



# ILO EVALUATION

- **Evaluation Title:** **Improving labour relations for decent work and sustainable development in the Myanmar garment industry - Final evaluation**
- **ILO TC/SYMBOL:** **MMR/16/01/MUL**
- **Type of Evaluation:** **Final Evaluation**
- **Country(ies):** **Myanmar**
- **Name of consultant(s):** **Theo Van der Loop**
- **Date of the evaluation:** **February to June 2020**  
**Field mission dates: 10 – 18 March 2020**
- **ILO Administrative Office:** **ILO-Yangon**
- **ILO Technical Backstopping Office:** **INWORK**
- **Donor: country and budget US\$** **Jointly funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), Hennes & Mauritz (H&M) and Marks & Spencer (M&S)**
- **Date project ends:** **July 2016 – September 2019 with no-cost extension to 31 May 2020**
- **Evaluation Manager:** **Mr. Dzung Bui Van and Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka**

**This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO's evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited but has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Office**

## Table of Contents

<b>List of Tables and Boxes</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>vi</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background and Context of the ILO-GIP project .....	1
1.2 Purpose, Scope and Clients of the Evaluation .....	4
<b>2 Methodology of the Evaluation</b> .....	<b>6</b>
2.1 Conceptual Framework: Data Collection Worksheet.....	6
2.2 Methodology, Work Plan and Key Deliverables.....	6
<b>3 Overall Findings</b> .....	<b>10</b>
3.1 Relevance .....	10
3.2 Validity of design.....	13
3.3 Effectiveness.....	16
3.4 Efficiency.....	24
3.5 Impact .....	27
3.6 Sustainability .....	30
3.7 Other priority aspects: Cross-Cutting Issues .....	34
<b>4 Conclusions and Recommendations</b> .....	<b>36</b>
4.1 Conclusions .....	36
4.2 Recommendations .....	40
<b>5 Lessons Learned and Good Practices</b> .....	<b>43</b>
5.1 Lessons Learned .....	43
5.2 Good Practices .....	46

## List of Annexes

<b>Annex 1</b> Terms of Reference (TOR).....	<b>50</b>
<b>Annex 2</b> Inception Report.....	<b>51</b>
<b>Annex 3</b> Mission Schedule, Skype Calls and List of Stakeholders interviewed .....	<b>52</b>
<b>Annex 4</b> Data Collection Worksheet .....	<b>56</b>
<b>Annex 5</b> Recommendations of the MTE and Updates on Follow-up.....	<b>59</b>
<b>Annex 6</b> Selection of Documents Consulted.....	<b>63</b>
<b>Annex 7</b> Details of Types of Training .....	<b>64</b>

## List of Tables and Boxes

### **List of Tables:**

1	Objectives and Outputs of the ILO-GIP project (cf. Updated LogFrame) .....	3
2	Five types of training undertaken by ILO-GIP with the beneficiaries reached and the service providers involved.....	17
3	Budget and Expenditures/Commitments until 9 March 2020 by Budget categories.....	25
4	Expenditures until 9 March 2020 by year (2016-2020).....	25
5	Assessment of the impact of the objectives and outputs.....	27-28
6	Major Stakeholders in the Garment Sector in Myanmar and their interest in a possible new intervention. ....	33

### **List of Boxes:**

1	Myanmar: Legislation relevant to GIP.....	2
2	Better Work (BW).....	32

# List of Abbreviations

ACT	Action, Collaboration, Transformation
ACTEMP	(ILO) Bureau on Employers' Activities
ACTRAV	(ILO) Bureau on Workers' Activities
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AMH	Aung Myin Hmu (Industry Solutions for Safe Employment)
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
BEO	Basic Employer Organization
BLO	Basic Labour Organization
BMZ	German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
CO	Country Office
CPO	Country Programme Outcome
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CTUM	Confederation of Trade Unions Myanmar
DIEH	Danish Ethical Trading Initiative
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
DWT	ILO Decent Work Technical Support Team
EBA	Everything-But-Arms
EII	Employment Injury Insurance
EO	Employers' Organisation
EU	European Union
FABRIC	Promoting Sustainability in the Textile and Garment Industry in Asia
FGD	Focused Group Discussion
FGLLID	Factories and General Labour Laws Inspection Department
GAP	Good Agricultural Practices
GAP-OSH	Global Action for Prevention on OSH (Flagship Programme)
GEA	Gender-Equality Assessment
GIP	Garment Industry Project (ILO)
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH
GSP	Generalized System of Preferences
H&M	Hennes & Mauritz
HQ	Headquarters
ILO	International Labour Organization
ILS	International Labour Standard
INWORK	Inclusive Labour Markets, Labour Relations and Working Conditions Branch, ILO Geneva
IFC	International Finance Corporation, World Bank Group
ITC	(ILO) International Training Centre in Turin
ITGLWF	International Textile, Garment and Leather Workers' Federation
IWFM	Industrial Workers Federation of Myanmar
JETI	Joint Ethical Trading Initiatives
LIFT	Livelihoods and Food Security Fund
LO	Liaison Office
LogFrame	Logical Framework
LOL	Labour Organization Law
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation

M&S	Marks & Spencer
MICS	Myanmar Industries, Craft and Services Trade Union Federation
MGMA	Myanmar Garment Manufacturers Association
MIR-Lab	Myanmar Industrial Relations Lab
MMK	Myanmar Kyat
MoHS	Ministry of Health and Sports
MoLIP	Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NPC	National Project Coordinator
NTDF	National Tripartite Dialogue Forum
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
P&B	Programme & Budget
PAC	Project Advisory Committee
PARDEV	ILO Partnerships and Field Support Department
PCC	Project Consultative Committee
PPDP	Public Private Development Partnership
PRODOC	Project Document
RBM	Results-Based Management
ROAP	(ILO) Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
SCORE	Sustaining Competitive & Responsible Enterprises
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SSB	Social Security Board
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound goals
SMART Myanmar	SMEs for Environmental Accountability, Responsibility and Transparency (EU) in Myanmar
TEO	Township Employers' Organization
TLO	Township Labour Organization
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
TOT/ToA	Training of Trainers/Training of Assessors
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
UMFCCI	Union of Myanmar Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
VLCA	Voluntary Labour Compliance Assessment
VZF	Vision Zero Fund
WCC	Workplace Coordinating Committee
WFP	World Food Programme
WO	Workers' Organisation

# Executive Summary

## ***Project Description, Objectives and Institutional Arrangements***

The present Evaluation Report is mandated by the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Independent Final Evaluation of the project entitled “*Improving labour relations for decent work and sustainable development in the Myanmar Garment Industry (ILO-GIP)*” (see Annex 1). The ILO-GIP project aims to contribute to the reduction of poverty and the empowerment of women in Myanmar by improving labour relations and social dialogue in the garment sector. Therefore, the project aims to achieve five immediate objectives (IO) and 17 Outputs in the updated Logical Framework or LogFrame of December 2017.

The ILO-GIP is jointly funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), Hennes & Mauritz (H&M) and Marks & Spencer (M&S) with a total budget of US \$ 2,486,437, amounting to 77% public funds and 23% private funds. It is implemented in collaboration with the main local industry stakeholders, including the Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population (MoLIP), the Industrial Workers Federation of Myanmar (IWFM), the Myanmar Industries, Craft and Services Unions Federation (MICS) and the Myanmar Garment Manufacturers Association (MGMA). The project is also liaising with relevant other garment sector initiatives such as the EU funded Smart Myanmar project and the Aung Myin Hmu (AMH) project. At the enterprise level, the project is implemented in 20 garment factories, including 10 factories which supply to H&M and 6 to M&S.

ILO-GIP is implemented by a team of 3 technical staff based in Yangon. Administrative supervision is done by the ILO Liaison Office (LO) for Myanmar and technical backstopping by INWORK, Geneva. The ILO DWT team in Bangkok and ILO Geneva provide technical support where required. A Project Advisory Committee was planned in the PRODOC but did not materialize. An internal Mid-Term Evaluation was done in the third quarter of 2018.

## ***Objective, Scope and Methodology of the Evaluation***

The main overall purpose of the present Final Independent Evaluation is to promote accountability to ILO key stakeholders and donors, and to enhance learning within the ILO and key stakeholders. It was conducted between February and June 2020. The findings will be used to improve design and implementation of future relevant projects/programs. The main objective of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, validity, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, i.e. the six ‘Evaluation Criteria’, and to document lessons learnt and possible good practices. Two other important areas of focus, *not mentioned in the ToR*, have been identified in the inception period of the present evaluation, i.e. the alignment of the ILO-GIP project objectives and outputs with the requirements under EU’s Everything But Arms (EBA) trade preference, and an investigation of the project set up as a Public Private Development Partnership (PPDP).

The scope of the evaluation covers all interventions the ILO-GIP has implemented under the project from the start until the time of the final evaluation and it covers all the geographical coverage of the project in Yangon. The cross-cutting concerns of gender equality and non-discrimination, promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes and constituent capacity development are specifically addressed in this evaluation.

The *Methodology* for the evaluation consists of a mix of qualitative and quantitative data collected, including interviews with key stakeholders and Focus Group Discussions in Myanmar as well as observations, critical reflection and triangulation of information acquired. The field mission to Myanmar took place from 10 to 18 March 2020, and it was cut short a few days because of the then rapidly developing global COVID-19 crisis. The *Data Collection Worksheet* in Annex 4 developed in the Inception Report identifies 25 Evaluation Questions which are summarized below under 'Findings'. In terms of limitations, this specific assignment involves a challengingly large number of 25 evaluation questions (46 including sub-questions) and of activities identified in the LogFrame (56). These limitations were mitigated respectively by focusing on the six main evaluation criteria, and by focusing on those activities that are underlined by the different stakeholders during the interviews and adjusted with the desk study.

### Findings

The findings are presented in this section according to the six Evaluation Criteria distinguished throughout this report. The overall **Relevance** of the ILO-GIP project has been *very high* from the beginning in 2016 especially in light of the then feeble institutional capacities of both workers and employers' organizations; the scarce recognition of labour rights; poor working conditions; and gender inequities that exist in the Myanmar garment sector. The project strategy and approach levels are consistent with the needs and priorities of the current and long-term development needs of Myanmar and with those of the beneficiaries and the tripartite constituents. The project donors indicated the particularly high relevance of the approach taken by the project. ILO-GIP is also aligned to the Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) for Myanmar, to three Sustainable Development Goals as well as to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). Lastly, the ILO-GIP project has a clear focus on issues that are part of the requirements for the EU-EBA trade preferences, including the fundamental principles and rights at work.

The **Validity of Design** is overall not fully satisfactory. While the project design is in itself mostly logical and coherent, there are some substantial flaws with an (over-)ambitious design, the lack of a theory of change and the almost complete absence of the Government (MoLIP). This was partly due to the fact that the design was not an easy process, taking a relatively long time with the involvement of different stakeholders. The project design was also not very realistic in the sense that three years would not be sufficient for the longer-term goals embedded in the five Immediate Objectives. The project set up as a Public Private Development Partnership (PPDP) was an interesting one, and worked out well in most respects; in fact, the intervention of H&M and M&S to convince their suppliers to join ILO-GIP's training programmes turned out to be a necessary condition for the project's progress and achievements. At the same time, the MTE (2018) identified a potential conflict of interest that might negatively influence the employers' and national owned factories' willingness to join in ILO-GIP. Ownership was quite low among MGMA and MoLIP, while it has been gradually increasing for the trade unions. The gender needs and interests were clearly addressed in all five immediate objectives, while the second one is even exclusively directed at the empowerment of women workers, viz. a twin-track approach. The monitoring and evaluation arrangements planned in the PRODOC were implemented only partially, especially because the project took long to actually start up and then priority was given to move forward as quickly as possible with the activities themselves.

In terms of **Effectiveness**, it was concluded that the planned activities have in large majority taken place which is in itself a significant achievement. The project has taken clear action on most of the 14 Recommendations of the MTE (see Annex 5). The substantial achievements in the area

of training are summarized through the five types of training delivered (see Table 2) which were generally much appreciated by beneficiaries and stakeholders. In addition, some useful partnering by the ILO-GIP project has facilitated these trainings, in particular through the delivery of training by local service providers. Several other important achievements are the extensive library of training tools, the Gender Equality Assessment ('Weaving Gender') and the Gender Profiles, the WCC-Toolkit, the formation of OSH committees in all 20 factories, the two research studies undertaken jointly with MGMA, and the production of informative and educational videos.

The ILO-GIP project suffered from a relatively large number of constraining factors often resulting in delays, while the important achievements described above were in particular made possible by several success factors, such as the crucial role of H&M and M&S stimulating their suppliers to participate. In addition, the PPDP project set-up was in the end crucial for the effectiveness of the ILO-GIP project because factories were often joining the project as advised and stimulated by their buyers. Flexibility and creativity were shown by the project team to design various measures to timely address the problems or delays encountered. Stakeholder participation of the social partners can at best be described as partial: while the commitment of the two trade unions has clearly increased since the start of the project, the reluctance of the MGMA to squarely join project activities continued until today, partly as a result of their reluctance to deal with trade unions.

