREE into local resource material (including the Pacific CB TREE Manual currently being developed.)
- Technical backstopping staff need to be fully utilised to ensure that project activity is well designed and supported. This is particularly important where ILO tools (such as CB TREE) are being introduced in a country for the first time.

2 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND LOGIC

2.1 Youth Employment in Pacific Island Countries

Youth unemployment in Pacific Island Countries is a serious and growing problem. According to data compiled by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), annual population growth rates in Pacific Island Countries are between 2.2 and 2.7 per cent. The proportion of young people aged 15 to 24 to the total population is approaching 20 per cent. More than half the total population is under 20¹.

Labour market growth has failed to keep up with population growth. Formal sector employment in many countries is limited (mainly to jobs in government administration, retail and services). The majority of economically active people work in the informal economy, either in subsistence production or in modest cash earning activities.

As young people leave school or training institutions and enter the labour market, they face intense competition for jobs and the real possibility of long term unemployment. Some may find work overseas, but many find themselves without options or ill-equipped to successfully take up the jobs that are available or to participate in the informal economy. In many locations women face additional obstacles, including lower participation in secondary education, and cultural barriers, such as the expectation that they take the lead in caring for the elderly and the young.

The situation is both economically inefficient and socially damaging. Fears that disaffected youth might engage in crime and other antisocial activities have already been realised in some locations and are growing in others. The trend across the region for young people to relocate from rural communities and outer islands to urban centres increases this risk and geographically concentrates it. If left to get out of hand, the problem may threaten political and social stability. In a vicious circle, employment and economic growth would then be further curtailed.

While Pacific Island Countries share many of the same labour market issues, they also differ in many important respects – such as their economic potential, culture and history and the mobility of their workforces. Policy and program responses need therefore to be responsive to these differences.

2.2 About YEP

Overview

The YEP initiative is the first multi-country project that the ILO's office in Suva has managed in the Pacific region. It was designed as a three-year project (2007-10) which would operate in five of the ILO member states in the region - Kiribati, PNG, Vanuatu, Samoa and Solomon Islands. ILO technical and project management staff supporting the project were to be based in Suva, Fiji. National Project Officers were appointed for limited periods in four of the five countries to facilitate project activities.²

Target Groups

There were three specific target groups identified in the original Project Document:

¹ : Pacific Island Populations 2004, Secretariat of the Pacific Community

² Periods of employment of the National Project Officers: Vanuatu – June 2008 to present; Kiribati – May 2009 to present; Samoa – May 2009 to present; PNG – August 2008 to October 2009; Solomon Islands – none.

- Young women and men who have **dropped out of education and are in a precarious labour market situation**, including child labourers;
- Young women and men who are **at school but are not gaining employable skills nor exposure to an entrepreneurial mindset**; and
- Young women and men in selected urban and rural locations who have **completed school but are unemployed or struggle to make a living** as self-employed or casual workers in the informal economy.

In subsequent project documents and reports, the first two of these target groups receive far less, if any, specific attention.

In terms of geographical emphasis, the original project document indicated that the “largest share of resources in direct intervention will be in Papua New Guinea due to its population size” (80% of the five countries). This principle appears not to have been followed in the implementation and it is unclear if there was an explicit rationale for a change of emphasis.

Objectives

The project’s Development Objective – its ultimate goal – was “*to contribute to improved employability and Decent Work for young women and men in Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.*” The project document provided detailed information that linked this objective to various international, regional and national development goals, objectives, strategies and Decent Work Country Program frameworks.

In line with the three issues identified in the project document and summarised above, the project had three Immediate Objectives. At the end of the project:

1. *Knowledge of how to address the challenges youth face in securing decent wage and self-employment will have **increased** and will have been efficiently **disseminated** within each country and in the sub-region.*
2. *Governments, employers’ and workers’ **organizations** and youth organizations will have **greater capacity** to develop national and local policies and programs to achieve Decent Work for youth*
3. *Young women and men are **accessing support services** for wage and self-employment through new tools and methodologies adapted to national circumstances*

Outputs

In line with these immediate objectives, 16 major outputs were defined. These are set out in *Annex E*. Changes made as a result of the 2008 reprogramming exercise are highlighted.

ILO Tools and Methodologies in YEP

Other than the introduction of the Know About Business (KAB) approach in Samoa – an output (3.3) that was dropped in the re-programming because UNDP was already implementing it there - the original project document did not specify the tools and methodologies that would be used as part of the pilot projects in each of the five countries. However, as self-employment and entrepreneurship were considered as an important option for youth, two ILO tools were seen to be relevant – Start and Improve Your Business (SIYB) and Community-Based Training for Regional Economic Empowerment (CB TREE). These

tools have somewhat different emphases, target groups and modes of operation and are described in *Annex C*.

Funding Arrangements

The revised program budget (\$2.125 million) allocated funds as below:

Programme Activities (Project Implementation + consultants)	37%
National Programme (National Programme Officers)	15%
Programme Support Activities (CTA & Other Support Staff)	21%
Project Office/Overhead (Travel, equipments, stationeries, etc.)	11%
Programme Support	11%
Provision for Cost Increase	<u>5%</u>
TOTAL	100%

3 THE EVALUATION

3.1 Purpose, Scope and Clients

The Terms of Reference specified the following purpose, scope and clients for the evaluation:

Purpose

- Assess the achievement of the project's outcomes and outputs from the resources invested and any positive impact in relation to policies, processes, behaviour and lives of young people, as well as, in analysing what has worked well and what has not so that it can contribute to organizational learning and the continuous improvement of ILO's tools and approaches.
- Assess the challenges and opportunities that the project faced.
- Provide suggestions and inputs for the design of new or expansion project on youth employment.

Scope

The scope of the evaluation would cover all geographical areas in 5 countries and take into account all interventions of the project. The evaluation mission would be undertaken in 3 countries - Kiribati, PNG and Vanuatu.

The reasons for selecting the three countries are as follows: -

Kiribati is the only country that the project is providing technical assistance in the formulation of the National Action Plan on Youth Employment. It is an important output of YEP and can be a model for the Pacific. There is also a fully functional DWCP committee in Kiribati which also serves as the National Steering Committee for YEP. The employers organizations there are the most active in promoting youth employment where they embarked on a temporary work placement benefiting young graduates of the Kiribati Institute of Technology with first-hand work experience in the private sector. The Chamber of Commerce there served as the coordinating agency for SIYB. The project has managed to establish a Youth Wing within the Kiribati Trade Union as a result of the ACTRAV-ITC-YEP workshop for young leaders of trade union. The project has also established a technical working group in LMIA and has supported several CB-TREE projects. Kiribati ILO YEP is also a recipient of the funds under the Kiribati One-UN fund -this is the first in the Pacific.

PNG is by far the most populated among the targeted countries, and it is where the ILO had previous projects on Start and Improve Your Business- SIYB. The SIYB project produced a set of tools for enterprise development that are suited to economic characteristics of the Pacific region (e.g. specific tools for fisheries) and a pool of trainers with relevant international experience, of which YEP may have built its strategies on. ILO also implements another project on child labour called "TACKLE" in PNG.

Vanuatu is a country where ILO has worked on youth employment related issues before the project started e.g. Vanuatu participated in youth-related capacity building initiatives such as the 2005 Pacific Sub-regional Tripartite Forum on Decent Work Project that focused on major issues, including better social protection for workers and their families, increasing unemployment particularly for the youth, widening informal economic activities and the impact of globalization. Some of the YEP's outcomes are likely to be mainstreamed by the constituents.

The evaluation should consider factors that have impacted on the delivery of outputs such as the reduction of project duration due to belated recruitment of the CTA, or absence or limited availability of National Officers in all 5 countries.

Clients

The principal clients of this evaluation are the project management, the ILO Office in Suva and in Bangkok, the Evaluation Unit, the backstopping units in Bangkok, the YEP in Geneva for NAP, the Donor (the Government of Netherlands) and the ILO constituents in relevant countries.

(The full Terms of Reference for the evaluation are included at ***Annex B.***)

3.2 Methodology

The evaluation mission was undertaken between 28 February and 28 March 2010 and included visits to three of the five project country locations as well as to the ILO's sub-regional office in Suva, Fiji.

Tony Powers, an independent consultant based in Sydney, Australia, undertook the evaluation mission and wrote the report. Ngutu Awira, the National Project Officer based in Kiribati, attended all consultations in that country as did his counterpart in Vanuatu, Shaun Kennedy. Ofelia Eugenio, the project CTA, attended the consultations held in PNG. Pamornrat Pringsulaka, an Evaluation and Monitoring Officer based in Bangkok, acted as the Evaluation Manager. UN evaluation norms and standards, OECD/DAC evaluation quality standards and ethical safeguards were all followed in the evaluation.

In all locations visited, meetings were held with the peak employer and worker organizations and with key government agencies including employment, youth affairs, economic development and planning. Gender equality issues were discussed with project staff and in meetings with stakeholders. Evaluation methods included:

Desk top Review

A range of reports and project documents were analysed including the YEP Project document, progress reports, mission reports, the Decent Work Country Program documents, documents on related programs, and various other project-related documents including forums agenda, policy papers and ILO tools and methodologies that were adapted and updated for use in the Pacific. A full list is included in ***Annex G.***

Telephone and Email Contacts

Numerous telephone discussions and email contacts took place between Tony Powers and the Evaluation Manager and other ILO project staff based in Bangkok in the lead up to the field visits and subsequent to them. Feedback on the draft report was received by email from ILO staff in Bangkok, Suva and Geneva.

Field Visits and Stakeholder Interviews

Field visits were made to Kiribati (4-11 March), Papua New Guinea (14-17 March), and Vanuatu (19-25 March). The field visit to Papua New Guinea included a one-day workshop with representatives of the community-based businesses established through CB TREE as well as other stakeholders. Project briefings with ILO Director a.i., project Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) and other ILO Staff were held in Suva, Fiji (1-3 and 26-28 March). Site visits to the other two project locations, Samoa and Solomon Islands, were not included in the

mission. Instead, the evaluation relied on written reports, briefings from Suva-based project staff and some telephone interviews with project staff to gather data for these countries.

Questions asked at these interviews and meetings reflected the list provided in the Terms of Reference (See *Annex B*). A full list of consultations is included at *Annex D*.

Possible Limitations or biases?

Data limitations – Due to the compressed timeframe of the project, some of the pilot project activities have only recently commenced and it was not possible to make a comprehensive assessment of outcomes and pilot project impact. It will probably require another 6 months of operation before a reasonable assessment can be made in these cases. In the case of SIYB, outcome data was either lacking in detail or unavailable in most cases.

Financial data – Limited data was made available to the consultant on project finances.

Project Field Visits Limited to 3 countries – Data from Samoa and Solomon Islands were restricted to written reports and interviews with project staff.

Qualitative research – Qualitative research techniques were used in the evaluation. These are by definition subjective in nature.

Selection bias – Most interviewees were selected by project staff and not the evaluation consultant. There is therefore the possibility that the views and opinions canvassed during the evaluation were not representative – that is, if they came from a hand-picked group. Given the very broad range of people interviewed, however, this seems very unlikely.

4 FINDINGS

4.1 Review of Implementation

Activities under YEP were conducted both at the national level and at the Pacific sub-regional level. This section will firstly examine the project's progress and effectiveness in each of the five participating countries and then look at the overall Pacific sub-regional picture. (Some contextual information on the countries visited is provided in *Annex F*.)

4.1.1 Implementation in Kiribati

Considering the fact that the project has effectively been operating for less than a year in Kiribati, there has been a high level of project activity in this country – see *Annex A* for details. In this short period of time, there have been policy workshops involving key national stakeholders, program workshops on SIYB and CB TREE, the establishment of various committees, working groups and institutional “youth wings”, the training of 112 people under SIYB, and the establishment of 8 community businesses involving 178 young people.

This activity has given impetus to the youth employment agenda in Kiribati and raised the ILO's profile. The ILO's past contact with Kiribati could best be described as episodic, focusing on the delivery of workshops rather than on direct intervention through projects. Giving the stakeholders an opportunity to do something about the problem - rather than just talk about it - has energised the social partners, engaged local communities, individual employers and youth organizations, and provided them with tools and methods to apply. This has created a snowball effect, positioning Kiribati to attract additional assistance from both the ILO (e.g. possible technical assistance to develop a National Action Plan on Youth Employment) and from other donors (e.g. additional funds for future SIYB and CB TREE activities under One Kiribati Fund, a joint UN and AusAID project).

Representatives of government, including the Minister of Labour, Departmental Secretaries and senior officials, all expressed a high level of ownership of the project. This was perhaps assisted by the fact that the National Project Officer was previously a senior government official, enjoys good access to decision makers and is based in the Ministry of Labour offices. Through their involvement in the project steering committee and the DWCP committee, the employer and worker organizations were also closely involved in project implementation – the Kiribati Major Employer Organization administers the Youth Work Attachment Program, the Kiribati Chamber of Commerce and Industry coordinates SIYB delivery and the Kiribati Trade Union Congress (KTUC) is actively working on an innovative CB TREE project that will involve young unemployed teachers. All stakeholders expressed their disappointment that the project was nearing its completion date so soon after commencing in Kiribati.

High levels of activity, of course, do not guarantee outcomes and one of the disadvantages of the project's brevity of operations in Kiribati is that there is, as yet, insufficient data in some areas to determine how well the program has achieved certain objectives. In other locations, individual projects have failed soon after the establishment phase, but the Kiribati projects have not yet faced this “moment of truth”. Nevertheless, there are some indicators of progress as well as some issues of concern:

Objective 1

The project cannot be said to have significantly added to the availability of data on youth employment issues in Kiribati. The Pacific sub-regional desk study undertaken by the University of the South Pacific was not helpful and seems to have been “buried” soon after its

presentation (and unfavourable reception) at a Pacific sub-regional workshop. The Government has received some technical advice in the development of better labour market information and analysis processes, has identified some labour market indicators it might use, and has established a LMI Committee. However, little if any progress has been made in improving data availability – this is an expensive and complex undertaking.

General awareness of the importance of youth employment in Kiribati has been enhanced by the project and has galvanised the stakeholders. This is evidenced by the stakeholder engagement levels described above, the involvement of communities and their leaders in workshops and in CB TREE projects, the development of local youth strategic plans in rural and urban communities, the priority afforded to the issue in the DWCP and the nascent Kiribati National Action Plan on Youth Employment (NAP). The concern here is whether the momentum gained towards achieving this objective will be lost if the capacity to translate words into action - or plans into projects - is suddenly curtailed at the project's completion.

Objective 2

The second objective – strengthening the capacity of stakeholders to develop national and local policies and programs to achieve Decent Work for youth – has also been advanced to some extent in Kiribati. The hands-on experience gained by the government ministries, unions and employer organizations in shaping and implementing the pilot projects (CB TREE, SIYB and Youth Work Attachment Program) has given them experience in youth employment program administration and has improved their readiness to contribute to the NAP. Following a workshop in Samoa organised by the project for young union leaders, the KTUC has established a youth wing as well as corresponding structures in specific trade unions (e.g. teachers, nurses, telecommunication workers). This is in its early stages but the KTUC is overseeing a strategic planning process for these wings to support youth employment initiatives.

Objective 3

The third objective is the facilitation of employment and self-employment support services through the implementation of new tools and methodologies. **SIYB** has been introduced to Kiribati through the project. 4 trainers have been accredited and 5 courses run between May and November 2009. Outcomes reported from these courses have so far been unimpressive. Of the 112 people (47 male, 65 female) to undergo training, only 5 new businesses were reported to have been created (3 by males, 2 by females). Another 5 businesses that were already operated by SIYB participants before they did the training (2 by males, 3 by females), reported some unspecified expansion of activities (e.g. capital, labour, stock or physical or geographic expansion)³. Post-training follow-up and support seems to be limited and there may have been problems with participant selection. The Kiribati Chamber of Commerce and Industry, which administers SIYB in Kiribati, indicated that despite using selection criteria designed to identify only those people who were serious about starting a business (including charging a \$30 participant fee), a number of people seem to have done the training for “other reasons”, perhaps to improve their household management skills or even to advance their careers (i.e. they were already employed in the formal sector).

As a very encouraging sign of the program being sustained and supported by other donors in Kiribati interested in youth employment development, the SIYB methodology has been

³ Monitoring results of the SIYB pilots was poor across all project locations. Data were often unavailable or did not tell us much of SIYB's success in achieving YEP objectives.

picked up by a NZ Aid project involving the Kiribati National Advisory Council for Youth. A YEP-trained trainer will deliver SIYB training to a group of young people in April. NZ Aid will contribute \$3000 to fund the training delivery and also offer \$5000 in loans to the start-up businesses.

CB TREE has also been implemented in Kiribati, but it is too early to evaluate its results. 105 people (63 males, 42 females) received skills training and 38 (16 males, 22 females) received training in basic business planning through the Transition Enterprise Planning (TEP) module of CB TREE. Only two businesses have recently commenced operations – a group of KIT graduates in an electrical repair business (3 in electrical trades, all female, and 1 in accounts also female); and another group of KIT graduates in a carpentry business (3 carpenters, all male, and one accounts clerk, female). The participants in both these businesses had been unemployed for extended periods after their graduation. Neither group indicated that they were yet making as much money as they would in a job in the open market, but were hopeful that their businesses would grow. Both had received significant capital grants under the program (e.g. the carpenters had received \$AU3900 for tools and raw materials – a figure that seemed to the evaluator, without seeing the budget, to be somewhat generous in the Kiribati context and relative to project expenditure as a whole) and had received training based on the “Business Planning” module of SIYB. Government stakeholders were taking an active interest in the two businesses, even going so far as to actively link them to business opportunities (e.g. repair of a government office’s air conditioning unit; carpentry work in a school.)

Most of the other CB TREE businesses in Kiribati are the product of a somewhat different model. This approach involved working with discrete villages and youth groups, identifying projects, providing skills training to community members, and supplying start up capital and ongoing support. None of these had yet started operating at the time of the evaluation, but were expected to do so in the ensuing few weeks. These businesses involved much larger groups of young people – from 24 to 36 officially, but possibly many more – and focused on small-scale production of value-added products such as tuna jerky, the cultivation of vegetables or the processing of fish. In practice, these businesses will engage smaller groups of around 5 to 10 in production shifts and distribute profits to these groups. No business planning documents were made available to the consultant for these businesses and it remains to be seen whether the scale of their operations can generate sufficient profits to significantly increase the income of their participants or their communities. The level of ongoing support that will be provided to these projects once YEP concludes is also of great concern. Experience in other YEP locations (i.e. Vanuatu – see below) suggests that these projects need a high level of “hand holding” in their infancy, particularly when they begin to face the reality of operating as a business.

The final pilot project operating in Kiribati is the **Temporary Job Placement Program** (or the Youth Work Attachment Program as it seems also to be known). Recognising that many graduates of KIT do not find work, and that lack of work experience is a major factor, the Kiribati Major Employers Organization saw value in promoting a project that provided work experience opportunities in private sector organizations and put a proposal to the DWCP/YEP committee. Each placement would last 6 weeks and participants would receive a \$25 weekly allowance (“pocket money” as it was called) during the placement. Employers would pay only \$5 of this and the rest would be paid from YEP project funds. The project was approved by the committee and by YEP and results so far have been encouraging. 8 of the 33

participants were offered jobs on full pay by their host employers at the end of the work placement.

The Human Resources Manager of one major employer (Moel Trading Company) said that the project had also served to raise the awareness of the private sector of the skills available in the market. He said that the prevailing culture in Kiribati was to fill jobs by word of mouth, usually through friends and relatives, without necessarily taking time to find the most suitable and skilled candidate. Another employer said that the project gave employers the opportunity “to try before they buy” – to test the suitability of the prospective employee in the job.

There are concerns with the project, however. Sustainability is a concern with one employer saying the project would fall over if employers were asked to pay more than the current \$5 per week for each placement. Another said he would like to see the length of the work placements extended to 13 weeks. While recognising that participants might not be fully productive, care will need to be taken to ensure that young people are not exploited in any future incarnation of the scheme.

In summary, the following factors can be identified as assisting or hindering the project’s implementation in Kiribati:

- Having a highly skilled and knowledgeable National Project Officer with extensive contacts and local knowledge was clearly a major benefit to the project. His former position as a Director within the Labour Ministry meant that he had excellent access to decision makers and the ability to continuously act as an advocate for the project and the ILO.
- Regular visits made by CTA helped provide expertise and advice to stakeholders and to the National Project Officer.
- The severely reduced project time frame hindered implementation in Kiribati. The National Project Officer was only appointed in May 2009 and nearly all of the project’s activities have been squeezed into the last 9 months of the project’s life.
- The delay in project commencement has led to a “use it or lose it” approach to expenditure. The emphasis has been placed on getting projects started (and paid for) rather than on putting systems and procedures in place to ensure their long-term success. Little attention has been given to an exit strategy in Kiribati or to long term sustainability. The continuation of some project activities (e.g. NZ Aid’s support of a follow up SIYB project for youth) was more an example of good fortune than good planning.
- The need to follow up recipients of project funds for receipts has placed something of an administrative burden on the National Project Officer and reduced the time available for development work. The fact that project payments that were often paid 80% “up front” may have contributed to the tardiness of recipients.

4.1.2 Implementation in PNG

Being a far larger project location, PNG has proven to be a more difficult environment in which to implement YEP. Government departments are under-staffed and are struggling to keep up with the demands being placed on them (e.g. responding to the challenges posed by major resource sector projects). Some have been undergoing restructuring for much of the life of the project. Some key agencies, such as the National Youth Commission, have been disrupted by leadership uncertainties and this has retarded progress in important project areas

(e.g. developing a NAP). The Decent Work Country Program committee is not yet really active and its absence has deprived the project of an important institutional support base and communication channel. Worker and employer representative organizations have limited resources.

Because of these barriers - and the temptation, given the compressed project timeframe, to get things happening quickly – less attention seems to have been given to PNG. Activities seem mainly to have focused on workshop delivery – see *Annex A* for details. There were pilot projects established, but these seem to have been rather small, especially considering the relative size of PNG (80% of the total Pacific Island population) and the original project document’s intent to invest the “largest share of resources in direct intervention” in the country.

The quantity and quality of project activities in PNG might also have been influenced by the National Project Officer appointed for the project. In both Kiribati and Vanuatu, the local project officers were able to use the fact that they were hosted by the local Ministries of Labour to embed the project’s goals and activities in the Ministries’ own action agenda. This gave the project a much higher profile in these two countries. While acknowledging that this might have been much harder within PNG, it seems that the Project Officer there was unable or unwilling to do this⁴. According to the CTA (based on the feedback of the officials of the Department of Labour to the Director of ILO), he did not engage well with the Ministry and did not keep them or the ILO informed of his activities. One Ministry Official said that their intention in housing the project officer was to facilitate the integration of the project in the Ministry’s “mainstream activities” so that a recurrent budget could be set aside. In practice, however, he was reported to have operated independently.

The success of the project in achieving its objectives was therefore limited in PNG. Notwithstanding the degree of difficulty of the project location, PNG was intended to be major centre of YEP activity. Concentrating project activities in locations where quick results were more easily obtained – the “low hanging fruit” – is understandable to some extent, but more could have been done to pilot activities in PNG, both through the use of ILO tools and through other more innovative models. This is not to say that YEP should have spread itself even more thinly by establishing more projects, but rather that the pilots chosen could have been up-scaled or given additional support to ensure their success and to more effectively engage with stakeholders. As was demonstrated in other project locations, engaging stakeholders in real, youth employment interventions can energise them and can lead to a better understanding of the local issues than attendance workshops⁵. As one Ministry official pointed out the consistent message received from stakeholders at the provincial level was a need for more action and less talk.

In terms of the specific objectives:

Objective 1

The evaluation found few signs that the project has significantly contributed to stakeholder knowledge of youth employment issues or to dissemination of this knowledge more broadly. A desktop research project was commissioned (undertaken by the University of the South

⁴ The person resigned in October 2009 and was not interviewed as part of the evaluation.

⁵ According to the CTA and as reinforced by NOs, feedback had been received from a number of locations/countries that suggested that there was frustration that the ILO, prior to YEP, was not doing enough direct project work and was instead concentrating on workshops.

Pacific and covering all project locations) and, although presented at a workshop in November 2008, has not been widely distributed.⁶ In terms of Labour Market Information, the workshop delivered as part of the project helped to reinforce the need for better information collection and analysis, but did not have a practical impact – as one Ministry of Labour official put it: “we know the problem, but we’re still looking for solutions”. Some work has been done on promoting awareness of gender equality issues with the Employers’ Federation and there is talk of a campaign to establish gender equality policies among major employers (e.g. hotels), but this is yet to be implemented. Also, following an August 2009 gender workshop supported by YEP (and the ILO’s Gender Bureau and International Training Centre), Government agencies are now required by the Department of Public Services to formulate workplace gender equality policies.

Objective 2

Progress towards meeting the project’s institutional capacity building objective in PNG is similarly modest. Discussions with the Secretary of the Ministry of Labour revealed that the organization is significantly under-resourced at the moment, but a current restructuring exercise may partly address this. Officials seemed well versed in the elements of YEP and were enthusiastic about the CB TREE model. They saw great potential in CB TREE as a means of addressing economic development needs in rural locations while remaining sensitive to the communal nature of society in these areas. Officials interviewed said that they are “trying to sell it internally” and might be able to secure funds for more training. The Secretary also sees some potential in linking CB TREE to the Independence Fellowship Scheme, a program that provides training and start up capital to entrepreneurs in rural localities. Although seen as being a Ministry of Commerce program, there is also a desire to link SIYB to the scheme.

The PNG Trade Union Congress engaged with the project, participated in the Samoa union workshop and is in the very early stages of establishing a Youth Wing. Its General Secretary sees youth employment as “the single most important issue” to be addressed in the DWCP, but as DWCP activity seems to have become bogged down in bureaucratic delays, there has been little opportunity yet for the union to influence policy and program action.

The Employers’ Federation said that its participation in the project’s national youth employment workshop for employers highlighted the need for better communication and networking between employer organizations in PNG. It was unaware, for example, that the Port Moresby Chamber of Commerce was implementing its own youth employment initiative with the support of AusAID – a project that could perhaps have been linked to YEP activities in PNG in some way.

Youth organizations were involved in strategic planning workshops in November 2009. However, due to a lack of follow up by the National Youth Commission, there is nothing yet to show for this initiative.

One organization that could perhaps have been better used to build local capacity and to improve program linkages was the Small Business Development Corporation (SBDC). SBDC has a recent involvement in various ILO initiatives, is the primary provider of SIYB trainer training, has access to mainstream PNG government funds for SIYB delivery and is also involved in various other enterprise education and development programs, including the

⁶ According to the CTA, some of the countries did not like the report, objecting to it on the basis of both tone and content.

school-based Know About Business (KAB) product of the ILO. YEP engaged with SBDC to facilitate additional youth-focused SIYB Training of Trainer courses (see Objective 3 below), but did not involve it with other project activities until very recently when it was invited to assist the CB TREE projects. SBDC expressed its disappointment at this limited involvement and believed that it could have made a greater contribution to YEP – for example, by facilitating pathways for youth involved in KAB to feed into CB TREE and SIYB projects.

There have been some tentative, early steps towards the establishment of a National Action Plan on Youth Employment in PNG and this has some potential to improve institutional capacity to address youth employment issues (e.g. through better policy and program coordination). A NAP workshop was held in Port Moresby in November 2009. Bureaucratic difficulties have again worked against the project in this area, and so the NAP is at best just a concept at this stage. In the words of a Labour Ministry official it will require “thunderbolts from above” – probably from the Prime Minister – to stimulate real action in advancing a NAP agenda in PNG. It needs to be an integral part of the National 2050 Vision and driven by a more active DWCP committee.

Objective 3

As already mentioned, pilot project activity was conducted on a disappointingly small scale in PNG, considering the size of the youth employment problem in that country. Pilot projects were limited to the comparatively safe ground of SIYB (which is already well established in PNG) and CB TREE.

For the **SIYB** project, 3 people from PNG (as well as participants from the other 4 YEP countries) were put through a 10-day Training of Trainer course run by an SBDC Master Trainer. However, the accreditation process – which involved the later assessment of SIYB trainers while they delivered the program to participants - was undertaken by another Master Trainer. Only one of the three PNG trainers was initially accredited, with one failing because of an inability to deliver the training in Pidgin (a requirement that was not part of the initial selection criteria used in this instance to select who would be trained). A second trainer from this group has since gained accreditation, but the whole process seems to have not run as smoothly as it might have.

Under the project, 4 youth-focused SIYB courses were run – two in Port Moresby, one in Lei and one in Goroka. 80 young people participated including 37 women. In terms of outcomes, trainers reported that there were some success stories following the delivery of the courses, but these were mainly with older youth (a breakdown of participants by age was not provided). Those aged over 22 were reported to be generally more ready to embark upon a business venture, but the younger participants needed much more support than could be provided under the program. SBDC suggested that linking youth SIYB courses to school leavers who had completed KAB could improve success rates for this younger cohort. No outcome data was available on SIYB courses run in PNG.

CB TREE is a new program in PNG and YEP has supported three small projects – a poultry farming project (in Inauabi Village) and two rice farming projects (in Veifa Village and Babangogo Village). Discussions with project participants revealed that virtually all were previously involved in small scale, informal cash earning activities such as bringing betel nut to Port Moresby to sell (an activity that would earn between 20 and 50 Kina per 10kg bag, depending on the quality). As a result of the project, 91 people are now in the process of establishing ventures designed to provide an alternative – and hopefully more rewarding – livelihood.

The process for establishing the projects involved an ILO consultant who visited the communities in November 2008 and selected the two enterprise activities after making a quick assessment of local assets and skills. Discussions were held with officials from the Ministry of Agriculture and a Memorandum of Understanding was signed in April 2009 that set out the support that they would provide to the participants. \$US10,000 was paid to the Ministry in June 2009 (rather than to participants as was the case in some YEP project locations) which organised training, and purchased equipment (e.g. power rice tillers) and livestock (i.e. chickens). Training was conducted in November 2009 to coincide with the favourable weather conditions for rice planting – 68 people were given skills training (58 male, 10 female) and 90 were given TEP training (72 male, 18 female). Participation in the projects was 80% male - details are summarised below in Table 2.

The projects are yet to reach a point where their impact on participant income levels can be measured. As was the case in Kiribati, it remains to be seen how many people can viably be supported by these businesses. Regardless, as one provincial official said, the young people are benefiting in other ways from their participation in a meaningful activity in their community. The Paramount Chief of one community was actively supportive of its project and observed the training – a source of great pride for the participants. The Ministry of Agriculture officials are enthusiastic about the potential of the program in PNG and outlined a number of lessons already learned in the course of the pilot, including the need to give extra support to the younger participants (e.g. mentoring and personal development training) and the need to ensure that all village adults knew about the project and how they might themselves benefit from it (e.g. the rice farming groups have agreed to use their equipment to help plant crops on other villagers' land).

Interviewing the participants, it was clear that although they had developed new technical skills and had commenced their farming ventures, they had not yet really faced the *business* realities of running an enterprise. This challenge is imminent and the participants have only received very basic business skills training so far through CB TREE. It is hoped that the linkages now being made with SBDC will address these needs, but it is unfortunate that the YEP project is ending at this critical point. In future, there would be clear benefits of embedding SIYB training in CB TREE projects in the future (See Recommendation C). Ministry of Agriculture officials seem willing to continue to provide support to the projects, but, to do this effectively, they will need to invest a lot of their time over the next year. Given capacity constraints within the Ministry and without the ongoing support and advice of YEP, there is a risk that these promising ventures may collapse as they have in other locations.

The biggest issue that is still to be addressed is the future sustainability of CB TREE in PNG after the project winds up. None of the projects piloted could have commenced without the injection of cash – for training, equipment and livestock – by YEP. The Ministry of Labour sees potential in funding projects (including for capital purchases) through the Independence Fellowship Scheme and there is support at senior levels for this. After YEP concludes, to maximise the project's impact, the ILO needs to continue to provide technical and program design assistance so that this process of mainstreaming CB TREE continues. (See Recommendation A)

Table 2 – CB TREE Participation Details in PNG

Project	Location	Males	Females	Total
Poultry	Inauabui	41	8	49
Rice Farming	Veifa	13	4	17
Rice Farming	Babangogo	19	6	25
TOTAL		73	18	91

In summary, the following factors can be identified as assisting or hindering the project's implementation in PNG:

- Difficulty in advancing initiatives while certain key organizations (e.g. National Youth Commission) faced internal management and leadership problems.
- The National Project Officer was unable or unwilling to cultivate an effective working relationship with the Labour Ministry.
- A closer working relationship should have been forged with the SBDC and the Ministry of Commerce. SBDC had the capacity to better link project activities with other enterprise education and development activities and to bring resources to SIYB implementation. The Ministry of Commerce funds SBDC and may have provided more support to youth business start-ups.
- The scale of project activities was probably too small for a country of PNG's size. Having more activity may have helped the ILO to have its youth employment message "cut through" and get the attention of local stakeholders. Because CB TREE is new to PNG, it has done this to some extent.
- As with the project as a whole, the compressed timeframe led to a focus on rapid expenditure rather than strategic long term mainstreaming goals.

4.1.3 Implementation in Vanuatu

The implementation of YEP in Vanuatu was unique because it built directly on an earlier ILO youth employment pilot project that operated there from July 2007 to March 2008. This project employed an energetic and highly skilled ex-patriot National Project Officer (NPO) to conduct research into local youth unemployment, to run a series of skills training courses in areas of occupational demand and to pilot a work experience project. The NPO was based in the Vanuatu Department of Labour and was able to form very effective relationships with local youth stakeholders and government representatives. He also acted as an unofficial ILO representative in the country, rebuilding relationships which, historically, were not positive in some cases. In June 2008, at the conclusion of this pilot project, the NPO made the transition to a similar role in YEP. This gave the project a head-start in Vanuatu and activities got off the ground earlier there - see *Annex A* for details.

Perhaps because of the opportunity given to Vanuatu through the pilot project to act more autonomously in addressing youth employment, some stakeholders indicated that they would have preferred to have had more say in the choice of activities and projects implemented. A senior official in the Labour Ministry, for example, said that Vanuatu needed “to come up with our own programs that respond to our own unique needs”. Similarly, the Department of Youth agreed that the approach taken by the ILO was not one where they were asked “what do you think we should do here?” but rather of being told “this is what we are going to do, will you support us?” Regardless, all the stakeholders were happy to do this and to actively engage in the Pacific sub-regional and local workshops, follow up these workshops with action in most cases, to play a continuing role in policy development relating to YEP goals, and to get involved in the pilot projects.

The NPO has been a major factor in the orchestration of this stakeholder support. Having been actively working with these stakeholders in the area of youth employment for nine months prior to starting with YEP, he has an extensive knowledge of the local situation and the ability to nurture very strong relationships with key individuals, especially the Commissioner of Labour and the Director of the Youth Affairs Department. It was clear to the evaluator that he has their trust - they listen to him and heed his advice. He has also been very active in bringing attention to youth employment issues more broadly by developing a relationship with the local media, generating publicity and contributing newspaper articles on the project.

His position in Vanuatu as a sort of de facto ILO official, however, has at times meant that he has been required to perform other tasks that were not directly associated with YEP. While this is not unusual⁷, in the NPO's case there have been some significant distractions that have sometimes required him to spend much of his time on other, non-YEP duties – for example, the organization of a major ILO Ministerial conference in early 2010 dominated his time for some months. While this was happening, project monitoring suffered (see Objective 3 below).

Overall, the project has had mixed results with some good achievements relating to Objectives 1 and 2 and both successes and failures in Objective 3:

⁷ The CTA, for example, has been called on frequently to fill in for the ILO Director in Suva

Objective 1

As with the other project locations, the Youth Employment Desk Study commissioned by YEP was rejected by Vanuatu as being inaccurate and outdated. As part of the NAP development process, a local situational analysis was commissioned, but the first draft of this was considered to need more work and is currently being reviewed.

A three day workshop on Labour Market Information and Analysis was held in February 2009 which highlighted areas that require attention, but little progress has yet been made in advancing this agenda.