With respect to *Efficiency*, it was found that the resources were mostly used in an efficient manner but that on some occasions it could have been better managed. At the same time, there do not seem to have been many clear-cut options at hand to cut costs while still delivering the same level of achievements and outcomes. The expenditures indicated quite a balanced spending pattern with 40% for staff and 43% for activities, and the yearly expenditures provide a logical pattern (Table 3). Considering the wide coverage of the project combined with the large quantity of the interventions, as well as the overall complexity of the project's context, the staffing for its implementation seems to be less than sufficient in the technical areas. Since the planned activities were in majority completed and additional activities were undertaken, and since the financial resources were almost all spent in 2020, it could be concluded that the delivery was to a certain extent timely although a substantial no-cost extension was required and there were issues of trainings being overrepresented in the later phases of the project.

The ILO-GIP project has laid a basis for improving labour relations in the future which is a first necessary step towards a contribution to broader and longer-term *Impact* and decent work goal in Myanmar. The project has mainly worked with beneficiaries in 20 garment factories and with workers' and employers' organisations and local service providers, most of whom learned for the first time about labour relations, social dialogue, gender equality, sexual and reproductive health and productivity through ILO-GIP. The specific impact achieved vis-à-vis the 17 outputs in the LogFrame is satisfactory with the majority of *outputs* (75%) at least partly achieved (Table 5). The project contributed to a certain degree to improved industrial relations especially in the 20 factories involved in the project and among the two trade unions as was illustrated with *quotes* from beneficiaries interviewed (including representatives in WCC's).

The *Sustainability* envisaged by the PRODOC was very much hinged on the full participation in the project of the workers' and employers' organizations, and as we have seen in the above this has been achieved only partially whereby the complete absence of the usually influential and steering Project Advisory Committee (PAC) is exemplary. Still progress has been made and it would be very unfortunate if the efforts would stop here. The project does not have an explicit exit



strategy apart from the activities and documents that were developed since January 2020 as preparations for a possible Phase II and the project will provide follow-up until the end of May 2020. However, now is the time to decide which unit within ILO will take the lead after that. A possible follow-up intervention could be done either through a GIP Phase II, or through the starting of the consultation process with the Myanmar Tripartite Constituents about a possible introduction in Myanmar of the joint ILO and IFC Better Work (BW) programme. It would be only logical if such a future intervention would partner with the other main garment sector interventions, i.e. EU SMART and CARE/AMH. The very first crucial step is to build trust with as well as among the tripartite constituents by having individual and plenary consultations. An analysis was made in this report of the interest in a possible new intervention among the main stakeholders (Table 6). From this analysis it was concluded that most stakeholders would welcome BW to Myanmar *provided* sufficient consultations take place in particular with the tripartite constituents and *provided* there are special components on capacity building for all three constituents as well as for the nationally owned factories.

### Recommendations

- 1) **Continue activities on improving labour relations, social dialogue and gender equality** as this is no less relevant now than it was at the design stages of the ILO-GIP project and try to combine this with **emergency bridging programmes to mitigate the effects of the COVID-19 crisis** for the (laid-off) workers and for the factories as has been proposed by some of the social partners and as currently is being developed jointly by GIZ and ILO-GIP, while other donors have also expressed interest in such programmes. As the ILO Director-General Guy Ryder recently stated: “Workers and businesses are facing catastrophe, in both developed and developing economies. We have to move fast, decisively, and together. The right, urgent, measures, could make the difference between survival and collapse.”<sup>1</sup>
- 2) **Follow more closely the ILO template for a Project Document (PRODOC) in follow-up interventions**, and include a Theory of Change, a clear M&E Plan, an appropriate Risk Matrix regularly updated, an Exit Strategy, and make sure that the Immediate Objectives are reachable within the project period.
- 3) **Involve always the official ILO counterpart from the side of the Government (viz. ministries of labour/Employment) in any follow-up intervention** and strive for enhanced ownership in the relevant department(s); this will in particular also **enhance the leverage** of the intervention vis-à-vis the employers’ and workers’ organisations to join consultative structures such as a project steering committee.
- 4) **Enhance cooperation between ILO and other interventions** in particular through the proposed **One ILO Approach**, which has been tried and tested in Ethiopia.
- 5) **Make sure that the size of the project team in follow-up interventions is appropriate to the amount of work proposed in the PRODOC** as in the case of ILO-GIP a three-person project team had to manage 56 activities in addition to Finance, M&E, Communication and Knowledge Management.
- 6) **Pay more attention to a well-developed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan** established from the inception phase of a follow-up intervention **by employing an additional national staff member for M&E and Knowledge Management** from the start of the project.
- 7) **Continue the important work undertaken by ILO-GIP related to Gender Equality via a twin-track approach** in a follow-up intervention and include attention for the new ILO

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS\\_740893/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS_740893/lang--en/index.htm)

- Convention 190 on Violence and Harassment in the World of Work** as well as for **Women's Voice** (representation and leadership).
- 8) Nominate a unit and a person within ILO who will be in the lead to develop a follow-up phase** and who will take over from the CTA of the ILO-GIP project on June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020 when the ILO-GIP project closes.
  - 9) Initiate as soon as possible the consultations with the Tripartite Constituents** (bilaterally and/or plenary for example through the NTDF) on **a follow-intervention either through a GIP Phase-II or by introducing the joint ILO and IFC programme 'Better Work' in Myanmar**, and gradually include in these consultations the other stakeholders identified in the present report such as the nationally owned factories, internationally owned factories, Brands/Buyers and Donors (see Table 6).

### *Lessons Learned and Good Practices*

Two Lessons Learned (LL) and two Good Practices (GP) have been compiled as follows:

- LL1: Stakeholders' participation of all three Tripartite Constituents, including the Government (a Ministry of Labour or Employment), in the project design and in the implementation result not only in Ownership but also allows for leverage vis-a-vis the other constituents.*
- LL2: The Public Private Development Partnership (PPDP) Model used in this project has advantages and disadvantages which should be managed well especially concerning the different roles played by international private companies.*
- GP1: The Twin-Track strategy on Gender Equality based on the comprehensive Gender Equality Assessment is a Good Practice that should be replicated (GEA, entitled 'Weaving Gender').*
- GP2: The collaboration between ILO-GIP and the local service provider Aung Myin Hmu (AMH/CARE International) resulted in the mainstreaming of Industrial Relations issues into the existing national training programme of AMH.*

# 1 Introduction

The present Evaluation Report is mandated by the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Independent Final Evaluation of the project entitled “*Improving labour relations for decent work and sustainable development in the Myanmar Garment Industry (ILO-GIP)*” (see Annex 1). In the present report we will firstly summarize the background and context of the ILO-GIP Project (1.1), followed by the purpose, scope and clients of the Evaluation (1.2). In Chapter 2 the methodology used for the evaluation will be explained. The actual evaluation exercise consists of the findings following the analysis of the Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions in Chapter 3. The findings are further summarized in the Concluding Section 4.1, while the Recommendations are the subject of Section 4.2. The final Chapter 5 presents several Lessons Learned and Good Practices.

## 1.1 Background and Context of the ILO-GIP project

### *Economic Context*

In its Asian Development Outlook 2015, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) recognized Myanmar as one of the “Top 10 performers in developing Asia”. ADB has estimated that the current growth rate of 7-8% could continue until 2030 (Annex 1). Interest from international investors was growing rapidly, with both the ADB and the World Bank identifying foreign investment as an important driver of economic growth, however, this has all changed in the past few months due to the outbreak of the COVID-19 crisis.

Myanmar’s garment industry is one of the country’s main manufactured goods export sectors. The sector has seen rapid growth since the country’s re-opening to global markets in 2011. The sector’s export value reached \$2.5 billion in 2017, and the garment manufacturing industry is estimated to employ around 450,000 workers of which more than 90 per cent are women (see Annex 1). The Myanmar Garment Industry 10 Year Strategy (2015-2024) claims that the industry could achieve exports of \$8-10 billion in the coming year if all the stakeholders (factories, international brands, sourcing companies and their agents, various ministries and workers) can work together to develop the industry in a responsible and ethical manner. It also needs to be noted that there are some insecurities around the EU review of Myanmar’s fulfilment of demands related to the *Everything-But-Arms* (EBA) trade preferential scheme of the EU especially following the Rohingya refugee crisis.

### *Gender Context*

According to the UNDP Gender Inequality Index, Myanmar ranks 83 out of 151 countries with comparable countries such as Lao PDR and Cambodia being ranked 105 and 118 respectively (see Annex 1). Nevertheless, there are still significant challenges in gender equality notably related to violence against women, wage employment with women mostly concentrated in the lower-ranks and lower-skilled jobs, as well as access to equal participation in politics as the proportion of seats held by women in parliament is much lower than other countries in the region.

Women in Myanmar face multiple challenges in voicing their needs and accessing basic social and workplace rights. Women workers in general are among the most vulnerable workers and

are concentrated in low productivity, low wage jobs that enjoy little protection. The available evidence also shows that women in Myanmar have little knowledge about their rights in the workplace, and most workplaces give little attention to gender-specific needs. In 2018 the ILO-GIP project carried out a Gender-Equality Assessment (GEA) in 16 foreign owned Yangon-based factories in Myanmar's garment sector which provides further in-depth information.

### ***Institutional Context***

Despite an on-going reform process, considerable gaps remain within the legal and regulatory framework and industrial competitiveness continues to be built primarily on low wages. Myanmar's modestly sized manufacturing sector is hampered by poor infrastructure, lack of access to capital, limited technical skills, and the high cost of starting and running a business.

The country is in the very early stages of the development of its industrial relations system. This presents significant challenges but also unique opportunities. Since the adoption of the *Labour Organization Law (LOL)* in 2011, which introduced the principle of freedom of association, more than 1,500 trade unions and almost 30 employers' organizations have come into existence. The adoption of the *Settlement of Labour Disputes Law* in 2012 introduced the concepts of workplace cooperation and collective bargaining. There are some **25 pieces** of legislation governing the world of work in Myanmar. The various laws, rules and regulations suffer from a lack of consistency in definition and other concepts, lack of coordination and do not always adequately reflect the international labour standards. Despite some notable challenges in the legal and institutional framework, workers and employers' organizations are working toward becoming strong, independent and representative organizations. For a variety of reasons related to culture, and decades of military rule, and continuing weaknesses in the law, *the practice of social dialogue*, including collective bargaining, has yet to be properly developed in Myanmar. The Government of Myanmar is engaged in a reform process and has adopted in recent years several new policies and regulations in this area (see in particular the laws highlighted in red in Box 1).

#### **Box 1: Myanmar: Legislation relevant to GIP**

- ✓ Workmen's Compensation Act 1923
- ✓ Factories Act 1951
- ✓ Labour Organization Law (LOL) 2011
- ✓ Social Security Law 2012
- ✓ Settlement of Labour Disputes Law 2012
- ✓ OSH Law 2019

ILO-GIP is part of a global agreement as the cooperation between Sida, H&M and the ILO dates back to 2013. In 2014 two agreements were signed: the MoU between H&M and Sida and the subsequent Framework Agreement (or: Public Private Partnership, PPP) between ILO and H&M creating a formal partnership to promote sustainable global supply chains in the garment industry. Based on these two agreements a number of PPDPs on industrial relations and social dialogue between the parties have been developed, and this resulted for example in projects in Cambodia (2014), Ethiopia (2015) and the GIP-project in Myanmar (2016); the three projects share a common intervention model.

### ***Objectives and strategies of the project***

The ILO-GIP project aims to contribute to the reduction of poverty and the empowerment of women in Myanmar by improving labour relations and social dialogue in the garment sector. Therefore, the project aims to achieve five immediate objectives (IO) as they are specified in Table 1 below. For each IO, Table 1 specifies several outputs as laid down in the updated Logical Framework or LogFrame (of December 2017) with a total of 17 Outputs.