Advocacy of youth employment issues has been a continuous and creative process in Vanuatu. Activities include regular contributions by the NPO to local newspapers, radio talkback shows, celebrations such as International Youth Day, project launches and the development in Luganville of a music CD of local songs written about youth unemployment. The NAP process also involved the conduct of a “Youth Employment National Action Workshop” in May 2009 that was attended by a wide range of stakeholders and which identified the four key result areas to be included in the NAP.

Vanuatu was the only location to complete a comprehensive assessment of gender equality in the workplace (completed in August 2009) and this work has underpinned the development of draft policy documents for the public and private sectors. The research has filled some important information gaps for stakeholders including the Department of Labour and Department for Women which are now driving this agenda.

Objective 2

Building on the previous pilot project, YEP has made a good contribution to institutional capacity building in Vanuatu. Individual institutions have acquired new capabilities. As a direct result of YEP, SIYB has been formally accredited as a course within the Vanuatu National Training system and the Chamber of Commerce has become a registered provider of this course and is actively marketing it as a core service.

Government agencies have similarly benefited – in the words of the Labour Commissioner, “the Government’s ears are now opened and, as a result of the project, has realised the need”. The Ministry of Youth previously focused on priorities other than employment (e.g. sport) but is now actively engaged – youth employment is now included in the National Youth Strategic Plan as is the NAP (referred to as a “Youth Employment Opportunity Plan”). A network of provincial and national youth councils has been re-established and YEP has played a key role in ensuring their voice is heard in the policy development and planning processes.

Even more importantly, great progress has been made in improving the capacity of the key agencies to work together to improve coordination. The Labour Commissioner directly linked YEP to the development of a team approach to youth employment with the departments of labour, youth and education now working together and with other stakeholders more effectively. The culmination of this will be the NAP, which Vanuatu expects to finalise this year. This will set an agreed agenda for youth employment and provide a means to better harmonise the activities of government, donors and NGOs in line with agreed priorities. Completing the NAP will also enable Vanuatu to become the first Pacific Island member of the Youth Employment Network (YEN), a joint UN, World Bank and ILO initiative that is “a platform and service provider focusing on policy advice, innovative pilot projects, knowledge sharing, and brokering partnerships. YEN makes use of

its core agency partners' know-how and resources and ensures youth participation in delivering its services.⁸ YEP conducted the stakeholder consultations on the proposal for YEN membership and both the Labour and Youth Ministers have recently formally approved this initiative.

Through the introduction of SIYB and CB TREE, awareness of tools available to address youth employment needs has increased. The idea of CB TREE has especially captured the imagination of stakeholders although, as will now be shown, the pilots in Vanuatu did not live up to these high expectations in practice.

Objective 3

Although institutional capacity to deliver **SIYB** was enhanced by the project, its delivery as a pilot for youth employment in Vanuatu was hampered by a lack of appropriate targeting and by a complete lack of participant monitoring and follow up. Regarding targeting, although the first course run⁹ exclusively targeted youth, in a second course run by the Chamber of Commerce in November – the participant costs of which were subsidised by YEP – only 9 of the 22 participants were under 30. Advertisements for the course made no reference to age eligibility and youth were given no preferential treatment in the course selection process. When questioned about the reasons for this, the Chamber said that, as this course required a cash contribution from the participants and that youth generally had little cash, a fee-paying youth market for SIYB was simply not there. While this is an important point and will be discussed in Section 4.3, it begs the question as to why adults were subsidised in this course. Surely it would have been more sensible to fully subsidise youth participation in the course and let the adults pay the full fee. A third course, hosted by the youth organization Won Smol Bag in Luganville, was run during the evaluation visit. Its participants were all youth and no fees were charged.

SIYB targeting seemed also to be deficient in other ways. As was the case in Kiribati, a number of the participants seem to have enrolled in the course for reasons other than starting their own business or improving their existing business. Given a general lack of options for business training in Vanuatu, some formal sector employees (often mature aged) were reported to have enrolled in the course to sharpen their skills. While this is not inherently a bad thing, it of course does nothing to pilot test the program as a tool to address youth unemployment in Vanuatu.

Table 3 – SIYB Participation Details in Vanuatu

Course Location	Young Males (under 30)	Young Females (under 30)	Older Participants	Total
Port Vila (Jun 09)	14	11	0	25
Port Vila (Nov 09)	4	5	13	22
Luganville (Mar 10)	22	8	0	30
TOTAL	40	24	13	77

Regarding monitoring, although about 70 people have undertaken the training, no data have been collected by the trainers on participant outcomes and it seems that trainers were never

⁸ <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/employment/yen/>

⁹ Run in June 2009. This was attended by a Master Trainer.

asked to do so¹⁰. Feedback from participants at the end of the courses was reported to have been very positive, and there were one or two encouraging anecdotes shared about successes the trainers had heard about on the grapevine, but nobody knows the real self-employment or improved business outcomes of the courses as a whole. As a pilot project – designed to prove the value of a methodology – good monitoring mechanisms should have been built into the YEP design and into contracts with service providers. (See Recommendation B)

As for the SIYB training materials and their adaptation for use in the Pacific, trainers were very enthusiastic about their quality and local relevance – as one trainer said “the course is better than the one we were trained to deliver”. The reduction of the course from 10 days to 5 was also considered to be highly appropriate. One trainer questioned the relevance of the main case study included in the work book (a bakery), but this seems to have been only a minor issue. An option that might be worth considering is whether there is a need to develop not just a “Pacific flavoured” SIYB package but a “youth flavoured” package. Given YEP’s focus and the reported extra difficulties faced by young people in both accessing SIYB (when it is unsubsidised) and in actually starting a business, more research may be needed into youth entrepreneurship training needs (see Section 4.3).

The **CB TREE** implementation, which started much earlier than other YEP locations, exposed a number of major deficiencies in project design and resourcing. Of the seven projects established in the first half of 2009, five seem to have perished within three months of commencement and two have struggled on in a very limited sense. Given that most of the CB TREE projects in other locations have only just started, it may prove to be instructive to examine the Vanuatu experience in some detail.

The projects were run in two locations – 3 in Hog Harbour, a rural community on the island of Espiritu Santo, and 4 in Ohlen, a disadvantaged suburban area on the outskirts of the capital, Port Vila.

- The Hog Harbour projects were set up after the ILO CB TREE consultant visited the community with the Principal of the Vanuatu Agricultural College (VAC) in August 2008. The Principal had attended the CB TREE workshop in Port Vila in August 2008 and, seeing its relevance to the College, had enthusiastically volunteered to be a partner in the program’s delivery.
- At Hog Harbour, the local community attended a meeting in September 2008 at which various enterprise ideas were discussed. This process was referred to as “Rapid Community Assessment”, but sounded very much like a simple brainstorming exercise. No in depth analysis of these ideas was undertaken, but three projects were selected – a sewing business that would prepare high quality “Hog Harbour brand” shirts and sell them to the cruise ship passengers that regularly stopped there; a piggery that would breed and sell native pigs for ceremonial purposes across Vanuatu; and a seedling cultivation business that would supply local farmers.
- The Agricultural College was contracted to assist the projects. Funds were paid to them directly and they were expected to purchase the necessary equipment on behalf of the

¹⁰ Trainers were required to submit a report with very basic information on the number of trainees who started businesses, improved/expanded businesses and the number of jobs created, but this was not done well if at all. Moreover, It is also unclear how they were expected to gather this information – no resources were provided for the task to be done and no guidance provided on how and when to do it.

community, to deliver training and to provide on-going support. The Department of Forestry would also support the seedling project

- The community was very enthusiastic. According to the NPO, a big thing was made of the fact that “this was the first development assistance the community had ever received”.
- At a meeting with representatives of the Hog Harbour community projects, the College and the Forestry Department, the following facts emerged:
 - The wrong equipment was purchased for the sewing project. The participants needed an over-locking machine and to be trained in its use. Instead they were given three second-hand standard sewing machines (one of which soon stopped working) and received just three days training in skills they already had. No business training was included and no support was provided after the training. The things the members made were identical to what they had always made. In the words of one of the members, the project “made no big difference at all”.
 - With the piggery, 10 pigs for breeding were meant to be provided and assistance given to train participants, build a suitable enclosure for the pigs and to purchase and install a water tank. In reality, three pigs were provided (all female), no training at all was given, some wire provided to erect a rudimentary enclosure, and no water tank was bought. No consideration was given to business training.
 - The seedling business relied more on the locally based Forestry Department who helped to source the seedlings (over 1500) for the project and to provide regular training (2 days per month) as part of its own mainstream functions (i.e. not through YEP funds). Many seedlings were lost because of the lack of a water tank, but the enterprise is still operating and has started to sell a few plants. Most of the work being done on this project was reported to be done by adults, not youth.
 - Of the funds provided to the Agricultural College (approximately \$US6000 in total) about \$US800 is thought to be unspent. The NPO has for many months been trying in vain to get receipts from the College, so the exact figure is unclear. More importantly, given the critical importance of some of the purchases – especially the water tank – it is not yet known why they were not made. Discussions with College staff suggested that visits to the community stopped because it was considered to be too far away (it is a one and a half hours drive).¹¹
- The Ohlen projects had a similar genesis and fate. A group of young leaders in the community, the “Positive Youth Movement” seized the opportunity to engage in CB TREE and, following process similar to that used in Hog Harbour, three business ideas were identified¹² – sewing, art/landscaping, and panel beating/mechanical repairs. A local NGO, Habitat for Humanity, was given the project management role. The project was launched with much fanfare in January 2009, but things deteriorated soon afterwards:
 - The sewing group of about 15 young women had intended to make school uniforms and local schools had agreed to buy them. They were, however, unable to source

¹¹ Due to a rental dispute, the college also temporarily closed down at the end of 2009, but the cessation of support seems to have pre-dated this closure.

¹² The leader of the group complained that the business selection was unduly influenced by members of the community who played no subsequent role in the project. He felt that some of the ideas that the youth wanted to pursue were not given a fair hearing.

materials (possibly due to local suppliers seeing the group as a threat to their market). They diversified into other product lines, but were unable to find markets for these. Although about two weeks of skills training was provided by a local person, no business training was provided. The participants soon lost interest and the project is defunct.

- All three businesses were based in a very basic shed in the Ohlen community. For the first three months, YEP paid the rent for this property and the participants refurbished and partitioned it for commercial use. At the end of this period, however, the landlord raised the rent and demanded payment. Two businesses (the sewers and the artists/landscapers) could not pay and ceased operating at this point. The mechanics have somehow continued (or, at least, have continued to house some of their equipment there) but any money earned goes to the landlord or to pay electricity bills. Again, only skills training was provided and the groups seem to have had no business training at all.
- Habitat for Humanity did its best to support the participants, but was clearly out of its depth when it came to supporting and advising the business. No business cash flow projections seem to have been done (by Habitat or the ILO) so it is unclear why three months rental assistance was considered to have been sufficient.

It is clear from the Vanuatu CB TREE experience that *it is not enough to simply set up such businesses and hope for the best*. The CB TREE model is promoted as providing on-going support, but this was sadly lacking. Not having the capacity to run these pilots itself, the ILO contracted third parties to manage them, but in Vanuatu these were ill-equipped for the task.

Better monitoring of the project by the ILO could have helped the situation, but for project staff in both Vanuatu and Fiji, the overwhelming priority imposed on them seems to have been the project's "delivery rate" (i.e. the rate at which funds are committed and spent).

A third pilot project was supported by YEP in Vanuatu – the establishment of a **Youth Employment Service Centre** in Port Vila by Youth Challenge, an Australian NGO. As well as engaging in community development activities, such as house construction and other infrastructure improvements, Youth Challenge has in recent years become involved in a range of youth employment activities, including a work readiness program ("Redi Blong Wok") and a self employment program ("Redi Blong Bisnis"). YEP and the previous ILO pilot project have actively supported Youth Challenge in the delivery of these services – for example, initiating business seminars¹³, introducing SIYB trainers to assist in the business training and brokering the participation of guest speakers (e.g. the evaluator attended a session on worker rights given by union representatives for a work readiness course).

In September 2009, YEP provided Youth Challenge with \$US17,000 to establish a youth employment service that would provide career counselling and compile and distribute information on job vacancies (via the internet). The centre is meeting an important youth need and has attracted a lot of local and Pacific sub-regional attention (e.g. the SPC are interested in replicating the model elsewhere in the Pacific) although little is yet known about the employment outcomes being generated. The Ministry of Labour is itself very interested in establishing a network of employment service centres and the Labour Commissioner said

¹³ For example, the "Bisnis Toksave" seminar held in June 2009 addressed the issue of balancing family and cultural responsibilities with running a business.

there was a need to create a better national framework for delivery of such services (an area that might be a good area for future ILO cooperation – see Section 6.3).

In summary, the following factors can be identified as assisting or hindering the project's implementation in Vanuatu:

- The project had a head-start, provided by a previous ILO youth employment project operating in Vanuatu in 2007 and 2008. There was continuity in staffing (i.e. the NPO) and activities that helped advance the policy development process and has led to Vanuatu being now well placed to develop and implement a NAP and to join the YEN.
- The NPO himself was able to form very strong relationships with key individuals and organizations. He has the respect and trust of key stakeholders.
- Being the ILO's only resource in Vanuatu, the NPO was required to spend much of the latter part of 2009 on another task – the organization of a Pacific sub-regional ILO conference that was held in Port Vila. This detracted from his ability to monitor project activities.
- The project has had to deal with some personnel changes in key positions. For example, in November 2009, a portfolio change meant that the project had to “re-educate” a new Minister for Youth on the NAP.
- Some of the stakeholders felt constrained by the project – for example, Vanuatu joining the ILO's YEN was seen as being a significant and highly relevant initiative, but, other than some support provided by the NPO, the project was not seen as offering technical assistance to do this.
- Emphasis was placed on the quick establishment of the pilot projects rather than on detailed planning for their success and on effective support structures. The partner organizations chosen to manage and support the projects failed to deliver.
- This emphasis seems to have been driven by the obsession with the project's “delivery rate”. The compressed project timeframe contributed to this project management mindset – see also 4.5 below.

4.1.4 Implementation in Samoa and Solomon Islands

Neither of these project locations was visited as part of the mission and so the evaluation of implementation was limited to a review of documents, a telephone discussion with the Samoan NPO and a relatively brief discussion with ILO project staff based in Suva. The evaluator was unable to validate the information provided and so less detailed description of project progress and effectiveness is provided below.

Samoa

YEP operated in Samoa almost as an element (or as a complementary program) of an existing UNDP-funded program, the TALAVOU Program (Towards a Legacy of Achievement, Versatility and Opportunity through Unity). TALAVOU is intended to be a holistic, sector-wide approach to youth development and involves young people, government ministries, village and church organizations, NGOs, the private sector and UN agencies, including the ILO. It supports the implementation of the Samoa National Youth Policy (2001-2010). Under this arrangement, the YEP National Officer reports to TALAVOU and project activities and funds were coordinated and monitored through it.

Being a “wheel within a wheel” seems to have been of benefit to the project in Samoa, providing the ILO with ready-made processes and support structures for networking and project implementation and, especially, monitoring. All projects set up under YEP were visited every month by a team of TALAVOU staff and by the NPO.

Objective 1

Of all the participating countries, Samoa was most critical of the Desk Review. Samoa had already undertaken a similar review as part of the formulation of its National Youth Policy, yet, according to the NPO, its findings were overlooked in the Desk Review. A Labour Market Information and Analysis workshop was held in Samoa and highlighted a number of needs (including the need for a Youth Employment Service that would assist in labour market information collection). Follow up to the workshop has not been good however – a technical working group was meant to be formed and this has not yet happened and, as the NPO pointed out, Samoa is “still waiting for help in setting up a proper system.”¹⁴

YEP’s NPO also undertook some other small scale research. A survey of 20 young workers in the formal sector was conducted and another of 20 employers. Results were shared with TALAVOU staff but were not widely distributed.

Objective 2

Representatives of Samoa attended the YEP Pacific sub-regional workshops (i.e. YEP, LMIA, SIYB Training of Trainers, Union Youth Leaders, CB TREE, Employers Workshop) but follow up to most of these is not clear from the reports. The unions in Samoa are historically weak and will need more time to establish effective youth wings.

Local workshops were also run. A local employers’ workshop has generated interest in the establishment of a work placement program. A youth organizations strategic planning workshop seems to have generated some follow up activity (e.g. the Youth Ministry plans to continue to assist youth groups to better plan their activities).

Four SIYB trainers were accredited and this increased the capacity of local organizations such as the Small Business Enterprise Centre (SBEC) to deliver the new 5-day Pacific SIYB package. Other donors are already funding additional SIYB courses in Samoa as a result (e.g. the EU recently funded SBEC to run an SIYB program to a mixed-age group and had the NPO deliver the certificates as a representative of the ILO).

Objective 3

YEP’s project activity was reported to have been warmly received in Samoa. The NPO said that the ILO’s history of running workshops, but no projects in Samoa had been a source of frustration in the past. With YEP, she said, comments like “at long last the ILO is doing things” were not uncommon.

Based on the information provided in reports and by telephone, the projects implemented in Samoa were better organised and supported than in other YEP locations and that some good results had been achieved. 60 youth (29 males, 31 females) received training under **SIYB** of which 8 were reported to have started their own business. The number of existing businesses that expanded after SIYB was not reported.

¹⁴ The CTA pointed out that Samoa is seeking technical assistance from the ILO for a full-blown LMI project that is beyond the awareness raising scope of YEP.

CB TREE in particular seems to have enjoyed some good results in Samoa. According to the NPO:

- 80 young people (48 males and 32 females) were given skills training and 125 (81 males, 41 females) were given TEP training. (Apparently, most of the participants were already working in some capacity in their chosen technical fields and so more business training was delivered than technical training)
- Four enterprises were supported – two in screen printing, one in carpentry and one in vegetable cultivation
- With the possible exception of the vegetable business (which is currently suspended due to weather) the NPO says “all are working well and are sustainable”. The businesses are making sales both locally and internationally (e.g. through distribution channels developed through visiting church ministers)
- Most participants are working and earning wages at least at the Samoan minimum rate (2 Tala per hour or \$US0.80).
- Two other groups have approached the NPO and want to start businesses.