**Table 1: Objectives and Outputs of the ILO-GIP project (cf. Updated Log Frame).**

Overall Development Objective	
<i>Contribute to the reduction of poverty and the empowerment of women in Myanmar by improving labour relations and social dialogue in the garment sector.</i>	
Immediate Objectives (IO)	Outputs
1. Increased capacity for sound industrial relations in participating enterprises leading to increased incidence of social dialogue, including collective bargaining, and, as a result, increased wages, improved working conditions and improved gender equality.	1.1 Participating enterprises are recruited and enterprise-level data-gathering exercises are carried out.
	1.2 Bipartite improvement plans are developed in each participating enterprise with the assistance of project staff.
	1.3 Bipartite improvement plans are implemented in each participating enterprise with the assistance of project staff.
	1.4 Bi-partite OSH action plans are developed in participating enterprises with the assistance of project staff.
	1.5 Bipartite OSH action plans are implemented in each participating enterprise with the assistance of project staff.
	1.6 Relevant training materials appropriate for use at enterprise level are identified and modified (if necessary) or developed from scratch and delivered in each enterprise.
	1.7 Bipartite continuous improvement plans on processes (productivity) are developed in selected number of participating factories. **)
	1.8 Bipartite continuous improvement plans on processes (productivity) are implemented in selected number of participating factories. **)
2. Empowerment of women workers via the removal of the most serious obstacles to women's participation in social dialogue, including in particular low levels of health knowledge, and to the extension of opportunities to all workers regardless of sex.	2.1 An overall project gender strategy is developed together with bipartite gender equality action plans in each participating enterprise.
	2.2 Bipartite gender equality action plans are implemented in each enterprise with the assistance of project staff.
	2.3 In collaboration with a suitable locally based partner organization, a programme to deliver health information and education targeted specifically at women is designed and delivered.
3. Increased capacity of social partners to deliver services to members and to participate in bipartite social dialogue.	3.1 Financial support for staffing is provided to the secretariats of both employers' organizations and trade unions at sectoral level, subject to appropriate assurances of sustainability.
	3.2 A programme of workshops to strengthen the social partners' capacity to deal with labour relations and to provide services to their members is developed and implemented for sectoral-level trade unions and employers' organization(s), with the support of international workers and employers' organizations where appropriate.
4. Regular bipartite social dialogue training takes place at the sectoral level in the garment sector, addressing concrete issues of common concern to workers and employers.	4.1 Shared goals for sustainable development and decent working conditions in the garment industry are defined by the social partners at sectoral level.
	4.2 A programme of bipartite training policy development workshops is developed and implemented at the sectoral level with a view to pursuing the shared goals defined under output 4.1.
5. Increased knowledge of the labour law and rights and responsibilities at work for garment worker. *)	5.1 An extensive curriculum on workers' rights and responsibilities is developed and delivered to garment workers through various TVET training channels.
	5.2 A curriculum on workers' rights and responsibilities at work is developed and delivered to garment workers through direct training in participating factories.

\*) This IO and its outputs (5, 5.1 & 5.2) were not in the original Project Document of June 2016; these were added in 2017.

\*\*) These Outputs (1.7 and 1.8) were not in the original Project Document; these were added in December 2017.

The original PRODOC of June 2016 (pages 20-25) identified only 13 out of these 17 outputs. The remaining four outputs were added in later stages as follows:

- After the inception period Outputs 5.1 and 5.2 were included, and
- After the additional funding by Sida was approved in December 2017 the new outputs on productivity were added (Outputs 1.7 and 1.8).

For each of the original 13 outputs the PRODOC identified a series of activities, which amounted in total to no less than 56 activities. No activities were formulated for the four additional outputs.

### *Institutional and management arrangements and stakeholders of the Project*

Following the ToR (see Annex 1) the ILO-GIP project is implemented in collaboration with the main local industry stakeholders, including the Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population (MoLIP), relevant trade unions, including the Industrial Workers Federation of Myanmar (IWFEM), affiliated to the Confederation of Trade Unions of Myanmar (CTUM), and the Myanmar Industries, Craft and Services Unions Federation (MICS), relevant private sector actors and employers' organizations, particularly the Myanmar Garment Manufacturers Association (MGMA) affiliated to the Union of Myanmar Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry (UMFCCI). The project is also liaising with relevant other garment sector initiatives such as the EU funded Smart Myanmar project, the German funded Tchibo/GIZ project on social dialogue, as well as Danish funded MyPod project, and the Aung Myin Hmu (AMH) project funded by the Livelihoods and Food Security Fund (LIFT). At the enterprise level, the project is implemented in 20 target garment factories, including 10 factories which supply to H&M. Others have been recruited via the support of other brands the project has approached: Inditex, Uniqlo and Marks & Spencer. An overview of all stakeholders in the ILO-GIP project is given in Annex 3.

## 1.2 Purpose, Scope and Clients of the Evaluation

The ILO considers evaluation as an integral part of the implementation of technical cooperation activities. As per the ILO evaluation policy and procedures all programmes and projects with a budget over US\$ 1 million must go through at least one *independent* evaluation. As the ILO-GIP project nears its end of implementation (i.e. 31 May 2020), an independent evaluator was contracted to carry out the present final evaluation. This evaluation is managed by an ILO certified evaluation manager with oversight by EVAL and implemented by a consultant expert in evaluation with no link to the project. In the third quarter of 2018 an *internal* Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) was conducted with the aim to assess the project progress toward the outcomes. The findings from this MTE indicated that the project had achieved significant results with some emerging good practices such as:

- training of trainers (ToT) approach for capacity building,
- training kit on industrial relations,
- development of the "Client Relationship Management database",
- the collaboration between ILO-GIP and Aung Myin Hmu, and
- the tripartite Sub-Working Group on Industrial Relations Training (SWG-IRT).

However, the project also faced challenges in stakeholders' participation in the project design, implementation schedule, staffing, and the brands' role in the project. The present Independent Final Evaluation includes explicitly a detailed investigation of whether, and if so, how the MTE Recommendations (included here in Annex 5) have been accommodated.

The main overall **Purpose** of the Final Independent Evaluation is to promote accountability to ILO key stakeholders and donors, and to enhance learning within the ILO and key stakeholders. The findings will be used to improve design and implementation of future relevant projects/programs. The main **Objective** of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, validity, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, i.e. the **six Evaluation Criteria**, and to document lessons learnt and possible good practices. Several specific areas of focus have been discussed in the ToR (see Annex 1, pages 6-7) and each of these areas have been categorized under one of the above-mentioned six criteria in the Inception Report (see Annex 2) and these areas are included in the Data Collection Worksheet discussed in Section 2.1).

Other important areas of focus, *not mentioned in the ToR*, have been identified in the inception period of the present evaluation as follows:

- Investigate to the extent possible within the framework of this limited evaluation the alignment of the ILO-GIP project objectives and outputs with **the requirements under the EBA trade preference** (i.e. compliance with the principles of the 15 UN/ILO Conventions on core Human and Labour Rights).<sup>2</sup> Currently a period of 'Enhanced Engagement' is ongoing between the EC and three countries (Myanmar, Bangladesh and Cambodia), and this process has, for example, resulted in a partial suspension by the EC of EBA trade privileges of Cambodia on 12 February 2020 (which is expected to take effect on 12 August 2020).<sup>3</sup> (*re: Relevance*).
- In a **Public Private Development Partnership (PPDP)**, the public and private sectors make a joint investment in a project implemented by a third party in this case respectively 77% and 23% (cf. the administrative information on page ii). The objective is to create conditions that will enable people living in poverty to improve their lives. The present evaluation will investigate the PPDP-project set up and the roles and responsibilities of each partner (*re: Validity and Effectiveness*).

The scope of the evaluation covers all interventions the ILO-GIP has implemented under the project from the start until the time of the final evaluation. The evaluation has started in February 2020 and will end in June 2020 and it covers all the geographical coverage of the project in Yangon. The cross-cutting concerns of gender equality and non-discrimination, promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes and constituent capacity development are specifically addressed in this evaluation.

The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations from the final evaluation are primarily addressed to the clients of the Evaluation, viz. ILO-GIP constituents, donors and other key stakeholders and partners (for a detailed list of stakeholders, see Annex 3).

<sup>2</sup> <https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/10102/2020/EN/SWD-2020-19-F1-EN-MAIN-PART-1.PDF>.

<sup>3</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip\\_20\\_229](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_20_229).

## 2 Methodology of the Evaluation

### 2.1 Conceptual Framework: Data Collection Worksheet

#### *Evaluation Criteria*

The evaluation has been carried out in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy, the ILO Guideline, the UN System Evaluation Standards and Norms, and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard. The evaluation has therefore addressed the following six Evaluation Criteria which are adapted for the purpose of the evaluation of this specific project as was formulated in the ToR (cf. Annex 1);

- |                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| A. Relevance:          | Relevance and strategic fit,  |
| B. Validity of design: | Validity of interventions design,   |
| C. Effectiveness:      | Effectiveness of project implementation and management arrangements,  |
| D. Efficiency:         | Efficiency of resource use and project set-up,  |
| E. Impact:             | Impact orientation by the project set-up, and impacts achieved vis-à-vis defined objectives and outcomes, and |
| F. Sustainability:     | Sustainability and continuation of project-induced activities and impact beyond the project's lifespan.       |

The issue of *gender equality* was considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. To the extent possible, data collection and analysis was disaggregated by sex as described in the ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines and relevant Guidance Notes.

#### *Data Collection Worksheet*

For each of the six Evaluation Criteria a series of Evaluation Questions (in total 25) were formulated and these are included in the Data Collection Worksheet as it has been developed in the Inception Report (Annex 2). This Worksheet, included in Annex 4, describes the way that the chosen data collection methods, data sources, sampling and indicators support the evaluation questions. It includes in particular the Evaluation Questions and Criteria/Indicators, the Sources of Data, the specific Methods used and the Stakeholder Interviews. The detailed findings for each of these Evaluation Questions will be discussed in Chapter 3 below.

### 2.2 Methodology, Work Plan and Key Deliverables

#### *Methodology*

The methodology of the present independent final evaluation includes multiple methods, with analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data as well as observations and captures the intervention's contributions to the achievement of expected and unexpected outcomes. The methodology ensures the involvement of key stakeholders in the implementation as well as in the dissemination processes (e.g. development of the ToR, debriefing of project manager, circulation of the PowerPoint with preliminary findings and of the draft report). The evaluation fieldwork has been qualitative and participatory in nature. Qualitative information was obtained through field



visits, interviews and focus group discussions with the key stakeholders of the ILO-GIP project, as well as through Skype interviews with staff of donors and with key ILO staff responsible for technical backstopping of the project in DWT-Bangkok and in HQ-Geneva. It was also envisaged to meet most of the DWT-specialists of ROAP on Monday 9 March 2020 in Bangkok, but early March all travel of ILO staff to/from Bangkok was suspended by ILO-ROAP in view of the situation related to the COVID-19 crisis; the interviews with these specialists were therefore conducted by Skype. Opinions coming from stakeholders have improved and clarified the quantitative data obtained from project documents including the progress reports and monitoring data. Data were thus collected from different sources by different methods so that findings could be triangulated to draw valid and reliable conclusions.

The methodology for the collection of evidences was implemented in **three phases**:

- (1) **An inception phase** based on a review of existing documents to produce the inception report (5 days). The desk review included the relevant project and other documents (see Annex 6), as well as Skype calls with the Evaluation Manager, the project's Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) and several ILO experts in Geneva.
- (2) **A fieldwork phase** to collect and analyse primary data in Yangon (9 days). The mission schedule and a list of persons to be interviewed was prepared by the project team in consultation with the evaluation manager and the evaluator (see Annex 3). A stakeholder workshop was scheduled to be conducted in Yangon to present the preliminary findings to the key stakeholders at the end of the mission, but due to the rapidly proliferating travel restrictions imposed by many countries it was decided to cut the mission short and the consultant returned to his duty station on Thursday 18 March 2020. He then prepared a PowerPoint with an audio commentary, which was distributed to the main stakeholders for their comments.
- (3) **A data analysis and reporting phase** to produce the final evaluation report (9 days). This phase included most of the Skype calls with those stakeholders who could not be met in Myanmar, including DWT specialists in Bangkok, specialists in Geneva and Brand representatives (M&S, UNIQLO).

The data and information were collected, presented and analysed with appropriate **Gender disaggregation**. Data have been disaggregated by sex where available and appropriate. To the extent possible, the data collection, analysis and presentation will be responsive to and include issues relating to diversity and non-discrimination, including disability issues where relevant.

A plan for a **critical reflection process** and for quality communication and reporting of evaluation outcomes, was developed as follows:

- The weekend during the mission period (i.e. 14-15 March 2020) was used to critically reflect on the interview notes so far, to peruse newly received documents and to start the preparation of the PowerPoint presentation.
- The draft PowerPoint presentation was shared with the Evaluation Manager, and also with the Project CTA (only for factual and diplomatic issues); the comments were taken into account in the final version.
- The final PowerPoint was distributed among key stakeholders who were invited to make their comments and suggestions by email.

- A series of discussions were held with the CTA of the project to put findings in the right perspective.