Solomon Islands

Other than participation in Pacific sub-regional YEP events, project activities in the Solomon Islands were limited. Some activities have been initiated in the last few months of YEP (including an introductory workshop on NAP held in the final month of the project). The CTA indicated that the main reasons for slow progress were YEP’s inability to recruit a suitable NPO which did not provide the presence for effective implementation and monitoring of activities. Although close partnerships were developed with the Commonwealth Youth Secretariat in Honiara, which provided some assistance to YEP. Poor communication and high mission costs proved additional challenges.

Objective 1

Apart from representatives of the Solomon Islands attending Pacific sub-regional YEP, LMIA, Union and Employer workshops (and some limited follow up), activities relating to this objective were restricted to some promotional/advocacy activities (e.g. radio talkback shows, information booths, dissemination of YEP studies and resources); some publicity associated with International Youth Day (August 2009) and the Pacific Youth Festival (July 2009); and a workshop on youth employment issues conducted for the Solomon Islands Youth Parliament¹⁵ (November 2009). Miss Solomon Islands was also part of the workshop held for Miss South Pacific beauty pageant contestants and apparently made reference to youth unemployment in a televised speech.

Objective 2

A national workshop on LMIA that was held in December 2008 and which agreed on the broad range of youth employment indicators needed in the Solomon Islands., Apart from this, activities in this area seem to have been mostly crammed into the last few months of the project. A workshop on NAP was held on 31 March to 1 April 2010 which recommended

¹⁵ 50 young parliamentarians representing the 50 constituencies attended in Honiara. This was the only YEP country to organize a Youth Parliament where the youth parliamentarians were able to better contribute to parliamentary debates when discussing youth employment issues.

that a NAP be pursued. Given the high level of support needed to drive the NAP process forward, it is not clear how momentum will be maintained after YEP finishes. A strategic planning workshop for youth organizations was to be conducted on 7-9 April 2010.

Earlier capacity building initiatives were undertaken but there is little or no evidence of their effectiveness. The Solomon Islands workers' organizations sent representatives to the September 2008 workshop for unions, received \$US 2500 of a \$US 5000 grant to establish a youth wing, but were reported to have done nothing. The employers' organizations went to the employers' workshop and formulated an Action Plan to promote Youth Employment in Solomon Islands. Prior to the New Zealand Workshop, a National workshop was organized where 35 Employer representatives were introduced to the Employers Toolkit on Youth Employment. The Chamber of Commerce has done some limited publicity work in the local papers highlighting youth unemployment. Following the January 2010 conference in Vanuatu, an employer organization work plan was also reported to be in development.

Objective 3

2 CB TREE trainers were trained, but no pilot projects were started. Both have now left the country to study overseas.

4 new SIYB trainers were accredited and 4 YEP-funded SIYB courses were run with 60 young people (36 males and 24 females) completing the training. No information was provided on the results of this training. The project also report that SIYB materials were used in a non-YEP program based in the provinces.

4.1.5 Pacific Sub-regional Activities and Overall Assessment of Progress

There was a range of sub-regional activities organised by the project that either directly supported the project's implementation in the five participating countries or engaged with sub-regional stakeholders – see details in *Annex A*. Sub-regional advocacy of youth employment issues (Objective 1) took many forms including working with other UN agencies to put employment forward as a key issue at the second Pacific Youth Festival in 2009 (which led to its inclusion as a key priority in the "Laucala Declaration" made at the festival's end); various interviews on radio and in the print media; involvement in the development of a youth employment portal¹⁶ to share information; and even the briefing of contestants in a regional beauty pageant (to get them to promote youth employment in their home countries).

Efforts made in the area of research and desk studies to improve sub-regional knowledge of youth labour market issues (Objective 1) were less successful. An assessment of youth labour market information and analysis was undertaken in November 2008, which helped to further highlight the inadequacy of the current LMIA systems, but has not as yet created much momentum for systematic improvement. As has already been mentioned, the five-country desk review conducted by the University of the South Pacific was completed, but not distributed widely. It was presented at a sub-regional workshop, but country representatives were not happy with certain elements of it. It was also based on fairly outdated information sources – a fact which, in itself, highlighted the need for better and more current information. In terms of sharing knowledge of the key lessons learned from YEP as a whole, and

¹⁶ In late 2009, YEP and the Pacific Youth Council (PYC) signed a MoU to create the first "Pacific Youth Employment Portal". In March 2010 an "e-discussions" facility was launched as part of this initiative, including the uploading of YEP studies/materials and initiatives implemented in each country to ensure greater knowledge sharing and sustainability in the Pacific.

formulating a way forward to continue and sustain YEP initiatives in each country, a project completion workshop was to be held in April 2010 (after the evaluation mission was completed).

One area which was not originally anticipated as an output for this project was the development of National Action Plans on Youth Employment (NAPs) in some of the participating countries. Relating to both Objectives 1 and 2 of the project, the ILO's intent in promoting these plans is to help countries "deal with youth employment challenges in a coherent and more integrated and coordinated way"¹⁷. Through YEP, specialist ILO expertise has been organised to assist Vanuatu and, possibly, Kiribati to develop their NAPs. The CTA reported that there was now "a real desire for NAPs in most countries" and that these could be "the medium for sustainability" into the future.

Institutional capacity building (Objective 2) took the form of targeted workshops initially. While these were well attended and focused on issues of relevance to government ministries, employer organizations, unions and youth organizations, follow up in some instances was patchy. For example, following the Pacific Sub-regional Labour Market Information workshop only Kiribati formed a local technical working group to follow it up and this appears not to have advanced very far. Union progress in establishing youth wings (following the Pacific sub-regional union workshop) has been slow or non-existent in most locations despite cash assistance (\$US5000) being provided to do so.

In some locations, following the sub-regional workshops, unions and employer organizations have become involved in youth employment initiatives. The teachers' union in Kiribati is about to run a CB TREE project that will use unemployed teachers to provide tuition services to students. Employer workshops helped to encourage their proactive involvement and a toolkit has been developed to assist them. Employers in some countries have expressed interest in new projects (e.g. the Samoan Chamber of Commerce is interested in establishing a work placement scheme).

Pilot project delivery (Objective 3) has already been described in detail in the country reviews earlier in this section, but some general comments need also to be made.

- Although the project was cut short by a full year, it would have benefited from the conduct of an external mid-term evaluation. (See Recommendation E)
- Outcome data for the SIYB participants proved to be difficult to obtain in some locations and the quality of this data was not very revealing when it was obtained. In most cases, the best that could be obtained was a figure on "started a business" or "improved a business" without any more meaningful indicators or descriptive data. Given that these were pilot projects, a more comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system should have been implemented.
- Feedback from SIYB trainers suggested that younger participants were generally not as successful and needed more help to succeed. In Vanuatu, the ILO project seems to have inadvertently subsidised the SIYB training of a number of people outside the target group (e.g. aged 30+)¹⁸. While the institutional capacity to deliver SIYB has been increased, the question remains as to who will pay for the training for youth in the future given that they

¹⁷ Draft YEP Newsletter 2

¹⁸ In particular, one subsidised workshop run by the Chamber of Commerce had a majority of participants over 30 (some in their 40s) and no attempt seems to have been made in this case to target youth.

cannot afford the fees charges. The most lucrative market for SIYB trainers is probably older people so what will drive youth-focused training? (See also 4.3 and 4.6 below).

- The tailoring of the SIYB training materials for use in the Pacific was done very well. Trainers were enthusiastic about the package and believed it met local needs. As already mentioned, there might be benefits in further refining the SIYB materials so that they can address the specific needs of *young* entrepreneurs in the Pacific.
- CB TREE is eliciting much interest in the four countries where it is being piloted and the concept is seen to be very relevant to Pacific communities. Project support and sustainability is the biggest issue, however. The program is relatively expensive and the standard model requires funding for independent analysis of economic opportunities, technical training, business management training, capital equipment purchases and *ongoing business support*. To run the program effectively, all these elements need to be well funded.
- In contrast, in YEP, there are some signs that the program was implemented “on the cheap” without sufficient resources and attention provided for monitoring and follow up. The disastrous Hog Harbour projects in Vanuatu, described earlier, are examples. It seems that most of the energy was devoted to getting projects off the ground and to spending the project budget rather than on running successful pilots that would demonstrate the potential of a program about which virtually everyone consulted in the evaluation was excited.
- Moreover, while there has been significant energy devoted to the start up of CB TREE enterprises, apart from some anecdotal information reported by the NPO in Samoa, there is as yet no data available on the difference being made to the incomes of the participants. Some projects involve large numbers of people and it is difficult to envisage in the short to medium term a scale of production that will adequately reward all these participants. Without proof of the model’s success in income generation for participants, attracting funds from national government or from donors to sustain activity may prove difficult. (See also 4.6 below)
- A Pacific CB TREE resource manual is apparently being developed, but was not available at the time of the evaluation. If possible, the lessons learned through YEP should be incorporated into this manual (See Recommendation H).

The project’s overall progress in advancing gender equity issues seems also to have been patchy and requires comment. Although not listing it as a specific output, the project document stated that “at the start of the project each country will develop a local gender mainstreaming strategy in close collaboration with local gender experts” (p.20). The reprogramming exercise subsequently restricted this to Vanuatu and PNG. An assessment of gender issues in the workplace was only completed in Vanuatu in August 2009. A sub-regional gender-mainstreaming workshop was held in PNG (only PNG and Vanuatu sent representatives) and this has led the Departments of Labour and the employer bodies in both countries to commit to the drafting of gender policies for the public and private sectors. Following an August 2009 gender workshop supported by YEP (and the ILO’s Gender Bureau and International Training Centre), Government agencies are now required by the Department of Public Services to formulate workplace gender equality policies. None of these initiatives seem to have had a particular focus on the labour market situation of young women, but do represent a contribution to ILO mainstream strategy promotion.

Another gender element that was included in the project document was output 2.4.6 which read “Ensure gender equality concerns are addressed in training materials, tools and selection of trainees.” Reviewing what was achieved, there are no apparent references to gender issues in the revised SIYB training materials – something that may have been a result of the cutting back of the training course duration from 10 to 5 days. Female participation in training and projects was very strong in some locations and weak in others.

4.2 Relevance and Strategic Fit

The situation of young people in the Pacific Island Countries remains a critical issue. The Project Document highlighted the key challenges – lack of formal sector jobs; a growing youth unemployment rate; a disproportionate youth share of total unemployment; large annual inflows of young people entering the labour market for the first time; insufficient jobs to absorb these new entrants; internal migration from rural to urban locations leading to a concentration of the problem and growing social problems; inadequacies in the education and training system that result in young people having neither the technical nor life skills to successfully compete for jobs or establish their own income-earning activities; and a continuing gender gap in both education and employment participation.

The project’s objectives fitted well with Decent Work Country Program (DWCP) priorities in each of the five countries, including:

- Kiribati – Poverty reduction through employment generating activities; youths benefiting from income generating activities; and employers’ and workers’ organizations strengthened to contribute to employment promotion;
- Papua New Guinea - Decent employment created in the formal and informal economies for school leavers and unemployed youth; institutional capacity of constituents improved in terms of labour market information systems and SIYB methodology applied at sectoral level;
- Vanuatu - Youth employment initiatives undertaken for school leavers and unemployed youth; successful models and other programmes are adapted and adopted in Vanuatu which result in youth having access to income and employment; Employers’ and workers’ organizations are strengthened contribute to employment promotion; Setting standards in vocational training and skills development;
- Samoa - Improved decent employment opportunities for youth through entrepreneurship development and support services; Improved availability of labour market information; Employers’ and workers’ organizations are strengthened contribute to employment promotion;
- Solomon Islands - Decent employment created in the informal economy for school leavers and unemployed youth; with the replication of successful models unemployed youth benefit from access to income; Employers’ and workers’ organizations are strengthened contribute to employment promotion.

The Decent Work Country Programs in turn are the ILO contribution to the implementation of the United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAF), articulated around

the Millennium Development Goals. Priorities expressed in the Pacific Youth Strategy (2010) also fit well with YEP.¹⁹

In summary, in its policy intent and objectives, YEP remains highly relevant to the labour market situation in the five participating Pacific Island Countries and fits well with the ILO's strategic framework, embodied in the DWCPs, with each country's own priorities in the employment and youth affairs portfolios and with Pacific sub-regional plans.

4.3 Validity of Design

While the aims and objectives of YEP were highly relevant to the needs of the five participating countries, a number of important issues need to be explored relating both to the project's original design and to the later adjustments made to this design following the project's delayed commencement.

How realistic was the project design?

The geographical scope of the project was ambitious – particularly given the small size of the ILO's sub-regional office in Suva and that office's lack of experience in running multi-location projects. Running multiple activities in five countries (and managing these from a sixth) placed a heavy strain on project staff in terms of understanding local issues, building relationships, identifying appropriate project partners, running local activities and, in particular, monitoring and reporting on progress. Travel between and within countries was not always straightforward and lack of direct flights often required long and circuitous trips through regional hubs such as Brisbane. Having local staff helped - the project was able to recruit some very highly skilled and energetic NPOs who were able to advance the project's implementation - but in most locations, they were only on the ground for limited periods. They also needed considerable technical support from both Fiji and from technical backstopping staff in Bangkok and Geneva, but this was not always available.

The design was also ambitious in the scope of its activities. The project design promised better understanding of youth labour market issues through new research and Labour Market Information and Analysis and improved institutional capacity in government agencies, employers' and workers' organizations, and youth organizations. It also expected very big things from the pilot projects which “would provide the key elements of a customized policy package to thoroughly deal with issues of education, employability and employment for the youth in each of the selected countries” (p.20 of Project Document).

All this was ambitious for a three-year project – to do it all in two years would have been a truly herculean task. A reprogramming exercise was carried out in December 2008, but this seems to have been driven by the fear of budget cuts rather than by the need to re-think what could be realistically done and achieved in the remaining time. For example, a decision could have been made to run fewer CB TREE projects but to provide them with much more intensive support and follow-up. It would have been far better to have a smaller, but well-designed and implemented project, than a project that maintained its “delivery rate” at the expense of effective follow up.

¹⁹ Component 2 of this Strategy, Nurturing Sustainable Livelihoods, “aims at helping young people participate in the workforce as either employees or self-employed workers thereby contributing to poverty reduction in their communities. It also promotes practical initiatives that improve their opportunity to earn a living through participation in self-employment and income-generation opportunities. The emphasis is on developing initiatives that will have long term economic impacts on the lives of young people

Were the right targets chosen?

When the reprogramming exercise was done, a number of the original outputs were dropped. These included activities that were focused on a younger cohort, including those entering the labour force for the first time – the conduct of a school-to-work transition survey in PNG; testing of entrepreneurship education materials in formal and non-formal training institutions targeting in- and out-of-school youth in Samoa²⁰; and the preparation of career information and counselling materials. This cohort was specifically identified in the Project Document as a target, but once these outputs were dropped, so too was the focus. Younger people did participate in SIYB and CB TREE, but were identified by trainers and project staff as being less able to benefit from these projects – and requiring much more assistance - than older youth and adults.

The transition from school to work remains a major problem in all the participating countries. Many youth leave school too early and need access to an alternative education and training pathway. Rather than implement a “one size fits all” approach to pilot project implementation (i.e. just SIYB and CB TREE) there were opportunities for YEP to design and test other interventions – for example, SBDC in PNG said that there was a great opportunity to link its existing school-based Know About Business (KAB) project to a school-to-work transition project designed to provide an enterprise creation pathway for them.

Were the right methodologies and tools selected?

SIYB has proven its value in many different contexts, but as a stand-alone service for young people it has some weaknesses. A recurrent theme in the consultations was that young people find it very difficult to access the financial assistance they need to implement their business ideas. A youth-focused loan or start-up grant facility needs to be in place²¹.

More broadly, there is the issue of whether a “youth flavoured” SIYB package could be developed that addresses the specific issues faced by young people attempting to start their own businesses. Although the existing Pacific-tailored package has been very well received, its natural market seems to be “older youth” or adults. More research is needed on youth entrepreneurship training. (See Recommendation D)

CB TREE is promoted as being a holistic package of assistance – in-depth analysis of opportunities, skills training, business training, access to finances and on-going support. It is not surprising, therefore, that stakeholders were very excited about its potential. In practice, the pilot projects do not seem to have offered such an attractive and comprehensive package. The emphasis was on getting projects off the ground and funded as quickly as possible. Analysis took the form of “Rapid Community Assessment” – which seems little more than a brainstorming exercise. Skills training was often inadequate (e.g. two days training conducted by unqualified trainers). TEP business planning training was basic and sometimes did not happen at all. Capital equipment grants were often handled by third parties who sometimes did not make the required purchases. Ongoing support was not provided and some projects failed soon after they commenced.

²⁰ Apparently dropped because UNDP was already doing something similar (ironically with the ILO’s own Know About Business package)

²¹ In Kiribati, NZAid has already picked up on this and has funded an SIYB training project together with a small-scale business start-up grant.

CB TREE is quite possibly a very relevant tool, but unless it is adequately resourced and supported, it is unlikely to work well. It seems to have been run on a shoestring budget and without expert guidance. The project has succeeded in creating a demand for CB TREE in the participating countries, but the model still needs to prove itself in the Pacific if it is to attract government or donor support for wider implementation.

It could also be argued that YEP “played it safe” by using SIYB and CB TREE. There were a few other pilot projects implemented (e.g. the Temporary Work Placement Project in Kiribati and the support for the Youth Employment Service in Vanuatu), but in general, perhaps because of the reduced timeframe, YEP did similar things in each location. Pilot projects are meant to test new things and it may have been more empowering for the stakeholders if they were allowed to be more creative. At the very least, experimental linkages could have been tested – for example, embedding SIYB in CB TREE to improve the delivery of that program’s business awareness and planning training.

Were indicators of project progress appropriate?

The project document listed a range of mainly quantitative measures of progress – numbers trained, numbers “pursuing entrepreneurship after training” (a somewhat vague indicator), number of new projects launched outside the project that refer to the lessons learned, even “number of policy issues related to the programme *discussed* in advocacy events, workshops and media”. Some of these measures are important indicators of project *input and throughput*. They give an indication of “how busy” the project has been and whether it is keeping up its “delivery rate”. Not all of them appear to have been used.

What were completely missing from the project document were indicators of outcomes and sustainability. Such indicators require a mix of qualitative and quantitative data collection. What has become of the young people who did the SIYB training? How much income are individuals earning on each of the CB TREE projects? What difference has the establishment of union youth wing made? How many young people have got jobs through the Youth Employment Service in Vanuatu? These are all vital indicators of the project’s progress in achieving its objectives, but were not built into the original project design or into subsequent monitoring or reporting frameworks

Was gender equality addressed in the design?

The project document detailed a range of gender-related elements that were to be included in YEP – activities to ensure women are equally represented in projects, the development of a gender mainstreaming strategy for each country, a focus on the gender dimension of the transition from school to work, seeking out the views of both male and female policy makers and explicit gender specific action measures to redress inequalities between male and female youth in access to employment and training (e.g. by including gender specific topics in training and by producing gender-sensitive career information).

In practice, the project did do some work on gender issues (e.g. a gender equality workshop attended by two countries and the subsequent development there of Equal Employment Opportunity policy documents for the public and private sector), but gender seems not to have been a pervading theme of the project. The activities undertaken were not especially focused on the employment needs of *young* women, which gave the whole gender dimension of the project the appearance of being added as an afterthought rather than being mainstreamed in the project’s core activities. (See Recommendation F) Gender issues were

not, for instance, built into the revised SIYB materials. The participation of women in pilot projects was good in some projects and poor in others, but the project seems to have done little to influence this anyway (e.g. by setting targets or benchmarks)

Was a tripartite approach built into the design?

In terms of tripartism, the project design included the active engagement of the social partners. Unions and employer organizations were consulted in the evaluation field visits and all indicated that they were happy with the level of consultation that had taken place in the implementation of YEP.

4.4 Efficiency of Resource Use

The most significant resource lost by the project was, of course, time. Considering that a whole year was lost, YEP managed to initiate an impressive and diverse range of project activities in a significantly reduced timeframe. In this sense, the project has been efficient and productive and has maintained a high delivery rate.

Based on the data supplied, the evaluation consultant was unable to draw many conclusions on the efficiency of the project's use of finances. A review of expenditure relative to the revised (i.e "reprogrammed") budget showed a +11% variance in the Programme Activities (Project Implementation and Consultants) category (see Table 4 below). However, the significance of this variance is difficult to assess as the category seems to have included a very wide range of expenditure line items the details of which were not available to the evaluation consultant.

Table 4 - Project Expenditure v Revised Budget (Percentages only)

Description	Budget (%)	Expenditure (%)	Variance (%)
Programme Activities (Project Implementation + consultants)	37	48	+11
National Programme (National Programme Officers)	15	11	-4
Programme Support Activities (CTA & Other Support Staff)	21	21	0
Project Office / Overhead (Travel, equipment, stationery, etc.)	11	9	-2
Programme Support	11	11	0
Provision for Cost Increase	5	0	-5
Total	100	100	

The project was run in five countries and managed from a sixth. This arrangement had the advantage of better linking YEP activities to broader regional activities and to the ILO's agenda, but, on the downside, it meant that the CTA was required to spread her time and support thinly across multiple locations and to spend much time travelling.

National Officers were used to good effect in the locations visited and, considering the high level of skill and experience that they brought to their roles and the relatively low NO salary costs involved, represented a very efficient use of program funds.

4.5 Effectiveness of Management Arrangements

The YEP project is managed from the ILO office in Suva. The CTA is based there along with one NPO, an SIYB support officer (working on an *ad hoc* basis and not funded through the project) and an administration officer. As at March 2010, NPOs were also based in Kiribati (in place since May 2009), Vanuatu (since June 2008) and Samoa (since May 2009). Another NPO had been based in PNG (from August 2008 to October 2009) but had not been replaced. No NPO was ever based in the Solomon Islands.

The Evaluation Consultant had the opportunity to observe the CTA and two of the NPOs (Kiribati and Vanuatu) in a variety of project situations and all were clearly capable, knowledgeable and professional. Team members appear to enjoy good working relationships with each other and with other ILO staff, have a thorough knowledge of their roles and responsibilities and communicate effectively.

Field officers indicated that they receive good support and regular visits from Suva, though were sometimes frustrated by the emphasis on improving the “delivery rate” at the expense of project monitoring. Because many of the activities were funded 80% on commencement, NPOs also reported difficulties in getting recipients to submit acquittals in a timely manner. It seems recipients may have had insufficient incentive to do so because they had already received most of their payment. As most of the NPOs were previously senior managers, they found this administrative work frustrating and said it distracted them from development and monitoring work.

In all of the countries visited, the project received good political, technical and administrative support from its national partners. The CTA and NPOs have developed good relationships with key government agencies, employers’ and workers’ organizations and have engaged them well in the process of project implementation. A national project steering committee is active in Kiribati (it is also the DWCP committee) and has a good grasp of YEP and what it is trying to achieve. The TALAVOU project oversees project activities in Samoa and also understands the value YEP is adding. The other three countries do not have active steering committees and they are needed.

The project had some difficulties in the area of technical backstopping. Project staff may not have fully understood the roles and responsibilities of the backstopping unit. Staff in Bangkok said that Suva-based project staff were reluctant to engage with them, seek their advice or share key planning documents (e.g. the project implementation plan). Concerned about progress in implementing SIYB, Bangkok sent a project consultant to Suva to help the project and this seems to have been welcomed. Despite this, there still appears to be communication problems between Suva and Bangkok – Bangkok staff reported having never seen many of the project outputs (e.g. desk reviews, training materials). Geographic location also hindered communication between YEP and the ILO Regional Office in Bangkok and the Head Office in Geneva - missions to Suva are extremely costly and there are no common working hours between Suva and Geneva.

A CB TREE specialist spent three months in the Pacific assisting projects, but ongoing technical backup was either not sought or not offered. As they were working closest to the CB TREE projects, the NPOs were probably in most need of this ongoing assistance – particularly in Vanuatu where projects started earlier and faced problems earlier. ILO expertise in other specialist areas was obtained – for example, to conduct a gender workshop in PNG and to conduct a union workshop in Samoa.

Although a project work plan or implementation plan was developed early in the project, it was not adhered to very closely nor shared at country level given the constant threat of a budget cut (this was following the advice of the Director). The “delivery rate” was the driver of project activity leading to what one member of the YEP team aptly described as a “hysterical implementation” approach. As has already been discussed, the priority was getting things happening and spending the project budget and an implementation plan may have been seen as potentially slowing this process down (or, as “giving someone a reason to reduce the budget”).

4.6 Impact and Sustainability

YEP has been a high-profile and important initiative in the participating Pacific Island Countries. It is the first multi-country project run by the ILO’s Sub-Regional Office and it addresses an issue universally considered by stakeholders as being of paramount importance. The ILO’s past contact with some of the participating countries was intermittent at best – running an occasional workshop, conducting an annual visit, inviting partner organizations to regional events and the like. In some cases, NPOs said that some stakeholders had been either dismissive of the ILO or even hostile towards it.

But YEP has given the ILO a new profile in the region. Having ILO project staff based in Labour Ministries has provided a continuity of contact with national governments, as well as the ability to more quickly respond to local needs and opportunities and to influence policy development (e.g. the development of NAPs in Vanuatu and Kiribati and the Vanuatu government’s decision to join the YEN would probably not have occurred without the project). The fact that YEP has introduced pilot projects that were designed to directly assist unemployed youth has also made an impact in this regard.

What will the project leave behind when it ends? The project has done a lot in two years (maybe too much) and there are some concrete outputs that will remain such as the SIYB and TREE training package. However, many areas of project activity represent just the start of a process and there is a real risk that the gains made in institutional capacity building and in introducing new tools and methodologies will soon be lost if there is not a continuation of ILO support in some form. Some stakeholders (for example, in Kiribati where YEP has been effectively only operating for 10 months) expressed their dismay that the project was already drawing to a close.

In summary, the key impacts were:

Institutional Capacity Building

- National Ministries of Labour and Youth in Kiribati and Vanuatu have benefited greatly from YEP and are now well placed to develop NAPs that will provide a strategic framework for youth employment initiatives and a mechanism for coordination. PNG seems not to have benefited as much, due largely to ongoing disruptions within the relevant Ministries. In Samoa, the project has added its program expertise to the efforts of the TALAVOU project.
- The workers’ organization in Kiribati is now very involved in youth employment issues. Following the Samoa workshop, it established a Kiribati Youth Wing (at both the peak level and individual union level) and has even initiated an innovative CB TREE project designed to provide work to young, unemployed teachers. The President of the Kiribati Youth Wing is now sitting in the DWCP committee and on the Trade Union Board. In

PNG, the Trade Union Congress was reported to have also established a youth wing (subsequent to the conduct of the evaluation mission). Vanuatu, Samoa and the Solomon Island had made no progress on establishing youth wings.²²

- Employer organizations in PNG and Vanuatu are engaged in follow-up activities related to their attendance at a gender workshop (i.e. developing and promoting EEO policies for the public and private sector). In Kiribati, they are actively involved in a private sector Temporary Work Placement program for youth and this has increased their direct involvement in youth employment. Samoa is apparently investigating a similar scheme. Employer organizations have been trained and are coordinating SIYB in Kiribati, Vanuatu and Samoa and are now offering training to young people. A Pacific sub-regional employers' workshop (run in conjunction with the ILO's Bureau for Employers' Activities, ACT/EMP) was also run to improve their understanding of youth employment.
- Strategic planning workshops were run (or will soon be run) for youth organizations in all five countries, but no data was yet available on their impact. Some NGOs were also supported through YEP. YEP helped Youth Challenge in Vanuatu to start an Employment Service Centre - this now has more than 1000 youth registered. Various NGOs were also given training in CB TREE, though without ongoing ILO support they are unlikely to be able to initiate their own projects.

Direct Action through Pilot Projects

- In most cases, it is too early to tell if the **CB TREE** pilots have had an impact on youth employment and income levels. In Vanuatu, where projects started earlier, most fell over with a few months due largely to a lack of resources and support. In Kiribati, most of the projects officially started in the week of the evaluation mission and will need intensive support over the next few months if they are to avoid a similar fate. In PNG, the projects are now applying their technical skills (rice and poultry farming) but have not yet reached their "moments of truth" in a business sense. For these, YEP is ending at the most critical time. (The Samoan CB TREE projects, on the other hand, were reported to be doing quite well with participants earning minimum wages. These projects were not visited, but seem to have had some advantages including more intensive monitoring provided by the TALAVOU project. Some seem also to have been built on individuals' existing business activities rather than started up from scratch. No CB TREE pilots were run in the Solomon Islands.
- The CB TREE methodology – in theory more than in practice – was enthusiastically received by the stakeholders. If implemented effectively (i.e. well funded and managed) it could prove to be a very relevant tool in the Pacific. The pilots have taught some valuable lessons and these lessons are themselves important YEP results.
- The impact through YEP of **SIYB** on youth in the participating countries is largely unknown. Little or no post-training follow-up was done and information was not systematically collected on the number, type and nature of new businesses created or of existing businesses that may have been expanded or improved. Trainers reported that, in

²² In most cases, grants of \$US5000 (80% paid up-front) had been paid to the unions to assist them and, despite follow-up by YEP staff, no activities had been implemented. It is unclear how these grants will be followed up and acquitted after YEP ends. The issue was said to have been reported to an ACTRAV official in 2009 and YEP was advised that a follow up letter would be sent by ACTRAV.

general, participants reviewed the training delivery very favourably. They were able to describe some anecdotal success stories, but had not been resourced to track participants.

- Through YEP, SIYB training materials were tailored to the needs of Pacific countries and this is an important legacy of the project. The package was regarded by trainers as very good and appropriate to local needs.
- Of the other pilot projects implemented, the Kiribati Temporary Work Placement Project has had some good results. 8 of the 33 participants of the project were offered full time jobs at the end of their placements. As already mentioned, the Vanuatu Youth Employment Service now has over 1000 young people registered for its services.

Sustainability

In the areas of policy development and ongoing institutional capacity building, the ILO has initiated a number of processes that will require its continuing involvement and support. The NAPs represent a significant leap forward and offer the hope of better harmonization of effort and the alignment of youth employment projects funded or run by different agencies and donors. Vanuatu is most advanced in this respect, having already integrated the NAP concept into various national and ministerial planning documents. Kiribati is also very keen to advance the NAP idea. The others are still taking their first steps in the NAP process (e.g. the Solomons had a workshop to introduce the idea at the end of March). The CTA believes that, if properly established, the NAPs will provide the “medium for sustainability” for YEP.

The sustainability of the tools and methodologies tested through the pilot projects might also be ultimately assisted by the NAPs, but in the short term other things will need to be done. Some CB TREE projects have only just started and, as there does not seem to be a clear exit strategy for YEP, there is a need to firstly ensure that these projects are given the best possible chance at success. This is particularly the case given the lessons learned from the failed Vanuatu projects. A lot seems to rely on the continuing support of partner organizations – including technical support partners like the Departments of Agriculture - to monitor and service these projects. They do not yet have sufficient expertise in the methodology to do this and need support themselves.

The sustainability of CB TREE in the future is also uncertain. Despite the enthusiasm of many stakeholders, the pilots have not yet proven the value of the methodology in most locations (Samoa being a possible exception). CB TREE cannot be properly delivered cheaply and, to attract donors or mainstream government funding, evidence of its effectiveness in the pilots would have been invaluable. It is unlikely that, in most locations, national governments will pick up the bill for CB TREE and offer it as a mainstream service. The one possible exception is PNG, which has expressed an interest in linking the program to its Independence Fellowship Scheme, a program that supports rural entrepreneurs to establish businesses. They will need support and advice to do this. More importantly, they will need much more expertise in CB TREE to run it effectively themselves.

SIYB is usually regarded as a sustainable program because it can be self funding – trainers are able to promote the program and charge participants. As a youth program, however, this assumption may not be valid. Youth are less likely than adults to have the cash to pay for these courses and, in the pilots, relied on ILO subsidies to participate. They may need to continue to rely on the support of donors to access this training. Encouragingly, in Kiribati this is already happening, with one of the YEP-trained SIYB trainers involved in the delivery of an SIYB course funded by NZAid.

In short, a follow-up youth-focused project is needed to consolidate and further institutionalise the policy development work started and direct action piloted through YEP.

5 LESSONS LEARNT

- When a whole year is lost in a three-year project, a reprogramming exercise needs to be undertaken at commencement. Activities need to be comprehensively reviewed and chosen on the basis of what can best achieve the project's objectives - not solely on the basis of budget preservation. Consultation with partners in participating countries should take place as part of this process. ILO's criteria for project performance and reprogramming need to be reviewed with emphasis placed on achievement of project objectives and not on project fund delivery.
- Too much emphasis can be placed on maintaining project "delivery rates" at the expense of achieving effective and sustainable outcomes. All staff, including the CTA, felt that there was unrelenting pressure placed on them to increase the delivery rate and that the project suffered as a result.
- Projects suffer when the ILO "borrows" project staff to do other things. The CTA was regularly required to fill in for the previous Director (who was often away and making his transition to retirement). As they were the only ILO staff in their countries, National Officers were often required to attend to other ILO business (e.g. DWCP and UN meetings). The Vanuatu NPO was required to organise a major conference and various other events and consultations. While it is acknowledged that these activities have raised the profile of ILO and YEP, it has reduced the time available to project staff to run YEP.
- Engaging stakeholders in the design and management of practical projects is a very effective way of raising awareness of youth employment in Pacific Island Countries. Such projects can connect the stakeholders more directly with the realities of the youth labour market than simply talking about the issues in workshops and the like.
- To this end, project steering committees need to be established and be active in each project location. They should make recommendations on which projects are funded, but ILO should retain the final decision (for example, to avoid the situation in Kiribati where an unsustainably large number of people were attached to some CB TREE projects). Consideration should also be given to reimbursing steering committee members for their attendance (i.e. when they attend in their own time).
- Workshops have their place, but it can be frustrating for partner organizations to be simply shown what they are not doing without being given practical follow up assistance (e.g. the Labour Market Information and Analysis workshops).
- "Pilot projects" are by definition designed to test the effectiveness of different approaches. To do this, there is a need to put in place processes to gather outcome data that relate to the project's objectives – e.g. quantitative and qualitative information on businesses created or expanded, income generated, people getting jobs etc. There is also a need for ongoing monitoring and, where required, remedial action by project staff. This was not done systematically or well in YEP.
- It would be far better to run a few projects and resource them well than to run many projects on a shoestring budget.
- Technical backstopping is vital to the success of multi-disciplinary projects like YEP. ILO enterprise specialists (e.g. for SIYB), skills specialists (e.g. for CB TREE) and Youth Employment specialists needed to be better used in the delivery of the project,

particularly the pilots. Where NPOs have a major role in coordinating projects, they should have direct access to this support.

- Where closely related ILO projects are or have been operating in a country, opportunities for collaboration in project delivery should be fully explored (e.g. SBDC in PNG).
- Just because SIYB and CB TREE are separate ILO programs, run by separate ILO divisions, they do not need to be separated in their application. SIYB training is probably superior to the TEP business training provided under CB TREE and could have been embedded in CB TREE projects. These things are just tools.
- Although the choice of project delivery partners was sometimes limited, more care needs to be taken in selecting organizations to manage activities. In some cases, they had neither the resources nor the expertise to effectively support the activities they were contracted to manage (e.g. CB TREE in Vanuatu). Paying such providers 80% of their fee up-front is asking for trouble – as was proven in a number of locations, many then had little incentive to deliver all that they had promised or to comply with administrative requirements.
- Where such third party organizations are contracted to deliver ILO methodologies such as CB TREE, they need access to technical support and advice. Their performance also needs to be closely monitored by the ILO.
- More research is needed on the entrepreneurship training needs of youth, particularly those in the age group 16 to 21. As the SIYB trainers pointed out they have specific personal development and skill needs and face a range of additional barriers to starting their own businesses. SIYB may need to be adapted to better meet these needs.
- A project exit strategy needs to be developed at least three months prior to the project conclusion. Where activities are expected to continue beyond the project completion date, alternative support and monitoring mechanisms need to be put in place.

6 CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

6.1 Conclusion

YEP was handicapped by a reduced operational timeframe and, under pressure to increase its “delivery rate”, some aspects of project quality and follow up clearly suffered. Under these circumstances it was very difficult to run the project effectively in five locations and manage it from a sixth. That said, the aims and objectives of YEP remain highly relevant to the labour market situations of participating Pacific Island Countries and to their respective DWCPs.