### **Limitations**

The Evaluation assignment is clearly laid out in the ToR (Annex 1) and the list of stakeholders and specialists to be interviewed in Annex 3 is quite comprehensive and exhaustive and is representative of the stakeholders. One qualification is that the ILO-GIP project is mainly focussed on activities involving the social partners, while ILO's third constituent, the Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population (MOLIP), has been involved only in a few specific project activities. Although the project design envisaged to install a Project Advisory Committee (PAC), its meetings never materialized for reasons explained in the next chapter. As a result, there are no PAC-minutes which often provides an evaluator with a flavour of the state of cooperation between the main stakeholders (ILO's three constituents, donors, project team, etc.).

This specific assignment involves a challengingly large number of *Evaluation Questions* which need to be answered; Annex 4 identifies 25 such questions whereby the majority consists of one or more sub-questions, amounting to a total of about 46. This is quite a substantial number of questions to be answered for a one-man team in a brief mission of just nine working days. This problem was mitigated by focusing on the six main *Evaluation Criteria*.

Another challenging task for the evaluator will be to investigate all the 'Activities' identified in the LogFrame. As we have seen in Chapter 1, the original PRODOC identified 13 outputs and associated to these outputs were a total of no less than 56 activities. For the four outputs that were added in later stages no activities have been formulated as such. This limitation was mitigated by focusing on those activities that are underlined by the different stakeholders during the interviews and adjusted with the study of the project documents.

### **Key Deliverables**

The following key outputs will be delivered:

- *Deliverable 1: Inception Report (dated 5 March 2020).*
- *Deliverable 2: PowerPoint Presentation with Spoken Explanations of preliminary findings (29 March 2020).*
- *Deliverable 3: Draft Evaluation Report by April 13, 2020. This was circulated for comments to key stakeholders, i.e. the Project team, ILO officials, donors and national stakeholders.*
- *Deliverable 4: Final Evaluation Report with Evaluation Summary (in ILO Template). The evaluator will incorporate comments received from ILO and other key stakeholders into the final report, and he will provide a **Matrix** with the comments and the explanations why comments were or were not taken into account. In addition to the final report, a stand-alone evaluation summary, will be provided using the ILO standard template.*

### **Management Arrangements and Quality Assurance**

A designated ILO staff, Mr Bui Van Dung, M&E Officer at ILO Country Office in Hanoi, who has no prior involvement in the project is managing this independent evaluation with oversight provided by the ILO Evaluation Office. The ILO Liaison Office for Myanmar and the ILO-GIP project team is handling administrative contractual arrangements with the evaluator and providing

logistical and other assistance as required. A detailed list of tasks of the evaluation manager as well as of the project team are given in the ToR (Annex 1). The evaluator reports to the evaluation manager. The evaluator is leading the evaluation and is responsible for delivering the above evaluation deliverables using a combination of methods as mentioned above.

### Work Plan

The evaluation has been conducted between February and June 2020. The field mission to Myanmar took place from 10 to 18 March 2020 (excluding travel dates). The draft work plan of the ToR has been further detailed as follows:

Work plan: Tasks	Responsible person	Time frame (by end)
<b>Preparatory phase</b>		
• Preparation, sharing & finalization of TOR	Evaluation Manager	6 December 2019
• Approval of the TOR	Regional M&E Officer	18 December 2019
• Issuance of EOI, advertisement of consultant, and selection of consultant	Evaluation Manager/ Regional M&E Officer	24 January 2020
• Issuance of contracts	CTA	February 2020
• Draft mission itinerary for the evaluator and the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed	CTA	February / Early March 2020
• Brief evaluator on ILO evaluation policy and the project	Evaluation Manager and CTA	4 February 2020
• Document review and interviews with stakeholders outside Myanmar (donor, ILO HQ, etc.) and development of the inception report submitted to Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	February 2020
• Inception report approved	Evaluation Manager	5 March 2020
<b>Fieldwork phase</b>		
• Evaluation Mission to Yangon and Nay Pyi Daw	Evaluator	10 to 18 March 2020
• Conducting National Stakeholder Workshop and Debriefings in Yangon		Cancelled due to COVID-19 crisis; A PowerPoint was distributed
<b>Development of evaluation report</b>		
• Development of PowerPoint with Spoken Explanations and distributed among key stakeholders		29 March 2020
• Analysis of data based on desk review, fieldwork and interviews and Skype calls	Evaluator	Late March/early April 2020
• Draft report submitted to Evaluation Manager		14 April 2020
• Sharing the draft report with all concerned stakeholders for comments for two weeks	Evaluation Manager	17 April 2020
• Consolidated comments on the draft report and send to the evaluator	Evaluation Manager	28 April 2020
• Finalization of the report and submission to Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	4 May 2020
• Review and approval of the final report	Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Office	18 May 2020

## 3 Overall Findings

The Independent Final Evaluation of the ILO-GIP project is based on the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, and in the previous chapter six Evaluation Criteria have been identified which will be discussed in depth in the present chapter (Sections 3.1 – 3.6). In addition, several other priority aspects were identified related to the Cross-Cutting Issues (Section 3.7). These six Evaluation Criteria and the cross-cutting issues have been investigated with the help of 25 Evaluation Questions which were included in the Data Collection Worksheet (see Section 2.1 and Annex 4), and these questions are reproduced below in bold.

### 3.1 Relevance

**1) To what extent are the project strategy and approach levels consistent and pertinent to current and long-term development needs of Myanmar, the needs and priority of beneficiaries, tripartite constituents and policies of partners and the donors?**

The overall relevance of the ILO-GIP project has been *very high* from the beginning in 2016 especially in light of the then feeble institutional capacities of both workers and employers' organizations; the scarce recognition of labour rights; poor working conditions; and gender inequities that existed in the Myanmar garment sector. The MTE also concluded that the overall ILO-GIP goal of improving labour relations, social dialogue and gender equality in the garment industry is highly relevant. All stakeholders interviewed for this final evaluation have also indicated explicitly that the focus on industrial relations and collective bargaining is very relevant for Myanmar at this stage, especially to improve working conditions for workers as well as to enhance compliance with standards of export products as well as to enhance productivity. All stakeholders underscored furthermore that at present the relevance is still as valid as when the project started.

The project strategy and approach levels are consistent with the current and long-term development needs of Myanmar, especially since the adoption of the Labour Organization Law (LOL) in 2011 which introduced the principle of Freedom of Association, and the Settlement of Labour Disputes Law 2012, as well as ongoing legislative reforms in recent years (e.g. the OSH Law 2019). The project is aligned with broader national policies and programmes of the Government of Myanmar (GoM), in particular with the Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan (MSDP) 2018–2030 through the direct contribution to Goal 3 on Job Creation and Private Sector Led Growth. Specifically, the project relates to these two elements of this MSDP:

- “Support the emergence of inclusive business and trade associations, representative employers' organisations and trade unions”
- “Strengthen priority, pro-job creation export value chains and build linkages with foreign companies and buyers, aligned with the National Export Strategy”.

The project is also aligned with the 12 Points Economic policy of the Union of Myanmar, in particular with its third and fifth policies “Fostering the human capital that will be needed for the emergence of a modern developed economy...”, and “Creating employment opportunities for all citizens including those returning from abroad, and giving greater priority to in the short term to *economic enterprises that create many job opportunities.*” (emphasis added).

Having interviewed different groups of beneficiaries, it can be concluded that the project strategy and approach levels are clearly consistent with their needs and priorities, for example both management and workers' representatives in the Workplace Coordinating Committees (WCC)<sup>4</sup> of three different factories said how relevant the project was to enhance the functioning of the WCC, and the tripartite representatives trained through the Myanmar Industrial Relations Lab (MIR-Lab)<sup>5</sup> underlined how they came to understand better each other's challenges. This also applies to the policies of the tripartite constituents as was firmly underscored during the interviews with IWFM and MICS as well as with MGMA.

The donors (Sida, H&M and M&S) all indicated the high relevance of the approach taken by the project. The project was funded by Sida headquarters in Sweden initiated by The Global Deal on decent work and inclusive growth, while the Sida *bilateral* strategy for Myanmar is focused on somewhat different priorities, viz. Human Rights and Democracy, Peace building process and Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR). In addition, there is a *regional* garment focused Sida programme operated from Bangkok and this underlines the importance of the GIP approach. Both private partners in the project, H&M and M&S, confirmed that the relevance of the strategy is just as high today as it was in 2016. Interventions in the garment sector in Myanmar are also considered by donors as a good practice in development cooperation vis-a-vis their own electorate since they provide support to more than half a million workers, who have stable industrial jobs with a decent income and the majority are women.

**2) To what extent is the project design aligned with or informed the Myanmar DWCP for 2018-2021? To what extent is the project design aligned with SDG 1, 5, and 8 (particularly the principle of 'leaving no one behind') and other relevant development policy frameworks and the requirements under the EBA trade preference?**

The project supports the realization of the following two Decent Work Country Programme Outcomes namely, Priority 2 on "Application of fundamental principles and rights at work", and in particular Outcome 2.3 on "Strengthened industrial relations system at the national, township, sectorial, plant and enterprise levels".

The ILO-GIP project contributes to several ILO Strategic Policy Outcomes of the Programme and Budget (P&B) 2018-2019, including:

- Outcome 7: Promoting safe work and workplace compliance including in global supply chains;
- Outcome 1: More and better jobs for inclusive growth and improved youth employment prospects;
- Outcome 8: Protecting workers from unacceptable forms of work; and
- Outcome 10: Strong and representative employers' and workers' organizations.

The project also aims at contributing to three Sustainable Development Goals including SDG 1 - End poverty in all its form everywhere; SDG 5 - Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls; and SDG 8 - Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all (including the principle of 'leaving no one behind'),

<sup>4</sup> WCC are joint workers and trade unions and management representatives compulsory in workplaces of more than 30 workers

<sup>5</sup> The Mir-Lab is a capacity building program on systems and practices for sound industrial relations in the Myanmar garment industry.

with a specific focus on Target 8.8: “Protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers ....”.

The project further aligns with the first United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in Myanmar (2018-2022). The UNDAF will adopt the principle from the 2030 Agenda of ‘leaving no one behind’, and it will be based on the “5 Ps” – People, Planet, Prosperity, Peace and Partnership.<sup>6</sup> While for example the contribution of the World Food Programme (WFP) to UNDAF is mainly directed to the People and Planet elements, the focus of ILO-GIP is on the Priority areas People and Prosperity (Priority 2.1).

The EU concentrates on eight areas/requirements concerning alignment to the EBA trade preference, of which the last one is: “Respect for labour rights. This includes alignment with the fundamental principles and rights at work, in particular eliminating forced and child labour, and ensuring freedom of association both in legislation and in practice.”<sup>7</sup> The ILO-GIP project squarely focuses on such issues. The export-oriented garment sector is also to a large extent a genuine *private* sector with hardly any military owned factories. At the same time, it has to be noted that the German Ministry of Development Cooperation (BMZ) cancelled certain types of development cooperation with Myanmar in early March 2020 after an official visit to the Rohingya camps in Bangladesh which might impact the EU’s decision. However, currently the focus has shifted fully to the COVID-19 crisis and to possible programmes to bridge the arising gaps in production and incomes, and an EU monitoring mission had to be cancelled because of this crisis.

### **3) To what extent are the project strategy and approach levels consistent with the gender equality goals of ILO?**

The project strategy is very much consistent with the gender equality goals of ILO as these goals figure prominently in the projects’ objectives, outcomes and activities as was shown in the above (see Section 1.1 and in particular Table 1). Furthermore, an important category of beneficiaries are the garment factory workers who are in large majority (over 90%) women.

### **4) Were the project strategies and the selected means of action appropriate considering the cultural setting, capacity of institutional partners for project implementation and the capacities of intended men and women beneficiaries in Myanmar?**

The original project strategies and the selected means of action were *not* appropriate considering the cultural setting, the capacities of institutional partners and of intended men and women beneficiaries in Myanmar which will be explained further when we talk about the Validity of the project design (Section 3.2 below). At the same time, one needs to admire the flexibility of the project team which made sure that (un-planned) training was added for all these stakeholders to account for a serious lack of basic knowledge on industrial relations.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. WFP-Report at: <https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/resources/wfp292739.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> <https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/10102/2020/EN/SWD-2020-19-F1-EN-MAIN-PART-1.PDF>

## 3.2 Validity of design

### 5) To what extent are the project design (objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities) and its underlying theory of change logical and coherent?

The project design (objectives, outputs and activities) is in itself mostly logical and coherent, however there are some substantial flaws as follows:

- The project design was quite ambitious with five rather long-term ‘immediate objectives’ that could not realistically be achieved within the project period of three years; a total of 13 Outputs were identified for these immediate objectives as well as no less than 56 Activities.
- The design was not tailored to the very basic needs of the main stakeholders (constituents and beneficiaries) and, therefore, Immediate Objective 5 was included in a later stage as we have seen in Section 1.1.
- There was no underlying theory of change provided in the PRODOC, and in later stages it was also not provided (and the MTE never mentioned it).
- What was lacking in the design is a substantial role for the Government (in particular MoLIP), and while studying the PRODOC one wonders where and when this third tripartite constituent comes in. This has partly been explained by the fact that at the time of the design another ILO project (on Freedom of Association, FoA) was already deeply involved with MoLIP (although that project ended in 2015). Since June 2019, the ILO implemented the Labour Law Reform project in Nay Pyi Daw which works intensively with MoLIP as well (funded by EU with a contribution from Japan).

Part of the explanations for these flaws might be found in the fact that the design of the project was not an easy process according to those that were involved, and it took a relatively long time (2015-2016) with contributions at different times from different units of the ILO (INWORK both in Geneva and in Bangkok, the ILO in Yangon, various DWT experts (including ACTRAV and ACTEMP), and at some points ILO-ITC’s Better Work (BW). Partly due to more than usual staff changes in these units, it was not always clear who was in the lead of the design process at any given time. There was also a bit of a difference of opinion between ILO’s INWORK and the joint ILO/IFC ‘Better Work’ (BW) programme, with the design of GIP trying at some level to replicate a BW-type intervention (see Box 2), which is quite difficult in the GIP set-up because BW is a very labour-intensive programme with many local staff liaising with the factories (in many countries dozens of technical national officers are employed).

In addition, there were the consultations between ILO, Sida and H&M, mostly taking place initially in pairs. In view of Sida’s bilateral priorities, SRHR was added to the project’s outputs, which was not part of the ‘sister programmes’ funded and implemented by the same three organisations in Ethiopia and Cambodia.

### 6) Was the project design realistic and adequate to meet the project objectives? To what extent was the project design, including the PPDP-project set up, adequate to be able to achieve the goal and addressing the needs of ultimate beneficiaries, tripartite constituents and the capacities of the project partners?

As indicated in the above, the project *design* was not realistic in the sense that three years would not be sufficient for such longer-term immediate objectives.

The project *set up* as a Public Private Development Partnership (PPDP) was an interesting one and was based on earlier experiences in Cambodia and Ethiopia. It worked out well in most respects, and the role of H&M and M&S was crucial for the progress and achievements of the project (as will be elaborated below in Section 3.3). Concerning the specific relation with national owned factories, it is worth quoting here the assessment of the MTE in November 2018 at some length as it concerns intricate and sensitive issues:

Stakeholders agreed that the brands' support to ILO-GIP has proved to be instrumental, as factories are willing to join the project if their buyers explicitly request them to do so. This is considered an advantage for the implementation of the activities in factories that participate in the project. However, at the same time it would be envisageable that the factories are convinced about the usefulness of taking part in a project and not being "strongly encouraged" by their buyers.

Furthermore, in this particular case, H&M partially funds ILO-GIP and is thus *accountable* towards H&M as it would be to any other donor. Besides, the company is regarded by national stakeholders as a *project partner* (along with trade unions and the MGMA) as a *project donor* it participates as an observer in the project's governance processes. Furthermore, H&M has a key role in the signing up of participating factories.

According to several stakeholders' opinions gathered by the evaluator, this situation creates a *conflict of interest*, which, in turn translates into a disinclination on the side of the employers' and national owned factories to join ILO-GIP for reasons related to potential unfairness and competitiveness.

Whereas ILO-GIP has sought the support and participation of additional brands in the project, this same argument may become more pertinent, as this potentially increases the risk of being seen as favouring international brands over nationally owned factories, especially if the latter continue to be absent from the project. This needs to be addressed with utmost diplomacy." (MTE 2018: 51).

On the basis of this analysis, and, in particular, in order to avoid potential conflicts of interest that might negatively influence the employers' and national owned factories' willingness to join in ILO-GIP (or other projects), the MTE arrived at the recommendation (No. 14) to manage private sector contributions through pooled funds at the ILO-HQ in Geneva (MTE 2018: 58).

The same can be said about M&S but they entered the project only in the final year (September 2019). Both H&M and M&S have indicated that they have appreciated the cooperation with ILO in the project.

The identification and design process was, according to the MTE, not a fully inclusive and participatory process, and this resulted in an apparent lack of ownership of the project among the social partners but especially for the MGMA. However, the government was only involved in a few project activities, and for all practical purposes one could claim that their ownership was even lower than that of the MGMA. The two trade unions (IWFM and MICS) have gradually grown in capacity as well as in their feeling of ownership. The problem with the MGMA was their reluctance to join the project, and, in fact, Outputs 1.7 and 1.8 on productivity improvement plans were added in a later stage specifically to attempt to enhance their feeling of ownership. The project's



Immediate Objective 4 was modified to prioritize training as opposed to policy dialogue for the same reason.

**7) Were the planned project objectives, means of action and outcomes, relevant, coherent and realistic to the situation on the ground?**

The planned project objectives, means of action and outcomes, were mostly relevant, coherent and realistic to *the situation on the ground* except for the fact that the level of knowledge on labour laws and rights and responsibilities at work among stakeholders and beneficiaries was over-estimated and an additional immediate objective had to be added (the 5th one).

**8) Did it address gender needs and interests?**

The gender needs and interests were clearly addressed in all five immediate objectives, while the second one is even exclusively directed at the empowerment of women workers. This will be further elaborated in Section 3.3 under Evaluation Question 12e.

**9) Were the capacities of various project's partners taken into account in the project's strategy and means of action?**

The level of capacities on issues of labour relations and social dialogue among various, in particular local, service providers at the start of ILO-GIP was much lower than anticipated, and for example additional training in workers' rights and responsibilities and in the implementation of the Labour law had to be designed and provided by the project team. This delayed the actual training which the local service providers were to give. This was particularly the case for the project's activities on occupational health and safety at work and social dialogue.

**10) Which risks and assumptions were identified and were they the appropriate ones?**

The risk matrix in the PRODOC consists of a series of Assumptions (19 in total) categorized into four groups: Sustainability, Development, Implementation and Management Assumptions. These are mainly *assumptions* and not, as such, risks, as was also underlined by the MTE. At the request of Sida, the project updated its risk matrix (dated 10 July 2018) before the 2018 Narrative Report or Technical Progress Report (dated April 2019). This update was very useful discussing all the issues and challenges that were going on at the time and which closely reflect those that will be discussed below (Section 3.3). However, it would have been useful for implementation and monitoring if this had been updated again a year later especially since the next narrative report (Progress report) will be the final report of the project due only in June 2020. In addition, if the risk analysis had been updated it should have included the risk of the EU's potential withdrawal of the GSP on EBA for Myanmar exports.

**11) Were the planned monitoring and evaluation arrangements adequate? Were the targeted indicator values realistic and can they be tracked?**

The planned M&E arrangements as described in the PRODOC would in itself be adequate but since the project took so long to start up and because then priority was given to move forward as quickly as possible with the activities themselves, several elements of the planned M&E system were not used or implemented, in particular:

- i. An M&E plan was planned in the PRODOC, but not implemented.
- ii. An Implementation Plan was planned in the PRODOC, but not implemented.

- iii. The updated LogFrame of December 2017 includes 5 immediate objectives, 17 outputs, many indicators, the means of verification and some assumptions/risks. The 56 activities were identified separately in the PRODOC and thus relate only to the original four immediate objectives (no activities were identified for the new fifth objective).
- iv. A Client Relationship Management (CRM) structure was created in June 2018 to which the MTE attributed a great deal of trust regarding its usefulness for M&E of the project; however, this CRM was not further implemented after that since the project team prioritized to focus their efforts squarely on activities and consultations with the social partners.

The targeted indicators as they are included in the LogFrame dated December 2017 were useful and realistic and could in principle be tracked, but the sheer number of indicators and its values were overambitious to say the least.

### 3.3 Effectiveness

#### 12) To what extent did the project achieve the intended objectives?

##### a. The extent to which the recommendations from the MTE have been taking into consideration?

In late 2018 the MTE concluded on Effectiveness: “Notwithstanding the challenges, the ILO-GIP has accomplished significant achievements and, the overall impression is that the ILO-GIP project is moving in the right direction.” The overall impression of the *present* final evaluation is that since 2018 the planned activities have mostly indeed taken place which is in itself a significant achievement.

The project has taken clear action on most of the 14 Recommendations of the MTE and a complete overview is included in Annex 5 where both the management response from the project is included as well as an update by the present evaluation. A few recommendations have *not* been followed-up as follows:

- ❖ Recommendations 8, 9 and 13 were delayed and were to become part and parcel of a possible follow-up project ('Phase II'); these concern possible coordination activities among projects in the garment sector as a whole in Myanmar including a mapping conference.
- ❖ Despite various efforts, the project did not succeed in enhancing the participation of nationally owned factories (Recommendation-7) due to various factors including the reluctance of the MGMA to join the project and jointly design and try to undertake such a task.
- ❖ The follow-up to Recommendation-12, i.e. to build on the results of ILO-GIP Phase I as preparation for a Phase II, is not yet completed, although draft concept notes for the future extension of the ILO-GIP have been produced by the project team and initial consultations with the ILO tripartite constituents concerning possible follow-up interventions were held jointly with ILO regional specialists in February 2020 (for details, see Section 3.6).

**b. How effectively has the project delivered core services to stakeholders including direct beneficiaries?**

The concrete progress made in the different types of training and capacity building of ILO-GIP is summarized in Table 2 and further details are provided in Annex 7.

**Table 2: Five types of training undertaken by ILO-GIP with the beneficiaries reached and the service providers involved.**

Type of training	Type of Training	Beneficiaries reached	% Women	National and International Service Providers (Trainers)	Immed. Object.
<b>1. Individual</b>	Workers trainings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2,189 garment workers (2 hours awareness raising session on labour law)</li> <li>903 garment workers (45 hours of training on industrial skills and labour law)</li> </ul>	67 %	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Fifth Pillar</li> <li>The Legal Clinic</li> </ul>	<b>5</b>
			83 %	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aung Myin Hmu</li> </ul>	
	Supervisors training	206 Supervisors	94	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aung Myin Hmu</li> <li>CBI Capacity Building Initiative</li> </ul>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.Factory level</b>	Social dialogue	WCC representatives of 19 factories (164 representatives)	68	Capacity Building Initiative - CBI	<b>1</b>
	OSH	28 OSH Safety officers (5-days tr.) 251 OSH Committee members (1-day training)	29	Converge Safety	<b>1</b>
	Sexual and reproductive health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>22 Clinic staff</li> <li>645 peers' workers</li> <li>17 trade union trainers</li> <li>Awareness raising (4,771 workers)</li> </ul>	n.a.	Marie Stopes International - MSI	<b>2</b>
	Productivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In 5 factories;</li> <li>Monthly seminars for WCC in 5 factories</li> </ul>	n.a.	Kaizen Institute	<b>1</b>
	Gender equality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>173 WCC members in 16 factories;</li> <li>Gender campaign and awareness in 16 factories; total 5,374 workers reached</li> </ul>	84	Care International/Myanmar	<b>2</b>
			82		
<b>3.Sector level</b>	MIR Lab	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10 sectoral trade union leaders</li> <li>7 sectoral employers' leaders</li> <li>10 government officials</li> </ul>	50	ILO International Training Centre (ITCILO) delivered in Yangon	<b>4</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 participants of MIR-Lab got a 5-days training on labour dispute prevention/resolution</li> <li>10-days training on Industrial relations for a tripartite delegation of sectoral leaders</li> </ul>	43		
			70		
			33	By and at ITCILO in Turin (Italy)	<b>4</b>
			n.a.		
<b>4.Trade union</b>	TU capacity building	20 Trade union trainers from IWFM and MICS	n.a.	International experts & MDF Training & Consultancy	<b>3</b>
<b>5.Employers</b>	Employers capacity building	<i>Did not materialize due to reluctance of MGMA to be involved; instead 4 products were developed (see below)</i>	--		<b>3</b>

*Source: Adjusted and updated from "Update for donors as of 1 October 2019" (ILO-GIP) and from written inputs from the project team.*

The delivery of the planned core services met with an unusual series of constraints (discussed below under Evaluation Question 12-c), and was also set back by the low basic level of knowledge and awareness on labour relations, social dialogue and gender equality among beneficiaries and social partners as well as among the local service (training) providers. In this respect, the training by the project CTA and the National Project Coordinator (NPC) of the trainers of many of the local services providers was crucial, whereby even the training package had to be developed for the OSH and social dialogue curriculum as well as the training package for AMH. In some cases, assistance was provided also by other ILO projects: Better Work Vietnam and Better Factories Cambodia. On the whole, some targeted partnering by the ILO-GIP project has facilitated these trainings, e.g. AMH already had vast training experience and had its own training centre that could be used.

The stakeholders interviewed generally considered these trainings to be very useful and effective. There were a few qualifying remarks by individual stakeholders such as: the MIR-Lab social dialogue curriculum was with five modules too large; and the training on productivity did not suggest any tangible changes for factories, but the large majority of stakeholders was very positive. The two trade unions would have preferred their own trainers to be involved instead of the local service providers, however, this was not acceptable for most of the employers and/or factory management.