The project raised the profile of the youth employment challenge in the participating countries and helped to improve the capacity of stakeholders to better plan and coordinate policy and program responses. The development of National Action Plans on Youth Employment (NAPs) now seem likely in Vanuatu and Kiribati and this promises to better focus attention and resources on agreed priorities. Other participating countries are in the early stages of the NAP process.

More broadly, the stakeholders have appreciated the ILO’s support in introducing new tools and methodologies and giving them an active role in their management. The tri-partite partners were closely involved in the implementation of the project and those consulted during the evaluation valued YEP’s contribution. Having skilled and energetic National Project Officers based in the Labour Ministries has also been a most welcome feature of the project enabling a continuity of contact between each country and the ILO that was previously lacking. The ILO’s visibility and profile have been significantly raised through YEP and it is now better placed to advance its broader agenda.

In YEP’s haste to get things happening quickly, the pilot projects were not managed very well. Partners in the project management process were often ill-equipped to provide the support needed by the participants. There was insufficient monitoring and follow up. ILO technical expertise was provided only at the design/establishment phase. The project spread itself too thinly and it would perhaps have been better to have run fewer pilots, but to give them more attention and resources. The ILO and its partners have learned some valuable lessons from the pilot projects – which was, after all, the reason why they were pilots.

6.2 Recommendations

General Recommendations

- (a) If possible, before the project ends on 30 April 2010, action should be taken by the project to ensure that all YEP-initiated CB TREE projects that are still operating have access to ongoing technical support and business advice. Ideally, a national partner organization should oversee this process, receive ongoing technical advice on the project and report on project progress to the ILO on a regular basis.
- (b) Before 30 April 2010, the YEP project and the ILO Suva Office should also encourage (and, if necessary, fund) SIYB training providers to make contact with all young people who have participated in SIYB training to gather more data on quantitative and *qualitative* data on outcomes. A simple questionnaire should be

developed by YEP to assist this process.²³ Such data should be collected as a matter of course in all future SIYB projects funded or subsidised by the ILO.

- (c) In any future CB TREE projects funded in the Pacific, more care needs to be taken in the assessment of project ideas, the selection of project participants, the delivery of appropriate technical training, the delivery of training in business awareness and business planning (possibly through SIYB), the choice of capable partners to manage the projects and the provision of continuous and accessible support. National Project Steering Committees should be established and make recommendations, but these recommendations need to be critically appraised by the ILO before funds are released. Expert technical assistance should be obtained from the Skills and Employability division of the ILO and projects need to be adequately funded.
- (d) To further test the relevance of SIYB as a youth employment tool, the Bangkok office of the ILO should commission (by the end of 2010) a research project to examine the effectiveness of SIYB in meeting the specific business start-up needs of young people (aged 16 to 21). This should include an analysis of youth outcomes, if available, from previous SIYB courses in the Pacific (e.g. those run by SBDC in PNG) and include an assessment of any barriers to youth participation in SIYB (e.g. training fees) and to business start up (e.g. access to finance). Models for the provision of ongoing support for this group (e.g. mentoring) need also be identified or developed.
- (e) For all future ILO projects of this size, an independent mid-term evaluation should be completed, even if on a relatively small scale. A request was made for such an evaluation, but a decision was made (in conjunction with the ILO's Regional Office in Bangkok) to instead conduct a "self review". An independent perspective might have been of value however - it may have helped curb the "delivery rate" issue that beleaguered the project.
- (f) In all future projects, work plans need to be kept up to date and shared with ILO backstopping staff.
- (g) In any future youth employment projects, gender initiatives should ideally address issues relevant to the project's primary theme (e.g. the employment needs of young women). The gender-related activities of YEP, while worthwhile, did not specifically address youth issues. This created the impression that gender was "bolted on" to the project as something extra, rather than as a core concern of all YEP activities.
- (h) By end April 2010, the YEP team or ILO Suva should seek to incorporate the lessons learned in YEP's pilot delivery of CB TREE into local resource material (including the Pacific CB TREE Manual currently being developed.)
- (i) In all future projects, technical backstopping staff need to be fully utilised to ensure that project activity is well designed and supported. This is particularly important where ILO tools (such as CB TREE) are being introduced in a country for the first time.

²³ Alternatively, SIYB graduate "re-call" sessions could be organised to discuss trainees' post-course experience.

Country-Specific Recommendations

(j) Kiribati

- By end June 2010, ILO Suva should assist the stakeholders involved in the pilot Temporary Work Placement Program to develop a sustainable version of the program (i.e. that does not rely on ILO subsidies provided by YEP). As part of this design, participating employers need to make a reasonable contribution to the allowance paid to the young people doing the work experience. Care needs to be taken to ensure that young people are not exploited.
- ILO Suva should maintain funding support for an NPO in Kiribati until at least December 2010. The position is needed to follow up YEP projects still in their infancy, to maintain momentum in the development of a NAP and to drive the implementation of the DWCP.

(k) Papua New Guinea

- ILO Suva should immediately provide support to the Ministry of Labour to link its Independence Fellowship Scheme (IFS) to SIYB and CB TREE.
- If CB TREE is institutionalised in this way in PNG, ILO Suva will need to provide the Ministry with additional technical guidance and support in running CB TREE. They are not ready to do this now.
- By end June 2010, ILO Suva should follow up the Youth Strategic Planning Workshops held in November 2009 to ensure that the participating youth organizations have received the support promised by the National Youth Commission to develop Strategic Plans.
- Throughout 2010, ILO Suva should continue to work with national partners to establish a NAP and to integrate this into the national planning framework.

(l) Vanuatu

- ILO Suva should immediately provide resources and support to salvage the two remaining CB TREE projects in Hog Harbour and Ohlen. A CB TREE expert is needed to review the situation in each location.
- ILO Suva should maintain funding for an NPO in Vanuatu until at least December 2010. The primary focus of the NPO would be to oversee the finalisation of the NAP and to facilitate Vanuatu's joining of the Youth Employment Network.

6.3 Possible Future Directions

School to Work Transition

YEP somehow lost its intended emphasis on young people making the transition from school to work. This youth cohort is especially vulnerable and there remains a need across the Pacific Island Countries to develop strategies and to provide support services for this group. Some of the outputs dropped in the reprogramming of YEP remain relevant, including school leaver tracking studies and the introduction of the school-based Know About Business (KAB) program of the ILO. Donors such as AusAid and NZAid are focusing on the education and TVET sectors in the Pacific and there is great potential for the ILO to offer its expertise in these areas.

Rural and Outer Island Initiatives

Youth population drift to urban areas from rural communities and outer islands is recognised as a major concern. Young people gravitate to urban centres because they believe they offer more opportunities, but in many cases they end up unemployed and contribute to social problems. More employment projects are therefore needed in rural communities and outer islands to provide young people with local options. Such projects must be adequately supported, resourced and monitored and, because of their remoteness, they are expensive to run. CB TREE is an option, but the lessons of YEP must be closely considered.

Youth Employment Services

In Vanuatu, YEP supported the establishment of a Youth Employment Service. The evaluator visited the centre (run by the NGO, Youth Challenge) and it was a hive of activity – young people researching career information, attending a job readiness course, and searching for jobs on the internet. The manager said that the centre was receiving a lot of interest and visitors from other countries in the region seeking to replicate their model. The manager admitted, however, that Youth Challenge needed more technical advice on employment service delivery and that they were doing things by trial and error. The ILO has considerable expertise in employment service systems and could make a real difference in this field in the Pacific.

Youth Entrepreneurship

YEP lost its focus on the younger cohort of youth. If self-employment is considered to be a viable option for this group, there is a need to look at a more holistic approach to supporting those in the age group 16-21 to start their own business. More research on their particular needs is needed. Barriers to accessing existing programs (such as SIYB) need to be identified and addressed. The effectiveness of these programs for this cohort needs to be evaluated. SIYB materials may need to be re-focused or augmented for this group. Support systems - such a business mentors - need to be established. Youth-friendly microfinance systems are needed. All of these areas could be pursued through a future ILO project.

ANNEX A: Key Project Activities

Overall Timeline of Activities

Date	Key Activities
4 April 2008	Project start up with arrival of CTA (Start up delayed for 1 year, project supposed to commence in April 2007)
May, June and August 2008	Consultation in 5 countries and recruitment of NPOs and other staff
May to June 2008 June - July 2008 July 2008	Recruitment of LMIA international consultant Recruitment of CB-TREE international consultant Recruitment of Consultant for Country Desk Review in 5 countries
July to December 2008	LMIA consultant arrive in Fiji and assessed LMIA in 5 countries (report and proposal prepared) and conduct LMIA workshops in 3 countries with Edward
August 2008	PARDEV's announcement of possible budget cut based on project delivery for one year when in fact project just commenced 5 months in April 2008
25-29 August 2008 September 2008	Sub-regional CB-TREE training in Vanuatu by Int Consultant Pilot implementation of CB-TREE in Vanuatu
August 2008	Commencement of work by NO in PNG - Taua Commencement of work by NO Fiji - Edward
22-26 September 2008	Training of Young Trade Union Leaders on Youth Employment and Decent Work in Apia, Samoa by ITC, ACTRAV and ILO YEP
October 2008 November 2008	Pilot implementation of CB-TREE in Samoa Pilot implementation of CB-TREE in PNG
27 October to 7 November	Sub-regional Training of Trainers (TOT) in SIYB in SPC, Narere, Suva (a collaboration between SPC and ILO YEP)
17-21 November	Sub-regional Workshop on Youth Employment (introduction of NAP and presentation of Country Desk Review and LMIA report) – collaboration between ITC-Turin, ILO YEP, UN-ESCAP and Commonwealth Youth Programme
November to December 2008	LMIA country workshops in Samoa, Solomon Islands, PNG
November and December 2008	Release of Trade Union funds for establishment of Youth Wing (Kiribati, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands)
December 2008	YEP Reprogramming
January, February and March 2009	Various talk back shows using Country Desk Reviews and LMIA report
February 2009	National workshops organized by Kiribati Trade Union Youth Wing and start of setting up Youth Wing
January 2009 February 2009 24 to 27 March 2009	Recruitment of consultant for Kiribati situation analysis (NAP) Conduct of situation analysis by consultant NAP Workshop in Kiribati (ILO YEP and UN-ESCAP collaboration)
March and April 2009	Newsletter preparation and distribution
April - May 2009	Conduct of Situation Analysis on Youth in Vanuatu for NAP

Date	Key Activities
April 2009 May 2009	Recruitment of National Officers for Samoa and Kiribati Commencement of Work of National Officers in Samoa and Kiribati
March - April 2009	Recruitment of SIYB consultant for certification of trainers Development of SIYB training manuals to be tested in the SIYB trainers certification process
May to June 2009	Conduct of SIYB national training for certification of Trainers (17 trainers certified in all 5 countries)
May 2009 April 2009	Signing of CB-TREE MOU with implementing partners in PNG Signing of MOU for release of funds for CB-TREE in Samoa
6-8 June 2009	NAP Workshop in Vanuatu
July 2009 to March 2010	Conduct of SIYB by certified SIYB trainers in all 5 countries
13-17 July 2009	Pacific Youth Festival (ILO YEP organized information booths, public forums and introduction to SIYB training and business plan competition)
12 August 2009	Youth Day celebration organized by YEP in all 5 countries
August 2009	Gender mainstreaming workshop in PNG (2 countries: PNG and Vanuatu) jointly organized by ILO YEP, Gender Bureau in Geneva and ITC-Turin
July to August 2009 September 2009	Negotiation with KMEO for the Temporary Work Placement Commencement of KMEO Temporary Work Placement (1 st batch)
October 2009 to March 2010	Commencement of Youth employment services in Vanuatu in collaboration with International Youth Challenge
2 October 2009	Employers organization in Kiribati (KCCI and KMEO) jointly organized first youth employment forum
October 2009 November 2009 December 2009 – February 2010	Training of CB-TREE beneficiaries pilot projects in Kiribati Finalization and approval of 8 CB-TREE projects in Kiribati Skills training and commence of some CB-TREE projects
July to September 2009 October – November 2009 December 2009	Recruitment of CB-TREE consultant to develop a Pacific adapted version of CB-TREE based on pilot projects in PNG, Samoa and Vanuatu Arrival of CB-TREE consultant to do field visits in Fiji and Vanuatu and review in Samoa and PNG Draft CB-TREE manual
October - November 2009	Training and commencement of CB-TREE projects in PNG
October - - December 2009	Strategic planning workshop for youths in Kiribati Strategic planning workshops for youths in Vanuatu (also National Youth Forum) Strategic planning workshops in Samoa Strategic planning workshops in Papua New Guinea
9 November 2009	Youth employment Forum at the South Pacific Beauty Pageant (part of regional advocacy of YEP)

Date	Key Activities
November 2009	Signing of contract for ILO YEP support to Pacific Youth Council Web Portal introducing youth employment e-network, e-library and e-forum on youth employment
November 2009	Samoa Employers Workshop NAP Workshop in PNG Employers' workshop in PNG
December 2009	YEP Programme Review in Suva
26 to 29 January	Sub-regional Employers Workshop in New Zealand
January to present	Review of draft report by ILO and Fiji National Planning and finalization/publication of manual
January to February 2010	Commencement of CB-TREE projects in Kiribati (to be funded by UN-One Fund Kiribati)
February to April	YEP Evaluation
March 2010	NAP Workshop in Solomon Islands PNG Youth Wing workshop and reactivation of Youth Wing in PNG
April 2010	Strategic Planning Workshop for Youth Groups in Solomon Islands
14 to 16 April 2010	Sub-regional Project Completion Partners' Dialogue
30 April 2010	End of Project

ANNEX B: Terms of Reference

1. Introduction and rationale for the evaluation

With the completion in April 2010 of the ILO Pacific Youth Employment Program: RAS/06/53/NET-Education, Employability and Decent Work for Youth in the Pacific, a final independent evaluation is proposed to be undertaken in March 2010. The project has never done any mid-term evaluation although attempt was made to self-evaluate the project during the backstopping mission of the Youth Employment Expert from the ILO Regional Office in Bangkok in February 2009.

The final independent evaluation of the ILO Pacific Youth Employment Program is in accordance to the ILO policy on project evaluations, where it is required to conduct an independent evaluation at least once during the project lifetime for all projects that have budget over USD500,000. An evaluation report will be produced which will also incorporate lessons learned to help guide future ILO projects tackling the challenges of youth employment.

This final evaluation will comply with evaluation norms and standards, particularly UN Evaluation Norms and Standards, and OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard, while ensuring that ethical safeguards will be followed.

2. Background on projects and context

In the Pacific as in other parts of the world, securing employment and decent work for the youth is a major concern. While the youth population is growing fast in Pacific island countries²⁴, the labour market struggles to keep pace and absorb new entrants. Small scale economies and low levels of either foreign or domestic investment inherent in small inland countries have limited the number of employment opportunities in the formal sector. In addition, most new labour market entrants are school leavers who have gained few skills relevant for employment during their school education and are poorly equipped to compete for scarce jobs in terms of knowledge and marketable skills. Consequently, a majority of the economically active population, especially in rural areas, are engaged in subsistence and informal work. Many of the youths give up actively seeking for work when it becomes clear that few opportunities exist, especially in the formal sector. They may end up being underemployed, engaging in informal income-generating activities that can be low-paid, unproductive, or hazardous. If not promptly addressed, these challenges risk harming decent work opportunities for young people in the short, medium and long terms and jeopardizing the economic recovery and social stability of Pacific countries.

In response to a request for support from constituents in addressing youth unemployment and underemployment in the Pacific region, the ILO has designed and implemented the project RAS/06/53/NET- Education, Employability and Decent Work for Youth in the Pacific.

This ILO Youth Employment Project is a sub-regional program of the ILO Office for Pacific Island Countries based in Suva, Fiji. Its development objective is to contribute to improved employability of young men and women in 5 Pacific island countries, namely: Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. To achieve this, its interventions will be focused towards achieving the following three immediate objectives:

- (i) Enhance the knowledge of how to better address the challenges faced by young women and men in securing decent wage and self-employment and efficiently disseminating the knowledge within each country and in the sub-region;
- (ii) Strengthen the capacity of governments, employers' and workers' organizations and youth organizations to develop national and local policies and programs to achieve Decent Work for youth; and

²⁴ Estimated 151% growth rate between 2010 and 2050, ILO, Trends Econometric Models, 2009.

- (iii) Facilitate greater access by young men and women to support services for wage and self-employment through new tools and methodologies adapted to national circumstances.

The implementation of the project combines three strategic interventions: (i) knowledge development and sharing to address gaps in information and to better understand the youth employment situation; (ii) social mobilization and increased capacity of action of the tripartite constituents and young men and women themselves to inform coherent youth employment policies and programs; and (iii) demonstration pilot projects and tools development to provide young women and men with better labour market information and greater access to opportunities for entrepreneurship and self-employment.

The project is funded by the Government of Netherlands in the amount of USD2,500,000 under the Netherlands and ILO Cooperation Project (NICP). The project commenced operation in April 2008. The project start up date was delayed for a year due to difficulty in recruiting the Chief Technical Adviser; consequently, the project duration has been reduced to 2 years instead of 3 years. The project is ending in April 2010.

In December 2008, a reprogramming exercise was necessary to redefine priorities and focus on important deliverables to ensure good results within the remaining 15 months of project implementation. The budget was reduced to USD2,125,000 as a result of the reprogramming exercise.

The project is executed by the ILO Office for Pacific Island Countries based in Suva, Fiji. The core project team based in Suva, Fiji composed of the Chief Technical Adviser (CTA), a National Officer (Fiji) and an Administrative/Finance Assistant. The project is headed by the CTA under the guidance and supervision of the Director of the ILO Office for Pacific Island Countries. National Officers are responsible for managing and coordinating the implementation of activities in some of the 5 countries targeted by the project. The National Officer (NO) in Vanuatu came on board in June 2008, while the NO in PNG came in August 2008 and ended his contract in October 2009. The NO in Kiribati and Samoa, respectively, were recruited in late May 2009. No NO was recruited in the Solomon Islands.

The project is implemented in collaboration with the ILO constituents: partner governments through the Ministry/Department of Labour, employers' and workers' organizations and with the Ministry of Youth and National Youth Councils as key strategic partners. Partnerships have also been forged and implementing partners include: relevant line ministries, vocational training institutions, non-government organizations, and youth groups. Some project initiatives were also undertaken in collaboration with regional agencies like Commonwealth Youth Program (CYP) and Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), UN-ESCAP. The project collaborated closely with several ILO departments such as the Youth Employment Program, ACTRAV, ACT-EMP, Skills Department, Enterprise Department, Gender Bureau, and the International Training Center in Turin Technical backstopping was provided by the ILO Regional Office in Bangkok.

After 18 months of project implementation (April 2008 to October 2009), the milestone achievements reported by the CTA include the following:

- Conduct of studies on youth employment, labour market information and gender situation in the work place and undertaking various advocacy activities on youth employment at national and regional levels creating greater awareness and better understanding of the challenges of youth employment and how to address them;
- Assisting governments in the formulation of national youth policies/strategies such as the National Action Plan on Youth Employment and the gender equality policy in the work place;
- Capacity building of ILO constituents: government, workers' and employers' organizations including youth groups through various training programs and other direct initiatives to promote decent work and youth employment;

- Promoting entrepreneurship among young men and women through ILO Start and Improve Your Business Training and creating a pool of national trainers in each of the five countries, enabling young men and women have access to business training to encourage and help them start and improve their small business, and developing SIYB training materials adapted to Pacific context; accreditation of SIYB training materials for wider use and application by relevant training institutions and other organizations in Vanuatu;
- Piloting the ILO community-based methodology Training for Rural Economic Empowerment (TREE) by assisting youth groups in using TREE tools to set up community-based economic enterprises, while building the capacity of national stakeholders to implement TREE tools on sustainable basis, developing TREE manual adapted to Pacific context, and accreditation of the TREE training materials for wider use and application especially by the network of rural training centers in Vanuatu; and

Mainstreaming youth employment and decent work agenda as evidenced by the inclusion of youth employment as one of the priority areas in almost all Decent Work Country Programs (DWCPs) of Pacific countries, in the United Nations Development Framework (UNDAF) and in the Declaration at the Pacific Youth Festival, while elevating ILO's mandate on the promotion of decent work for youth, and most importantly in forging strategic partnerships with national, regional organizations as well as with other UN and ILO agencies.

3. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

Purpose: The final evaluation is primarily aimed at assessing the achievement of the project's outcomes and outputs from the resources invested and any positive impact in relation to policies, processes, behaviour and lives of young people, as well as, in analyzing what has worked well and what has not so that it can contribute to organizational learning and the continuous improvement of ILO's tools and approaches. The evaluation will also assess the challenges and opportunities that the project faced. Capitalizing on the gains of the project, the evaluation is expected to provide suggestions and valuable inputs in the design of new or expansion project on youth employment.

Scope: The scope of the evaluation will cover all geographical areas in 5 countries and will take into account all interventions of the project but the evaluation mission will be undertaken in 3 countries of Kiribati, PNG and Vanuatu as mentioned in the Introduction..

The evaluation should consider factors that have impacted on the delivery of outputs such as the reduction of project duration due to belated recruitment of the CTA, or absence or limited availability of National Officers in all 5 countries.

Clients: The principal clients of this evaluation are the project management, the ILO Office in Suva and in Bangkok, the Evaluation Unit, the backstopping units in Bangkok, the YEP in Geneva for NAP, the Donor (the Government of Netherlands) and the ILO constituents in relevant countries.

4. Key Evaluation Questions/Analytical Framework

The evaluation should address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability as defined in the ILO Guidelines on Planning and Managing Project Evaluation (April, 2006), and for gender concerns see ILO Guidelines on Considering Gender in Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects (September, 2007). The evaluation will be conducted following UN evaluation standards and norms.

In line with the results-based approach applied by the ILO, the evaluation will focus on analysing results through addressing key questions related to the evaluation concerns and the achievement of the

immediate objectives of the project using data from the logical framework indicators taking into account the revisions of the indicators based on reprogramming in December 2008.

The evaluation should address the overall ILO evaluation criteria such:

- i. Relevance and strategic fit of the project – The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donor’s policies. The extent to which the approach is strategic and the ILO uses its comparative advantage.
- ii. Validity of project design – The extent to which the project design is logical and coherent.
- iii. Project progress and effectiveness – The extent to which the project’s immediate objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
- iv. Efficiency of resource use – A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.
- v. Effectiveness of management arrangements – The extent to which the management capacities and arrangements are put in place to support the achievement of results.
- vi. Impact orientation and sustainability of the project – The strategic orientation of the project towards making a significant contribution to broader, long-term, sustainable development changes. The likelihood that the results of the project are durable and can be maintained or even scaled up and replicated by project partners after major assistance has been completed.

The evaluator should make conclusions, recommendations, and identify lessons learnt and good practices based on the below specific questions. Any other information and questions that the evaluator may wish to address may be included as the evaluator see fit.

The suggested specific questions are as follows:

A. Relevance and strategic fit

- Have the project actions and interventions contributed to addressing the employment challenges and decent work deficits faced by young men and women?
- Have the means of action been appropriately responsive to the needs of the youths, national constituents and other strategic partners and have they taken ownership of the project?
- Have the project objectives been aligned and supportive of national and regional development priorities, policies, plans and strategies?
- How does the project align with, support and complement with ILO’s strategies and other programs, especially on actions to promote decent work and productive employment for young men and women, decent work country programs (DWCPs), mainstreaming policies as well as the use of ILO methodologies and tools on income and employment creation, especially among young women and men; how has the project used ILO’s comparative advantage in promoting decent work and productive employment for youth?
- How well does the project complement and link to activities of other donors at local level and within broader local donor context (UN and non-UN making reference to UNDAF, Pacific Youth Plan, etc.)

B. Validity of design

- What was the baseline condition at the beginning of the project and how was it established? Was a gender analysis carried out?

- Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground? Have there been a need to adapt to specific (local, sectoral, etc.) needs or conditions?
- Is the intervention logic coherent and realistic?
 - Do outputs causally link to the intended outcomes (immediate objectives) that link to broader impact (development objective)? How plausible are the underlying causal hypothesis?
 - What are the main strategic components of the project? How do they contribute and logically link to the planned objectives? How will do they link to each other?
 - Who are the partners of the project? How strategic are partners in terms of mandate, influence, capacities, and commitment?
 - What are the main means of action? Are they appropriate and effective to achieve the planned objective?
 - On which risks and assumptions does the project logic build? How crucial are they for the success of the project? How realistic is it that they do or do not take place? How far can the project control them?
- How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project document in assessing the project's progress? Are the targeted indicator values realistic and can they be tracked? If necessary, how would they be modified to become more useful? Are indicators gender-sensitive? Are the means of verification for the indicators appropriate?

C. Project progress and effectiveness

- Examine the extent to which the program has produced the anticipated results
 - Is sufficient progress towards the planned objectives being made? Will the planned objectives likely to be achieved upon project completion?
 - Have the quantity and quality of the outputs produced so far been satisfactory? Do the benefits accrue equally to men and women?
- Assess to what extent have countries and donors used and adopted policy advice and/or technical support.
 - Are the partners using the outputs produced? Have the outputs been transformed by the partners into the expected outcome (immediate objective)?
- How do the outputs and outcomes contribute to the ILO's mainstreamed strategies?
 - How do they contribute to gender equality
 - How do they contribute to the strengthening of the social partners and social dialogue?
 - How they contribute to poverty reduction?
 - How do they contribute to the strengthening the influence of labour standards?
- Assess the involvement of the partners and the project's responsiveness
 - How have the stakeholders been involved in the implementation? How effective has been the term of establishing national ownership? Is the management and implementation participatory and is the participation contributing towards the achievement of objectives? Has the project been appropriate responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?

- Has the project been appropriately responsive to the political, legal, economic, institutional, etc. changes in the project environment?
- Identify factors that have facilitated or deterred the realization of the program's objective (2007-2010) as well as significant/practical lessons (positive and/or negative) derivable from experience gained during implementation of program activities. Describe how these experiences may guide future activities of the program.
 - Has the project approach produced demonstrated successes?
 - In which areas (geographical, technical issue) do the interventions have the greatest achievements? Why is this? and what have been the supporting factors? How can ILO build on or expand these achievements?
 - In which areas seem to have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they be overcome?
 - What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the planned objectives?

D. Efficiency of resource use

- Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve objectives?
- Have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective? In general, do the results achieved justify the costs? Could the same results be attained with fewer resources?
- Have the funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?

E. Effectiveness of management arrangement

- Are management capacities adequate?
- Does the project governance facilitate good results and efficient delivery? Is there a clear understanding of roles and responsibility by all parties involved?
- Does the project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners? Do implementing partners provide for effective project implementation?
- If the project has a national project steering or advisory committee, do the members have a good grasp of the project strategy? How do they contribute to the success of the project?
- How effective is communication between project team, the Country Office in Suva, the Regional Office in Bangkok, the responsible technical department at headquarters, PARDEV and the donor? How effective is communication between the project team and the national implementing partners?
- Does the project receive adequate administrative, technical and – if needed – political support from the ILO office in the field, field technical specialists and the responsible technical unit in headquarters?
- How effectively do the project management monitor project performance and results
- Has cooperation between project partners been efficient
- Has relevant gender expertise been sought? Have available gender mainstreaming tools been adapted and utilized?
- Has the project made strategic use of coordination and collaboration with other ILO projects and with other donors in the country/region to increase its effectiveness and impact?

F. Impact and Sustainability

- Can observed changes (in capacities, institutions, transparency, policies, procedures etc.) be casually linked to the project's interventions?
- In how far is the project making a significant contribution to broader and long-term development impact? Or how likely is it that it will eventually make one? Is the project strategy and project management steering toward impact?
- Is there a need to scale down the project (i.e. if the project duration is shorter than planned)? If so, how do the project objectives and strategies have to be adjusted?
- How effective and realistic is the exit strategy? Are the means of actions gradually being handed over to the national partners? Once the external funding ends will national institutions and implementing partners be likely to continue the relevant means of action or carry forward its results?
- Are national partners willing and committed to continue with the certain means of action? How effectively have those interventions built national ownership?
- How effectively has the project interventions built the necessary capacity of people and institutions (of national partners and implementing partners)?
- Has the project successfully built or strengthened an enabling environment (policies, action plans, attitude of partners, people and young men and women)?
- Are the project results, achievements and benefits likely to be durable? Are results anchored in national institutions and can the partners maintain them financially at end of project?
- Can the approach or results be replicated or scaled up by national partners or other actors? Is this likely to happen? What would support their replication and scaling up?
- Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the interventions? If so, how has the strategy been adjusted? Have positive effects been integrated into the strategy? Has the strategy been adjusted to minimize negative effects?
- Should there be a second phase of the project to consolidate achievements?

5. Main Outputs of the Evaluation

The main outputs of the evaluation to be delivered by the evaluator are the followings: -

- Inception report – after desk review and the initial discussion with the core team in Suva, the evaluator will provide an inception report (2 pages) which contains finalized evaluation framework (systemizes the methodology, identifying the issues to be addressed, subquestions that provide elaboration; and the performance indicators (variables to be considered), sources of information and method of information collection for each issue)
- First Draft of evaluation report (by 31 March 2010)
- Final draft of evaluation report incorporating comments received (by 23 April 2010)
- Evaluation summary (according to ILO standard template) (by 23 April 2010)
- The evaluation report will be used as important input for the final “project completion report” that can be submitted to PARDEV before end of April 2009 for submission to the donor.

The “Project Evaluation Report” should contain the following contents: -

- Cover page with key project data (project title, project number, donor, project start and completion dates, budget, technical area, managing ILO unit, geographical coverage); and evaluation data (type of evaluation, managing ILO unit, start and

completion dates of the evaluation mission, name(s) of evaluator(s), date of submission of evaluation report).

- Abstract
- Brief background on the project and its logic
- Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation
- Methodology
- Review of implementation
- Presentation of findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations (including to whom they are addressed)
- Lessons Learnt
- Possible future directions
- Annexes

6. Methodology

The evaluator will travel to ILO Suva to meet with the project core team and ILO staff based in Suva, to interview project staff and ILO management. After the desk review and the initial discussion with the CTA and the core team in Suva, the evaluator will submit the 2 page-inception report before commencing on mission to the other 3 countries. Thereafter, the evaluator will travel to Kiribati, PNG, and Vanuatu (or Samoa) to interview the National Officer, ILO constituents and implementing partners, including youth beneficiaries.

The followings are the suggested methodology which could be adjusted by the evaluator if considered necessary for the review/evaluation process and in accordance with the scope and purpose of the evaluation. This should be done in consultation with the evaluation manager.

- Review of relevant documentations;
- Field visits to conduct interviews and discussions with project staff based in ILO Suva and with the respective National Officers and stakeholders, including youth beneficiaries, in 3 Pacific islands covered by the evaluation mission.
- Telephone interviews with key stakeholders in Samoa and Solomon Island. (to be arranged by the project)

3 Countries are selected for the evaluation mission due to budget limitations as travel to all five countries will require substantial travel costs beyond the evaluation budget. The reasons for selecting the three countries are as follows: -

- Kiribati is the only country that the project is providing technical assistance in the formulation of the National Action Plan on Youth Employment. It is an important output of YEP and can be a model for the Pacific. There is also a fully functional DWCP committee in Kiribati which also serves as the National Steering Committee for YEP. The employers organizations there are the most active in promoting youth employment where they embarked on a temporary work placement benefiting young graduates of the Kiribati Institute of Technology with first-hand work experience in the private sector. The Chamber of Commerce there served as the coordinating agency for SIYB. The project has managed to establish a Youth Wing within the Kiribati Trade Union as a result of the ACTRAV-ITC-YEP workshop for young leaders of trade union. The project has also established a technical working group in

LMIA and has supported several CB-TREE projects. Kiribati ILO YEP is also a recipient of the funds under the Kiribati One-UN fund -this is the first in the Pacific.

- PNG is by far the most populated among the targeted countries, and it is where the ILO had previous projects on Start and Improve Your Business- SIYB. The SIYB project produced a set of tools for enterprise development that are suited to economic characteristics of the Pacific region (e.g. specific tools for fisheries) and a pool of trainers with relevant international experience, of which YEP may have built its strategies on. ILO also implements another project on child labour called “TACKLE” in PNG.
- Vanuatu is a country where ILO has worked on youth employment related issues before the project started e.g. Vanuatu participated in youth-related capacity building initiatives such as the 2005 Pacific Sub-regional Tripartite Forum on Decent Work Project that focused on major issues, including better social protection for workers and their families, increasing unemployment particularly for the youth, widening informal economic activities and the impact of globalization. Some of the YEP’s outcomes are likely to be mainstreamed by the constituents.

Source of Information: Sources of information and documentation that can be identified at this point:

- Project documents
- All progress reports and newsletters
- Relevant DWCP documents
- Other relevant documents e.g. policy documents on youth employment in the Pacific etc.

The evaluator will have access to all relevant materials. To the extent possible, key documentations will be sent to the evaluator in advance.

7. Management Arrangements, Work Plan and Time Frame

Management arrangements: Evaluation Manager is responsible for the overall coordination, management and ensure follow up of this evaluation. The manager of this evaluation is Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka whom the evaluator reports to. EVAL will provide support to the evaluation process and does quality control of the process and of the report.

Evaluator’s tasks: The evaluation will be conducted by an external independent evaluator responsible for conducting a participatory and inclusive evaluation process. The external evaluator will deliver the above evaluation outputs using a combination of methods mentioned above.

Stakeholders’ role: All stakeholders particularly the project teams, RO Bangkok, ILO country offices and ILO HQ will be consulted and will have opportunities to provide inputs to the TOR.

The tasks of the Projects: The project managements provide logistic and administrative support to the evaluation throughout the process.

- Ensuring project documentations are up to date and easily accessible;
- Provide support to the evaluator during the evaluation mission.

ANNEX C: About SIYB and CB TREE

SIYB

SIYB is a long-standing program of the ILO that aims to create more and better employment in developing economies by providing training to individuals so that they can start a business (through the Start Your Business package or SYB) or improve an existing businesses (through the Improve Your Business package or IYB) . The program is currently running in more than 90 countries and follows an institution-building strategy involving the training of trainers drawn from network partners who, in turn, train small-scale entrepreneurs operating small or micro-businesses. A large bank of resource documents and training materials has been developed over the years and local projects are encouraged and supported to adapt these to local needs.

Ultimately, the SIYB model – including its methodology and core content - is intended to be “institutionalized” in the participating country. First, local expertise is created through the training of trainers; and second, the development and accreditation of local “Master Trainers” enables the participating country to continue to develop its own trainers without external assistance.

SIYB is not new to the Pacific and has been used in various countries for at least 15 years. Of the five countries involved in YEP, it is PNG where the program is best established having been the recipient of dedicated ILO technical support through a recent ILO project and where the national government now funds SIYB through its own budget.

CB TREE

CB TREE (or just TREE as it is usually known) is a methodology for promoting economic development, empowerment of vulnerable groups with a specific focus on poor rural women, youth and PWDs. It emphasises in particular the crucial role of training as part of an integrated package of actions to create new economic and employment opportunities for the poor, the underemployed, the unemployed and the otherwise disadvantaged. It is a tool that draws on a range of ILO expertise and experiences.

In TREE methodology, skills development is a central objective, but in a manner which is integrated with a range of other necessary and enabling policy and Institutional aspects. Its contents specifically reflect the considerable experience gained by the ILO with technical cooperation programmes related to the ILO-developed Community-Based Training (CBT) methodology, carried out in a number of countries.

The methodology consists of a set of procedures for institutional arrangements and planning among partner organizations at the national and local levels, systematically identifying employment and income generation opportunities at the local/community level, designing and delivering appropriate training programmes and providing the necessary post-training support services. The approach differs from conventional vocational training programmes in three main ways:

- by identifying potential income generating activities and related training needs before designing the content and duration of specific training programmes;
- by involving the local community and social partners directly in each phase of the identification, design and delivery process;
- by facilitating the necessary post-training support services, including design and facilitation of appropriate credit mechanisms, assistance in formation of rural corporate organizations, assistance and guidance in the use of production technologies, etc. to ensure that individuals or groups can initiate and sustain the income generating activity, and also raise productivity in trade areas for which training was provided.