There were also many practical problems with the training that need to be taken into account in future interventions. This includes, for example: changing of trainers halfway; changing of training participants; training participants do not always have the right background; factories do have difficulty in attending training because they are too busy running their production; frequent postponements by different sides; difficult to follow-up draft Action plans; the varying election processes of the management and workers' representatives in the WCC (democratic election, management's role in the process, involvement of trade unions or not, etc.); and some workers shift to another factory after getting the training. Such a list of practical problems enhances the appreciation for the actual achievement of the five training components.

**Several other important achievements**, apart from capacity building, were underscored by various stakeholders, such as:

- ❖ the extensive library of training tools created by the project, including the Step by Step guide to collective bargaining, and the two tools jointly developed with the MGMA, i.e. the 'All-Aboard' Training Package and the Voluntary Labour Compliance Assessment (VLCA) which were considered very useful for the factories, whereby the VLCA tool is already being implemented in two to three factories;
- ❖ the Gender Equality Assessment ('Weaving Gender') and the five Gender Profiles produced by ILO-GIP (see ILO-GIP website);
- ❖ the WCC-Toolkit which is actually being used by WCCs as a guideline;
- ❖ the formation of OSH committees in all 20 factories including support by Converge to draft Action Plans (although now coaching will be needed for the implementation); and
- ❖ The two research studies undertaken jointly with MGMA, i.e. Automation and Digitization, and Skilled Workers matter.

The production of informative and educative videos is another important achievement. In order to increase the sustainability of ILO-GIP's efforts, a series of educational videos was produced which trade union trainers can now use when they themselves deliver training. The first series (of nine videos) deals with various aspects of the Myanmar Labour Law, and the second series (of six videos) deals with such aspects as trade union governance, International labour standards (ILS), globalisation and role of the international trade union movement (including IndustriAll) and the Guideline of FoA (further discussed below), the role of multinationals in promoting decent work, collective bargaining and wages.

**c. What have been major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the project's objectives?**

According to the MTE (2018) there were a number of major factors constraining the achievement of the project's objectives often resulting in delays:

- i. Ambitious project design, and immediate objectives are in fact longer-term goals
- ii. Delays in the recruitment of project staff
- iii. Project Advisory Committee put on hold
- iv. Limited institutional capacities among workers and employers' organisations
- v. Engaging with the two trade unions was challenging at first
- vi. Engagement with the MGMA was challenging
- vii. Complications in establishing Workplace Coordinating Committees (WCCs)
- viii. Multiple international initiatives in the garment industry
- ix. Fragile enabling environment in the garment sector, especially due to a weak legal and regulatory framework, and limited governance of labour market systems.

Since the completion of the MTE in November 2018, the following updates on these constraints can be reported:

- The MGMA's limited engagement in the project continued overall, but in the end a quite successful MGMA-Event could be organized on 17 February 2020 launching four products brought about by the project in collaboration with the local ACTEMP project. MGMA, however, was not yet ready to organise the event as a tripartite dialogue, and as a result MOLIP and the two trade unions were not invited.
- The important Project Advisory Committee (PAC) never materialised, while the planned SWG-IRT, under the National Tripartite Dialogue forum (NTDF), could not be sustained in the absence of decision makers from the side of the government. The NTDF is a true tripartite body which was constituted in 2015 and is chaired by the Union Minister of MOLIP with 9 representatives each from MOLIP, trade unions and UMFCCI. Meetings have been held regularly, and for example the last two were held in October 2019 and in February 2020.
- While H&M's involvement in the project was a major driving force behind the progress and the achievements, the MTE (2018), as we have seen in the above, also established a potential conflict of interest, which could translate into a disinclination on the side of the employers' and national owned factories to join ILO-GIP.
- Increasingly, the direct engagement of the project team with the factories began taking its toll in that factories are busy and especially busy in certain (peak) periods.

- The role of MoLIP has been quite limited throughout, and it was involved in a few quite specific activities all funded by ILO-GIP: attend the MIR-Lab training activities (see Table 2), the participation of a Director of MoLIP to attend the 2 weeks Industrial relations academy in the ITC-ILO, and the participation of 1 staff from MoLIP to attend the 1-week ITC-ILO training on dispute settlement. MoLIP could possibly have played a mediating role between MGMA, the unions and the project.

Despite the above quite numerous constraints, the project made important achievements which can in particular be attributed to the following 'success factors':

- The importance of the garment sector for the economy and for (female) employment in Myanmar.
- The Labour Organisation Law (LOL) making the establishment of WCC's mandatory while no experience existed with that.
- The crucial role of H&M, and in a later stage of M&S, stimulating their suppliers (10 and 6 respectively) to participate actively in the ILO-GIP project.
- The hard work and the professional capacities of the project team as well as the staff continuity in this team since early 2017, and also the cordial relations of among others the National Project Coordinator (NPC) with the factories.
- Overall support from the ILO Liaison Office in Yangon.

**d. Examine the effectiveness of project institutional framework, its management arrangement and coordination mechanism with other relevant ILO projects, and with other implementing partners including the PPDP project-set-up.**

The project institutional framework and its management arrangements suffered from setbacks despite several attempts to revamp them. The originally foreseen Project Advisory Committee (PAC) never materialized due to the reluctance on the side of the employers' organisation (MGMA) to join the project. As an alternative the SWG-IRT was attempted, but, as mentioned above, this working group suffered from the absence of decision makers from the side of the government. The project therefore continued without formal guidance from the tripartite constituents. Whenever possible, the project consulted bilaterally with trade unions and with MGMA, which proved a time-consuming process. There was, of course, guidance from the ILO LO in Yangon and advice from ILO specialists in Bangkok and Geneva.

The MTE (2018) concluded on the effectiveness of management arrangements as follows:

“Considering the wide coverage of the project combined with the large quantity of the interventions, as well as the overall complexity of the project's context, the staffing for its implementation seems to be insufficient. Nevertheless, the project's management capacities and arrangements have so far been adequate and have facilitated quality results and good program delivery.”

The conclusion on the staffing is still as valid today as it was in 2018, but the second part of the conclusion should rather be that despite less than adequate management arrangements the project succeeded in producing good progress.

The PPDP project set-up was in the end crucial for the effectiveness of the ILO-GIP project because factories were often joining the project as advised and stimulated by their buyers.

In terms of coordination in the garment sector, no evidence was found of a kind of Local Consultative Group consisting of donors despite the sector's overwhelming importance for the Myanmar economy. ILO-GIP has undertaken several initiatives to work together with other major projects working on the garment industry, in particular:

- ❖ EU's SMART Myanmar: SMEs for 'Environmental Accountability, Responsibility and Transparency', which supports garment production 'Made in Myanmar' to increase international competitiveness of SMEs.
- ❖ Aung Myin Hmu (AMH), meaning 'success', is a CARE project dealing with Industry Solutions for Safe Employment, and focuses on skills development.
- ❖ German funded Tchibo project (GIZ), and
- ❖ The Danish funded MyPod project.

These initiatives have not resulted in a more regular type of cooperation (see for details Annex 5 under Recommendation 8).

In late October 2019 "Action, Collaboration, Transformation" (ACT) entered the scene, which is a collaboration of 21 international brands and IndustriALL, the global trade union federation of garment and textile workers. The coordination of all these actors and the development of the "Guideline on Freedom of Association", which was released in November 2019, was from then on taken up by ACT, with the support of the ILO-GIP which, when needed, also brought in the specialists from INWORK, Geneva.

In late October-November 2019 2018, the ILO-GIP received a request from IWFM to call the three main brands with similar industrial relations projects (H&M, Tchibo and bestsellers) into a coordinated meeting to discuss issues concerning freedom of association in their suppliers. The ILO-GIP complied and hosted the next few meetings designed to develop "Guideline on freedom of association". It however became quickly clear that inviting other brands equally committed to freedom of association would be sensible and allow an opportunity to have a broader impact in the Myanmar garment industry. Such coordination between a number of brands, their suppliers and IWFM did require a significant investment in time from the ILO-GIP. At this point, a request to bring in the support of ACT "Action, Collaboration, Transformation" (ACT) was made. ACT is entered the scene, which is a collaboration of 21 international brands and IndustriALL, the global trade union federation of garment and textile workers. The coordination of these numerous actors and the development of the "Guideline on Freedom of Association", which were released in November 2019, was from then on taken up by ACT, with the support of the ILO-GIP who, when needed, also brought in the expertise specialists in INWORK, based in Geneva. They are working on a "Myanmar Guideline on FoA" in which the CTA from GIP was also involved.

**e. To what extent did the project achieve the objectives related to gender equality?**

The project paid special attention to:

- i. Mainstreaming gender equality issues in the activities, and
- ii. Activities specially directed at (the empowerment of) women.

This could be called a *'twin-track strategy'*, a concept used in several other ILO projects in South-East Asia. It aptly describes the approach of ILO-GIP as can be clearly seen when one looks at Table 1 in which Track 2 is represented by Objective 2, while the mainstreaming of Track 1 is included in all other objectives. It is generally considered a good practice to undertake fact-finding in the early stages of project implementation and this was indeed done by ILO-GIP through the Gender Equality Assessment (GEA) or the 'Weaving Gender' report interviewing over 400 workers and human resource staff in 16 factories. Although it was labelled by most stakeholders as a comprehensive and useful report, it is not perfect; according to some it provided only few new insights, while the MTE (2018: 30) already underlined the issue of the representativity of the specific factories involved in this study by quoting the GEA report itself as follows:

"All the factories in the GEA are foreign-owned and are included in H&M's supply chain. This means the results and analysis do not reflect the gender situation of locally owned factories or of factories supplying to other foreign buyers. This GEA constitutes an assessment of the gender situation in 16 garment factories that supply to H&M, and not an assessment of the gender situation throughout the garment sector in Myanmar. H&M is a proactive brand. It has in its code of conduct elements that promote gender equality by which factories have to abide. This may have affected the results of the survey."

Nevertheless, the GEA provided a useful starting point and provided inputs into the design of the training and other activities.

The five *Gender Profiles* of women working and/or operating in the garment industry who followed a clear career path (one of which was about the Secretary-General of the MGMA who is also the Joint Secretary of the UMFCCI) were considered by many as very illustrative and could well have a demonstration effect vis-à-vis other women.

The activities specifically directed at women, the *'second track'*, include two different types of training (included also in Table 2): Firstly, the training on gender equality in 16 factories of in total 173 WCC members per factory, as well as through the gender campaign and awareness raising in 16 factories (5,374 workers reached) by Care International/Myanmar; in both cases a large majority of participants were women (over 80%). Secondly, it also includes the sexual and reproductive health training for 22 Clinic staff, for 645 peers' workers by Marie Stopes International (MSI), for 17 trade union trainers as well as an awareness raising campaign.

The *mainstreaming* of gender equality occurred broadly by including gender equality issues in the curriculum for the other types of training mentioned in Table 2.

The *percentages* of women among the beneficiaries of the five types of training were made available to the present evaluation only at the very last minute and not completely because of the absence of a project monitoring system (CRM or otherwise). The percentages we do have (cf. Table 2) indicate that in the majority of the types of training conducted women are clearly forming a majority, which is an important achievement in itself.

**13) To what extent do the measures adopted by the project management appropriately and timely address the problems or delays encountered and attribute to achieving the immediate objectives of the project? Examine the extent that the project has**



**adjusted/modified its strategy to respond to changing situation on the ground or challenges faced. To what extent were the mitigation strategies effective in addressing the risks during the implementation of the project?**

Generally, the project has undertaken many measures to timely address the problems or delays encountered as already discussed in the above; examples include adding basic training courses, adding productivity activities to engage MGMA, working through buyers to select/stimulate factories to participate in GIP, etc. These mitigation strategies were surely effective in addressing the risks during the implementation of the project but resulted in less time in later project stages for follow-up activities (especially more advanced training). Some mitigation strategies did not work, such as the design of an alternative for the non-existent PAC through the SWG-IRT which itself never materialized. However, the project team has shown clear alertness for such issues as well as the necessary flexibility to revise strategies.

**14) To what extent have stakeholders, particularly workers' and employers' organizations been involved in project implementation, and how can stakeholder commitment be described?**

Stakeholder participation of the social partners in ILO-GIP can at best be described as partial: while the commitment of the two trade unions has clearly increased since the start of the project, the reluctance of the MGMA to squarely join project activities has remained until today. Since this has had such a great impact on the running of the ILO-GIP project, some more analysis is required into the context of employers' organisations (EO) in Myanmar.

On the employers' side, the UMFCCI is the official tripartite partner or the 'recognized employer representative' of the ILO in the country, and therefore it is important to note that they hesitated to deal with labour issues even until July 2019 when they changed their Charter to include these issues. Under the UMFCCI are a series of affiliated associations, in particular the well-established MGMA for garments and the relatively new Myanmar Industry Association (MIA) for example for handbags. The MGMA considers itself as a private organisation and not as an employers' organisation, although it is an organisation catering for employers. Since the MGMA provides the certificates required for import of raw materials internationally owned factories are registered as members in the MGMA, although the members of the Board can, by its own regulation, only be Myanmar nationals. An important development is that the MGMA has employed its own Labour Officer since 2019. In part due to the vast claims laid on the time of the MGMA officials by many projects and international organisations operating in Myanmar, there is a broader challenge to cooperate with them (e.g. no meeting could yet be scheduled with ACT; the competency standards for the garment industry were not yet approved; and MGMA does not always have unitary views). The event in February 2020 organised by MGMA and ILO-GIP launching four products was therefore in many respects a genuine *landmark achievement* in itself. The downside was that, at the demand of MGMA, neither the government nor the trade unions were invited for the event. This contrasts for example with the Chinese textile and garment association, a chamber of commerce, which does engage directly with trade unions and has been keen to work toward improving industrial relations in the sector.

The planned capacity building programmes for workers' and employers' organisations in Table 2 (no's 4 and 5) foresaw in the PRODOC the funding of the employment of two staff members for

each. Since an MoU with the MGMA was not concluded, this funding was transferred to the production of the four products mentioned in the above. For the trade unions, however, MoU's were signed in August 2018 one each for MICS and IWFM whereby the ultimate goal was specified as: "...to contribute to the development of a strong and professional trade union movement in Myanmar by building a group of capable and performing trade union field trainers." For the coordination and implementation of the Trade Union Capacity Building component a staff member was funded from the project, one in IWFM and one in MICS each for about 15 months. It is important to highlight the fact that the MoU's which the ILO-GIP was able to develop with IWFM and MICS was the first visible example of collaboration between the two organizations which had, until then, been very hesitant to collaborate.

Lastly, stakeholder commitment has clearly increased in the course of the project among the two trade unions, while it has remained at a low level among employers' organisations.

**15) To what extent the project has managed the practice of knowledge management and lessons dissemination and visibility effort on project branding?**

Knowledge management, lessons dissemination and the visibility effort on project branding, were additional tasks of the project team. The distribution of some of the major products has been ongoing and includes the 'Weaving Gender' publication (GEA), the training modules, the (training) videos, the women's profiles, and the four products produced for MGMA. An important role hereby is played by the ILO-GIP Website.

Progress reporting was in principle by year with the first report covering the first project period (2017 including some activities in 2016) and the second report covering 2018. The one dealing with 2019 has been postponed to June 2020 due to the no-cost extension. For the evaluation it was important that a separate comprehensive note had been written entitled "Update for Donors as of 1 October 2019" which provides details on the activities during most of 2019, otherwise there would have been a large gap in data availability especially since the M&E plan and the CRM did not materialize. Project reporting has been appreciated by H&M and M&S, and Sida indicated that the reporting on activities has always been impressive but would prefer to have more in-depth analysis as well.

Regarding ILO's International Labour Conventions Myanmar has on the whole ratified 24 out of the total of 190 Conventions including (only) three of the eight Fundamental and none of the four Governance Conventions. The latest ratification dates from 2018 (i.e. Convention 185 on Seafarers' Identity Documents).

### 3.4 Efficiency

**16) How efficiently have resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) been allocated and used to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader project objectives and results? And have they been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the factors that have hindered timely delivery of outputs? Have any measures to mitigate the delays been put in place?**

The MTE (2018) concluded on efficiency of resource use:

“The project is considered as having made a cost-effective use of its financial and human resources. Activities implemented so far were efficiently managed...”

Overall, the present final evaluation found that the different project resources have been *allocated* strategically in the budget to achieve expected results, and the expenditures indicate quite a balanced spending pattern (see Table 3):

- 40% of the expenditures was for the project team (staff).
- Almost one-third of the expenditures was for activities, i.e. workshops, subcontracts and trainings.
- Just over 10% was for the services of national and international consultants working on specific activities.

In sum, 40% for staff and 43% for activities demonstrate a balanced spending pattern which is quite usual for projects this size implemented by ILO.

Programme Support Costs are indirect costs included in each project budget. ILO policy normally fixes support costs at a rate of 13 per cent over all *other* expenditures. These costs are expressed as a percentage of project expenditure, are centrally managed, and contribute to the cost of supporting the implementation of extra-budgetary projects. It includes the support from ILO units and branches involved, such as the support from the ILO LO office in Yangon, from the DWT specialists in Bangkok and from the experts in the HQ in Geneva.

**Table 3: Budget and Expenditures/Commitments until 9 March 2020 by Budget categories.**

Budget Categories	Expenditures & Commitments (as per 9 March 2020)
Staff	40,0%
National/International Consultants	10,2%
Activities	32,5%
Office costs	4,2%
Evaluation costs	1,5%
Program Support Costs (13% over all <i>other</i> expenditures)	11,5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100,0%</b>
<b>TOTAL Absolute in US\$</b>	<b>2.463.658</b>

*Source: Re-calculations by author based on data received from Project team on 9 March 2020.*

The spending by year provides a logical pattern considering that the project started slowly in 2016 and 2017 with just 20% of spending but it picked up pace rapidly in 2018 and especially in 2019 (see Table 4).

**Table 4: Expenditures until 9 March 2020 by year (2016-2020).**

Expenditures in %	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
<b>% per Year</b>	1,2%	19,1%	30,2%	37,2%	12,3%	<b>100,0%</b>

The spending of the budget has been almost completed by now and in mid-March just about US\$ 92,000, or only 3.7% of the total project funding remained unspent or uncommitted. In addition, there were some commitments regarding training programmes to be held in the second part of

March that were postponed at the last moment due to the COVID-19 crisis, and it was not clear if and when these activities could be re-scheduled.

Several stakeholders expressed concern with the fact that many types of training in factories were conducted during the final six months of the project (in particular the period from October 2019 to March 2020). This concentration of training in a relatively short period resulted in difficulties in finding the appropriate time to conduct the training and, on various occasions, H&M and M&S were called upon to explain the importance and urgency of the trainings to the management of the factories involved. This is not an ideal situation and could perhaps have been better planned and managed, although at the same time it should be indicated that, even apart from the series of constraints discussed in the above in Section 3.3 (under Evaluation Question 12-c), these types of trainings take a lot of preparations (develop training material, instruct the trainers, etc.) as well as the bringing together of various stakeholders (factories, local service providers, project team).

To which extent the resources have been delivered in a timely manner refers to the comparison between expenditures and the activities planned in the Log Frame/PRODOC. Firstly, these planned activities (see Table 1) have been in majority completed, and, in fact, additional activities have been undertaken (in particular the basic trainings and the work on productivity). Secondly, the financial resources will almost all be spent in 2020 although a no-cost extension was required for that which was quite logical considering the relatively large number of constraints that affected the project. In addition, the expenditures pattern over the years given in Table 4 indicates a slow start but after that quite a balanced spending, with 50% of the project budget spent in the period 2016-2018 and another 37% in 2019. If specific outputs were delayed, that seems to be relatively more often due to reasons related to effectiveness (Section 3.3) than to efficiency. The factors that have hindered timely delivery of outputs have been discussed in Section 3.3 above, as well as the various corresponding measures designed and implemented in a flexible way by the project team to mitigate the delays.

**17) Has the project been implemented in the most efficient way vis-à-vis its financial and human resources? What aspects of the project could be done differently to cut costs while still delivering achievements and achieve outcomes? Has the project been able to arrive at cost-sharing or in-kind contributions to complement its resources? (e.g. from other ILO projects, inter-agency collaborations and private sector contributions).**

As indicated in the above, considering the wide coverage of the project combined with the large quantity of the interventions, as well as the overall complexity of the project's context the staffing for the project's implementation seems to be less than sufficient in the technical areas with 1 international and 1 national technical staff, and 1 finance/admin staff. The need for a separate translator and driver is debatable and would also depend on the level of support which the ILO LO in Yangon is able to provide.

Some stakeholders expressed concern over a perceived lack of proactive planning in consulting with the factories about the scheduling of the training activities (as discussed under the previous evaluation question), and also that the project management was not able to convince the MGMA to join the project fully and set aside their reluctance surrounding in particular the involvement of

trade unions in the project (see for further details Section 3.2 under Evaluation Question 6, and Section 3.3 under Evaluation Question 14).

In view of the above considerations under Evaluation Questions 16 and 17, it can be concluded that the resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) were mostly used in an efficient manner but that on some occasions it could have been better managed (e.g. the training scheduling and the engagement with the MGMA). At the same time, there do not seem to have been many clear-cut options at hand to cut costs while still delivering the same level of achievements and outcomes.

The project has furthermore been able to arrive at quite substantial cost-sharing or in-kind contributions to complement its resources from private sector contributions (H&M and M&S), through inter-agency collaborations (CARE), and from other ILO projects (Better Work Vietnam and Better Factories Cambodia).

The project has received adequate support from the different branches and offices within the ILO that were involved in ILO-GIP, such as the ILO LO office in Yangon, INWORK both in Bangkok and Geneva, ACTEMP in Myanmar, Bangkok and Geneva, ACTRAV in Bangkok, GENDER in Bangkok, and Better Work in Vietnam and Better Factories Cambodia.

### 3.5 Impact

#### **18) What has happened as a result of the project? To what extent did the project make contribution to broader and longer-term impact and decent work goal in Myanmar? In how far the activity contributed to improved labour relations?**

The project has mainly worked with beneficiaries in 20 garment factories and with workers' and employers' organisations and local service providers. As a result of the project many of these beneficiaries and stakeholders have learned for the first time about labour relations, social dialogue, gender equality, sexual and reproductive health and productivity. The project has gone beyond that and implemented training courses and capacity building programmes for specific target groups, in particular through the twin-track gender approach and through the tripartite dialogue training by the ITC. As a result, the project has laid the basis for improving labour relations in the future which is a first necessary step towards a contribution to broader and longer-term impact and decent work goal in Myanmar.

The impact achieved vis-à-vis the defined project objectives and outputs can be considered at three levels following the LogFrame and these are analysed in Table 5.

**Table 5: Assessment of the impact of the objectives and outputs.**

LogFrame (update of December 2017)	Assessment of Impact
<p><b>One Development objective/expected impact was formulated as:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "The reduction of poverty and the empowerment of women in Myanmar via</li> </ul>	<p>The reduction of poverty will require a much broader and sustained type of intervention than ILO-GIP has done with 20 factories in the formal sector. As indicated in the above, the project has laid the basis for improving labour relations in the future as a first necessary step.</p>

the improvement of labour relations and social dialogue in the garment sector.”	
<b>Five Immediate Objectives:</b>	
a. Increased capacity for sound industrial relations in participating enterprises leading to increased incidence of social dialogue, including collective bargaining, and, as a result, increased wages, improved working conditions and improved gender equality.	The capacity for sound industrial relations in the 20 factories has indeed increased which has also led to more social dialogue and is expected to gradually result in improved working conditions. Wages are the subject of structured tripartite negotiations and any increase could only be indirectly attributed to the project as the trade unions have received capacity building in this area from ILO-GIP.
b. Empowerment of women workers via the removal of the most serious obstacles to women’s participation in social dialogue, including in particular low levels of health knowledge, and to the extension of opportunities to all workers regardless of sex.	This is quite a long-term goal, and the project addressed in particular the training on health for women, and it was observed that women do indeed participate actively in the WCCs interviewed and in the different types of training (cf. Table 2). The empowerment of those women working in these 20 factories has thus increased. In combination, this is a first step towards enhancing gender equality.
c. Increased capacity of social partners to deliver services to members and to participate in bipartite social dialogue.	The capacities of the two trade unions and MGMA to deliver services and to participate in bipartite social dialogue has increased to a certain extent in particular through respectively the capacity building components and the four products produced for MGMA, as well as through the tripartite training. Bipartite social dialogue itself related to ILO-GIP has in contrast not taken place.
d. Regular bipartite social dialogue training takes place at the sectoral level in the garment sector, addressing concrete issues of common concern to workers and employers.	Training on social dialogue has indeed taken place (see Table 2).
e. Increased knowledge of the labour law and rights and responsibilities at work for garment worker.	This task has been completed for the workers in the 20 factories.
<b>17 Outputs (for details see Table 1)</b>	
• Achieved (7)	Of the 17 outputs 6 have been achieved fully as planned (1.1, 1.6, 1.7, 2.3, 5.1 and 5.2), while a <i>seventh</i> had been adjusted: financial staff support to MGMA was converted into the production of four products (3.1).
• Partly achieved (6)	Another 6 outputs were partly achieved, e.g. improvement plans, OSH and gender equality action plans were only actually drafted in a minority of factories (1.2, 1.4 and 2.2); the programme of <i>bilateral</i> workshops (3.2) was at best partly realized; with respect to Output 4.1 the tripartite training was important for the participants but did not lead to an enhanced willingness to participate in sector social dialogue; although an overall project gender strategy seems to have been followed an actual document was not developed (2.1).
• Not achieved (4)	Four outputs were not achieved, e.g. the <i>implementation</i> of improvement plans, OSH action plans and productivity improvement plans (1.3, 1.5 and 1.8) did not yet take place; the bipartite training programme was not implemented (4.2).