ANNEX D: Consultation Schedule

Pre-Mission

Pamornrat Pringsulaka, Evaluation Manager, Bangkok
Valentina Barcucci, Consultant to Project, Bangkok
Charles Bodwell, Enterprise Specialist

1-3 March 2010: Suva, Fiji

Ofelia Eugenio, CTA
Trevor Riordan, ILO Director (a.i.)
Edward Bernard, Fiji NO
Sereana Cerelala, Admin/Finance Officer
Abdul Hafiz Ali, SIYB Support Officer
Jacque Koroi, Pacific Youth Council
Sai Gataurua and Rob Horton, Fiji Integrated Human Resource Development Programme
Lia Maka, Secretariat of the Pacific Community

4-11 March 2010: Tarawa, Kiribati

Ngutu Awira, NPO
Ioteba Redfern, Minister of Labour & Human Resource Development
Enota Ingintau, Secretary, Ministry of Labour & Human Resource Development
Teboa Awerika, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Labour & Human Resource Development
Watati Irata, Labour Market Information Coordinator
Martin Tofinga, Kiribati Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Teera Bakoaua, Kiribati Trade Union Congress
Taatoa Kaiteie, Secretary, Kiribati Trade Union Congress
Shui-Fung Jong and Jeff Jong, JMR Group (Kiribati Major Employers Organization)
Willie Maen, HR Manager, Moel Trading Co. (Kiribati Major Employers Organization)
Representatives of 4 CB TREE projects
Tamaroa Tebwaki, SIYB Trainer (Business Advisory Service)
Representative SIYB business
Kinnai Kairo & Routan Tongaiaba, Ministry of Agriculture
Brett Aldam, Australian High Commissioner
Joanne Craigie, AusAid
Tiimi Kaiekieki, Director of Planning, Ministry of Planning
Kevin Downie, Principal, Kiribati Institute of Technology
Nakamori Ueantabo, Ministry of Fisheries
Mauea Wilson, Department of Youth, Ministry of Internal and Social Affairs
Wiriki Tooma, Secretary, Public Service Office
Tomwa Tofinga, Head of Youth Wing, Kiribati Trade Union Congress

15-17 March 2010: Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea

Maria Lovaga, Executive Manager, International Labour Affairs, Ministry of Labour and IR
Richard Samuel, Director, Administration Division, Ministry of Labour and IR
Sam ?, Programming Officer, Ministry of Labour and IR
Florence Willie and Deborah Mian, Employers Federation of PNG
John Paska, General Secretary, PNG Trade Union Congress
Panda ?, Representative of Banking Union
David Tibu, Secretary of Department of Labour and IR
Representatives of 3 CB TREE projects
Regina Nukundj, Chief Livestock Officer, Department of Agriculture & Livestock
Boni Jules, Department of Agriculture & Livestock
Verave Gavali, Department of Agriculture & Livestock

Michael ?, Representative of Central Province (Provincial Government)
Peter Piawu, Manager SIYB, Small Business Development Corporation
Peter Miria, KAB Coordinator, Small Business Development Corporation
Henry Parasembi, KAB Project Manager, Small Business Development Corporation

18-21 March 2010: Port Vila, Vanuatu

Shaun Kennedy, NPO
Louis Kalnpel, Alick Berry, Hannah Mara & Joe Masing, Vanuatu Chamber of Commerce & Industry
Valua Gremson, Vanuatu Council of Trade Unions
Joseph Niel, Vanuatu Council of Trade Unions
Meeting with 3 SIYB trainers, Hannah Mara and John Meru
Lionel Kaluat, Commissioner of Labour and Employment Services

22 March 2010: Luganville, Espiritu Santo, Vanuatu

Representatives of the 3 CB TREE projects run in Hog Harbour
Peter Napwatt, Director, and other staff of the Vanuatu Agricultural College
Clinton and BJ, SIYB Trainers (delivering course in Luganville)
Young people attending the SIYB course

23-25 March 2010: Port Vila, Vanuatu

Hannington Alatoa, Consultant writing youth situation analysis for NAP
Leina Simon, President, Vanuatu National Training Council
6 representatives of the Ohlen CB TREE projects
Vivian Licht and Prescilla Meto, Habitat for Humanity (CB TREE Managers)
Joe Iautim, Director, Agnes David and Paul Nalau, Ministry of Youth
Sandra Moore, Manager, Youth Challenge
Simeon Tavoaa, Labour Officer, Department of Labour

26-27 March, 2010: Suva, Fiji

Sereana Cerelala, Admin/Finance Officer
Ofelia Eugenio, CTA
Trevor Riordan, ILO Director (a.i.)
Elisapeta Eteuati, NPO Samoa (Phone Interview)

ANNEX E: Main Project Outputs (with Changes Highlighted)

	Description
1.1	Desk reviews at the beginning and at the end of the project of existing qualitative and quantitative information on the youth labour market and employment situation of young women and men in all five selected countries. (Change – desk review to be conducted only at beginning)
1.2	Desk reviews at the beginning and at the end of the project of existing formal and non-formal education and training systems and programs for youth, and in particular for vulnerable youth (e.g. child labourers, unemployed school leavers, disabled, laid off workers, etc.) in all five selected countries. (Change – this output was to be incorporated in Output 1.1.)
1.3	Survey of the school to work transition of young women and men and the characteristics and determinants of child labour and youth employment in at least one urban and one rural area in PNG, with information disaggregated by sex, age and socio-economic status. Given the severe lack of labour market information in PNG, it is important the program engages in the collection of primary data. (Change – this output was dropped.)
1.4	Recommendations on how to improve national collection and analysis of data on the labour market for the youth in PNG and Samoa. This is in response to specific requests from constituents and it is linked to regular activities by the Suva Office envisaged in the DWCPs.
1.5	Synthesis reports, collection of lessons learned, policy recommendations, advocacy material and tools/guidelines on issues relating to decent work for youth developed by the program that can be shared within each country and the subregion. (Change – information sharing activities on good practice and policy lessons to be in form of end-project workshop. Regional study planned with UNESCAP dropped.)
2.1	Multi-country and national workshops to facilitate the participation of tripartite constituents and youth networks in policy and program development on decent work for the youth. (Change – participation of project partners in online gender mainstreaming program dropped.)
2.2	Training of staff at the Ministry of Labour and relevant line ministries to analyse the labour market situation of the youth, review and coordinate the delivery of youth employment support services and contribute to policy development in all five selected countries.
2.3	Toolkits/training for employers to participate in policy and program implementation in all five selected countries.
2.4	Toolkits/training for workers to increase the participation of young workers in union activities and enhance their capacities to influence policies and promote Decent Work in all five selected countries.
2.5	Capacity building for youth organizations to increase their voice in dialogue, policies and programs for decent work for the youth in all five selected countries.
2.6	Policy networks and forums are in place to promote a more coherent delivery of youth employment policies and support services by public and private sector providers in all five selected countries
3.1	Gender-sensitive career information and counselling materials developed and tested by key institutions, and made publicly accessible at affordable prices and through multi-media in, Kiribati, PNG, Samoa and Solomon Islands. (Change – this output was dropped.)
3.2	Integrated start-up pilot programs and materials appropriate to young men and women developed and delivered in partnership with local providers in at least 2 locations (one rural and one urban) in Kiribati, PNG, Samoa and Solomon Islands.
3.3	Entrepreneurship education materials adapted and tested in 10 formal and non-formal training institutions targeting in- and out-of-school youth in Samoa. (Change – this output was dropped.)
3.4	Model curricula developed to attract young people, young women, to rural self-employment and entrepreneurship in Vanuatu. (???)
3.5	Lessons learned from the pilots are disseminated for resource mobilization, replication and policy development within each country and the region

ANNEX F: About the Countries Visited

Kiribati

With half its population of about 99,000 estimated to be living in poverty and with a human development index of 0.52, Kiribati is the poorest of the five countries participating in YEP and has the lowest life expectancy (63.22 years)²⁵. Young people aged 15-24 represented 21.2 per cent of the population according to the 2005 Census. Youth employment (15-24) as a percentage of total employment has halved from 1978 to 2005 to 15%.

Kiribati has a small, import-dependent economy based largely on copra and fishing. Foreign aid, fishing royalties and overseas remittances are significant contributors to national income. The Global Financial Crisis has had an impact on national reserves and has reduced the country's investment income. This has placed additional restraints on budget expenditure, including public sector employment.

The formal employment sector is small and is dominated by the public service. Of the economically active population of 53,320, around 13,000 (24%) are cash workers. Services, small-scale manufacturing, fishing and agriculture were the biggest areas of employment activity, but the current growth potential of these is low. Infertile soils restrict the growth or diversification of the agricultural base. Where diversification potential does exist (e.g. growing root vegetables in the outer islands) logistical barriers prevent access to local markets at a competitive price.

Formal sector job options for young people include the public sector (including those with secondary school and higher education qualifications), the maritime industry (for those who have attended the Marine Training Centre), the commercial fishing industry (there is a Fisheries Training Centre and an expectation that those granted licences to fish in Kiribati waters will engage some local people²⁶), and the service sector (for example in the transport sector, where young people often work as mini-bus drivers). Youth living in the outer islands have far fewer opportunities. The only other options for young people are relocation (e.g. seasonal labouring work in New Zealand and Australia), cash earning activities in the informal sector (e.g. roadside stalls), subsistence activities in their villages or economic inactivity. In the absence of jobs, there are reports of increasing social problems, including drunk and disorderly conduct and violent crime²⁷, particularly in the more urbanised South Tarawa region.

With the public sector holding such a dominant position in the labour market, and facing pressure to create more job opportunities for youth, in 2003 the Kiribati Government lowered the compulsory public service retirement age to 50. While this created more entry level job vacancies for youth, it came at the cost of lost knowledge and experience at the more senior levels. Ironically for YEP, the policy has advanced one objective (job opportunities for youth) while hindering another (institutional capacity building).

²⁵ The highest is Samoa (73.72) followed by Solomon Islands (73.69), PNG (65.75) and Vanuatu (63.98) – Source: CIA World Fact Book

²⁶ The Project's National Officer indicated that there may be more weighting given in future licensing arrangements to local employment levels proposed by applicants.

²⁷ As described during the evaluation mission in an informal interview with NZ Police visiting Kiribati to provide technical assistance.

There is widespread concern over declining standards of literacy and English language proficiency and around a third of students were reported to exit school at Form 3 (aged around 14) very ill-equipped for work or further study²⁸. Representatives of the education system indicated that opportunities for school-based work experience while were limited to a small number of public sector placements for those “elite” students who went on to Forms 6 and 7. Little or no career or work education is provided. Also of concern are similar observations made about the preparedness for work of graduates from vocational training colleges, particularly the Kiribati Institute of Technology (KIT)²⁹. Standards are reported to be very low and this affects the employment prospects of graduates both within Kiribati or offshore. The Australian Government is funding a reform program designed to accredit KIT training within its qualifications framework and this will have huge consequences for the organization³⁰.

A tripartite Decent Work Country Program committee has been established which has so far focused exclusively on YEP and the development of a National Action Plan on Youth Employment (NAP, see below). Labour market information and analysis systems have been historically inadequate, which has inhibited the capacity of government to develop and implement youth policies and programs. Youth organizations exist but need capacity building in areas such as strategic and operational planning.

Papua New Guinea

PNG has a population of more than 6 million people spread across thousands of frequently small, isolated and ethnically and culturally heterogeneous communities. According to census figures, around 40 per cent of the population is concentrated in the less accessible highlands areas. The youth population is very high with 37.3 per cent under 15 years of age.

PNG has an abundance of natural resources including oil, natural gas, gold, copper, nickel, forestry, palm oil, coffee, cocoa, crayfish and prawns. The current global resources boom is greatly increasing their value, but exploiting them can be logistically difficult due to the rugged terrain, lack of infrastructure, land use negotiations and law and order issues. There is a great deal of economic activity currently taking place in relation to the \$US15 billion dollar Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) project that is now underway in the highlands. Scheduled to begin in 2013/14, the development includes gas production and processing facilities in the Southern Highlands and Western Provinces of PNG, liquefaction and storage facilities northwest of Port Moresby on the Gulf of Papua, and over 700km of pipelines connecting the facilities. Despite this, according to the Employers Federation, there was a significant risk that the project would not create as many jobs for local people as is hoped and could rely instead on “fly in/fly out” labour.

While the economy has a growing corporate sector, the vast majority of the population (85 per cent) participate in the informal sector. Many engage in subsistence farming. Many

²⁸ The new Australian Principal of KIT highlighted the self-contradictory nature of the system – education is compulsory to age 16 (usually Form 5), but, to advance beyond Form 3, students must pass an exam. One third of students, he claimed, did not pass and disengaged

²⁹ A review of KIT was conducted in 2008 by the Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development because of observations that KIT graduate standards and work readiness had declined over time.

³⁰ Courses delivered by KIT are likely to be accredited at the very bottom of the Australian Qualifications Framework – Certificates I and II – and, in all likelihood, many students will need to undertake further training and work placements offshore to advance further. English language proficiency will also need to be dramatically improved if graduates are to become mobile in the global labour market.

young people get involved in street sales of products like betel nuts, cigarettes, and pirated DVDs³¹. Jobs in the formal sector include work in mineral production, the public sector, and service industries including finance, construction, tourism transportation and utilities. The economy has been growing since 2003 and PNG Treasury projects continuing high rates of GDP growth.

In terms of education, the desk review prepared for this project highlighted an enrolment rate of 77% in primary schools and 27% for secondary schools. The rates for males were higher than those for females – their rates were 45% in primary and 40% in secondary. Youth literacy rates are low (67%) and, according to the desk review, there are widespread concerns about the relevance of the school curriculum and a belief that the school system fails to equip students with life skills and to make a successful transition from school to work.

Similar concerns are expressed about the vocational training system. The Secretary of Labour indicated that no information was available on the employment outcomes of vocational training graduates and that he believed that institutions were not meeting the needs and standards of industry.

In April 2009, a determination of the industrial relations commission saw the abolition of lower youth wage rates in PNG and the establishment of a minimum wage. There was some concern expressed by some employer groups, such as the manufacturers association, over this determination and some anecdotal evidence of staff reductions and the withdrawal of previous employer-provided benefits at the enterprise level (e.g. meals). The impact of the determination on youth employment levels is not yet known, but it is possible that, since wage costs are now the same, it might bring about a preference for older, more experienced workers.

PNG suffers from a number of major health and social problems. It has the highest incidence of HIV and AIDS in the Pacific region and, with 2 per cent of the population (over 100,000 people) now HIV-positive, it is the fourth country in the Asia Pacific region to fit the criteria for a generalised HIV/AIDS epidemic. Law and order is a major problem, particularly in the major city centres, where internal migration over the past decade has contributed to urban unemployment and social problems. Papua New Guinea's social indicators, in general, are well below those of lower middle income countries. This is particularly the case in rural areas.

Vanuatu

In 2006, Vanuatu's population was estimated at 221,000, comprised of 113,000 males (51%) and 108,000 females (49%). With a total land area of 12,190 skm, the population density was 18 per skm. Approximately 77% of the population live in rural areas. Vanuatu suffers from a number of major constraints in its efforts to achieve its development objectives. One constraint is a widely scattered and mountainous island geography, with the population scattered across 83 islands, in association with poor transport infrastructure.

Vanuatu is also vulnerable to natural disasters and suffers from a small domestic market with little potential for economies of scale. There is overall macroeconomic stability with a modest level of growth. Vanuatu's real GDP growth was estimated at about 1.5% for 2005 and was

³¹ In the case of the latter, often working on behalf of formal sector stores seeking to profit from this market without risking prosecution themselves.

expected to increase to around 3% in 2008. The impact of the global financial downturn on Vanuatu's future economic performance is yet to be seen.

Vanuatu's economy is dominated by agriculture and the services sector, the latter reflecting the importance of tourism. The agriculture sector is not only important in terms of its overall contribution to GDP (about 20%) but for foreign exchange earned through export earnings. Copra, coconut oil, beef, cocoa, sawn timber, cowhides, kava and coconut meal together earn about 80% of all exports. They are highly vulnerable to changing world prices. A decline in exports over time from this sector has contributed substantially to an increasing imbalance in trade. Vanuatu is a tax haven offering offshore banking facilities. There are no taxes on personal income, corporate profits, capital gains or any other taxes for foreign firms.

Vanuatu had a human development index (HDI) in 2005 of 0.674, ranking 120 out of 177 countries with data. Vanuatu had a higher HDI than the Melanesian countries of PNG and Solomon Islands. Vanuatu's population is highly youthful. In 2006, 87,000 ni-Vanuatu were under 15 years of age (39%) while 132,000 were under 25 years of age (60%). The median age was 19.7 years. The population growth rate between 2006 and 2010 is estimated at 2.6%. The "youth bulge" is one of the most profound challenges facing politicians, planners and policy makers. In addition to its youthfulness, the population is characterised by a great degree of ethnic, cultural and linguistic diversity.

ANNEX G: References

No.	Documents
1	Annual Report of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, 2008
2	Assessment on Gender Equality in the Workplace in Vanuatu, ILO Unpublished, 2009
3	DWCP Kiribati, , ILO, 2009
4	DWCP Samoa, ILO, 2009
5	DWCP Vanuatu, , ILO, 2009
6	DWCP, Papua New Guinea, ILO, 2008
7	DWCP, Solomon Island, ILO, 2008
8	Guide for the Preparation of National Action Plans on Youth Employment, ILO, 2008
9	Kiribati Development Plan, Kiribati Ministry of Finance & Economic Development, 2008
10	Pacific Business Planning, Trainers Guide – Generate Your Business Idea, ILO, 2009
11	Pacific Business Planning, Trainers Guide – Start Your Business, ILO, 2009
12	Pacific Business Planning, Trainers Guide – Workbook, ILO, 2009
13	Pacific Youth Charter, SPC, 2006
14	Pacific Youth Strategy 2010, SPC, 2006
15	TREE Pakistan Users Manual, ILO, 2007
16	YEP Newsletters 1 (April 2009) and 2 (Unpublished)
17	YEP Progress Reports (Sept 2009, May 2009, Dec 2008)