On the whole therefore it can be concluded that the majority of outputs (75%) were at least partly achieved (13 out of 17), while this is more difficult to conclude for the immediate objectives; as

the MTE already concluded these objectives are often quite long-term development goals not achievable in three years' time. The addition of the fifth Immediate Objective and its two outputs, which have been achieved completely, also meant that there was less time and resources to devote to the originally planned four immediate objectives and their outputs.

The ILO-GIP project contributed to a certain degree to improved industrial relations especially in the 20 factories involved in the project and among the two trade unions. This is also based on the interviews with ten (50% women) workers' and employers' representatives (from 3 different factories). The FGD with Local Service Providers and the interviews with the trade unions also pointed in that direction. This will be further illustrated with the following *quotes and paraphrases* from the interviews that commented on impact:

❖ Factory level (WCC):

- Management representatives in a WCC: "The training in factories reduced disputes at the workplace through the WCC." "After training we can see improvements: Workers now believe in the WCC, and all know how to negotiate. We also got new knowledge on OSH, social dialogue, etc." Some even talked about a "Culture of Dialogue within the WCC" as a result of the training.
- Workers' representatives of a WCC: "We learned how to deal with employers and acquired more knowledge on the different roles of the WCC and the Trade Unions. Before the training we had lots of problems with employers, but now we know each other's concerns and understand each other. Now it is peaceful."
- Local service provider: "There is an increased awareness on sexual harassment in the factories; previously they were quite sensitive on this issue. Now seven factories have a sexual harassment policy in place."

❖ Trade Unions:

- The capacities of the trade unions have improved during the project period, and some ILO experts were impressed by how astute they are in their advocacy, stronger, in fact, than employers' organisations.
- Cooperation among trade unions has clearly improved directly as a result of ILO-GIP, and it was learned from several sources that the joint participation of MICS and IWFM in the fourth type of training (cf. Table 2) was unique; prior to this effort, these two organizations avoided collaboration.

❖ Tri- and Bipartite relations:

- According to one trade union the "Bipartite relations are smoother through the ILO mediation."
- According to the training participants and the MGMA the Tripartite training of the MIR Lab was very useful for the knowledge gained as well as for enhanced understanding of each other's concerns.

❖ Local Service Providers:

- The ILO-GIP training by the Local Service Providers (LSP) and the experience these providers gained during the project implementation are according to some stakeholders an important result that could well have a very useful impact if these providers are further involved in future interventions.

**19) What real difference has the project made to the ultimate beneficiaries, capacity of local authorities, and to gender equality?**

The 'real' difference the project made to the ultimate beneficiaries can be found in enhanced knowledge and awareness of industrial relations and collective bargaining in the 20 factories, in the trade unions and to a lesser extent also in the employers' organisations. The project objectives are not something that can be achieved in just three years; a more sustained effort is required.

Since local authorities were not directly involved in the project there was no impact on their capacities.

The impact on gender equality has already been discussed in the above under Evaluation Question 18.

**20) To what extent can observed changes be attributed to the intervention?**

The observed changes as especially discussed in the above under Evaluation Question 18 can be attributed to the intervention's training activities and capacity building programmes with workers' and employers' organisations.

**21) Are there unintended impacts (including consideration of different segments of society)?**

The evaluation has not come across any unintended impacts of the project on the beneficiaries or stakeholders, nor on other segments in society. A partly unintended side-effect of the project approach and set-up was that not much progress has been made with respect to the capacities of government institutions and structures, nor with the legal framework, while both have been recognized to be in need of substantial support; since the project as it was designed was already overambitious, this has justly been left out, but it should be included in any future intervention.

**22) What interventions and approaches delivered the impact? Which are key contextual features for these interventions (e.g. gender, poverty, ethnicity etc.) so we can get deeper understanding on the factors that drive the immediate changes/impact?**

The main elements of impact were delivered by training and capacity building interventions and approaches. Key contextual features include: the low initial level of knowledge on labour rights and responsibilities among beneficiaries or stakeholders; the fact that over 90% of the garment workers are female; and the fact that the garment sector is largely part of the formal sector with stable jobs and a decent income, although the latter might well be undermined by the current COVID-19 crisis.

## 3.6 Sustainability

**23) To what extent the project's outcomes are likely to be durable and can be maintained or even scaled up and replicated by intervention partners after major assistance has been completed?**

The sustainability envisaged by the PRODOC (2016: 32-33) was very much hinged on the full participation in the project of the workers' and employers' organizations, and as we have seen in



the above this has been achieved only partially whereby the complete absence of the usually influential and steering PAC is exemplary.

The MTE concluded as follows on sustainability:

The project's sustainability strategies must be considered in terms of processes, related to increased national capacities, (both for continuity and for change), as well as in terms of institutional sustainability. This requires long-term processes that are integrated in a realistic, long-term strategy and time frame is essential. For this, additional technical and financial support is needed for the further development of a strengthened sectoral industrial relations system.

The present final evaluation agrees generally with this conclusion, and as some experts also underscored during the interviews it would be very unfortunate if the efforts would stop here. A lot of essential groundwork has been done in terms of demonstration effects through the training in 20 factories, the development of training programmes and tools and the capacity building programmes with the social partners, but now it has to be scaled up and broadened: scaled up to start engaging all 500 garment factories and another 200 or so handbag and leather factories, and broadened to move towards the enhancement of genuine sectoral bipartite dialogue and national tripartite dialogue.

**24) What are the major factors which will have or will influence the continuity of the project's benefit?**

The major factors which will influence the continuity of the project's benefits would be the crucial engagement of the tripartite constituents as well as the willingness of donors to invest in a follow-up phase. After the intervention has been completed, the project's outcomes are only going to be durable if another intervention will follow soon after the end of the present phase. A second phase of sorts should include not only a substantial scaling up and replication of activities undertaken in ILO-GIP-I for the 20 factories but should also move into a next step of enhanced capacity building of all three tripartite constituents, and a possible continued involvement of the local service providers.

The project does not have an explicit exit strategy apart from the preparations for a possible Phase II. To that effect several activities and documents were developed by the project CTA under the ILO-GIP project:

- 1) In February 2020, the ILO-GIP has organised the mission of ACTRAV, ACTEMP and INWORK specialists from DWT-Bangkok to Yangon, so that they could meet with the tripartite constituents in view of developing a new project on Industrial Relations.
- 2) A short-term Concept Note (February 2020) for GIZ to implement a Myanmar Garment Workers "Open University", currently being revised as a result of the impact of COVID-19. The ILO and the trade unions proposed to have instead an information and prevention campaign on COVID-19 as garment factories are currently feeling more and more the burden of the crisis with the laying off of workers and even the closing of factories, and from a more general viewpoint, declining levels of exports and FDI. Employers' organisations also indicated their intention to work with the trade unions and the government to arrive at a tripartite recommendation on the effects of the COVID-19 crisis.

- 3) A medium-term draft Concept Note (January 2020) on Collaboration between ILO and a number of brands, focusing on social dialogue, OSH and prevention of sexual harassment. This note was shared with 9 brands (e.g. H&M, C&A, M&S and Primark). Each Brand would have to fund US\$ 60,000 and appoint 5-6 of their suppliers (not only garments, but also footwear and handbags). It may be hard for brands to join the ILO in this effort at this time of crisis. It was intended, before the crisis started, as a bridge between the ILO-GIP and a possible broader Phase II.
- 4) A longer-term note on Ideas for consultation (January 2020) concerning a One-ILO coordinated approach in support of the Myanmar tripartite constituents dealing with improved industrial relations (this follows the example of ILO Ethiopia where it was received with a lot of enthusiasm). This One-ILO Approach would cover the following seven areas:
  - i. Continued support to the labour law reform,
  - ii. Increased capacity of Myanmar academic community to answer industrial needs of the country,
  - iii. Improved accountability and consistency of the Myanmar dispute settlement system through increased knowledge and transparency in the system,
  - iv. Enhanced ability of the general labour inspectorate to enforce the Myanmar labour law,
  - v. Increased knowledge and capacity for sound industrial relations in selected garment and shoe factories,
  - vi. Increased knowledge and capacity for sound industrial relations of sectoral level employers and workers representatives in the garment and shoe industry, and
  - vii. Increased support to workers and employers' organizations.

The Project Team, in particular the CTA, will provide follow-up until the end of May 2020 thanks to the no-cost extension of the ILO-GIP project which was approved by the donors. However, now is the time to decide which unit within ILO will take the lead after that.

A possible follow-up intervention could be done either through a GIP Phase II, or through the starting of the consultation process with the Myanmar Tripartite Constituents about a possible introduction in Myanmar of the Better Work (BW) programme which has been discussed off and on since 2015. However, in the past there was confusion over the difference between the Decent Work Country Programme, which is designed and approved every five years by the national tripartite constituents, and the Better Work (BW) programme which is a joint initiative of ILO and IFC, and is one of the five current Flagship Programmes of the ILO (see Box 2).

As we have seen, next to ILO-GIP there are two other important interventions in the garment sector in Myanmar, and it would be only logical if such a future intervention would partner with them, i.e. EU SMART and CARE/AMH. EU SMART has for

**Box 2: Better Work (BW):**

As a partnership between the ILO and IFC, Better Work (BW) brings diverse groups together – governments, global brands, factory owners, and unions and workers – to improve working conditions in the garment industry and make the sector more competitive. The BW approach creates lasting, positive change through assessments, training, advocacy and research that changes policies, attitudes, as well as behaviour. By sharing this approach and the results of the on-the-groundwork, BW seeks to influence policy makers and decision makers to promote decent work and better business.

Source: <https://betterwork.org/>

example operated in Myanmar since 2015 and has developed various training packages custom-made for Myanmar.

As already underlined in the above, the first crucial step is to build trust with and among the tripartite constituents by having individual and plenary consultations (whereby the NTDF could play a catalysing role). Based on the interviews with stakeholders the present evaluation has compiled Table 6 below which provides an overview of the main stakeholders and their potential interest in and/or reservation towards a possible new intervention.

In sum, most stakeholders would welcome BW to Myanmar *provided* sufficient consultations take place in particular with the tripartite constituents and *provided* there are special components on capacity building for all three tripartite constituents as well as for the nationally owned factories.

The stakeholders interviewed during this evaluation provided also several important suggestions for a future intervention regarding the methods used and specific components to be included. Recommended *methods* include:

- Capacity Building components should be included for each of the tripartite constituents;
- Cooperation should not be free for companies, but co-funding models (cf. the ones in BW) should be included, and it should be explored for which type of factories this co-funding should apply;
- Adapt BW packages to Myanmar through cooperation with of EU SMART, ILO-GIP and CARE/AMH;
- Continue to work with Service Providers (e.g. H&M plans to work with CARE, and GIZ with AMH Training Centre); and
- Include footwear and handbags factories which are growing relatively rapidly.

**Table 6: Major Stakeholders in the Garment Sector in Myanmar and their interest in a possible new intervention.**

Stakeholders	Interest in a possible new intervention
<b>Government</b>	Is ready to start consultations on a follow-up intervention.
<b>Trade unions</b>	Welcome BW if a specific capacity building component is included for the trade unions including a provision to have an ACTRAV specialist in Yangon.
<b>Employers' Organisation</b>	Welcomes BW under certain conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Solid consultations will be undertaken;</li> <li>○ Special provisions are made for nationally owned factories (see next line).</li> </ul>
<b>Nationally owned factories</b>	The nationally owned factories have special characteristics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Relatively small in size,</li> <li>○ Supply to Chinese and local brands (not European or US), and</li> <li>○ They have only very limited access to finance, so it is more difficult to modernize the factories and thus to comply to labour standards (than it is for internationally owned factories).</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, it is important to have a substantial special component to work only with these nationally owned factories (and possibly MSEs)</p>
<b>Internationally owned Factories</b>	Welcome BW because the number of audits that they have to undertake is greatly reduced to just the one audit for Better Work which will be recognized by all international buyers.

<b>Brands/Buyers</b>	Welcome BW particularly since buyers are currently quite cautious about placing orders in Myanmar because of several factors: labour issues (including wild-cat strikes), a lack of Freedom of association, and the issues related to Rakhine state (and not to mention the COVID-19 crisis). Having BW present in Myanmar makes a difference for the calculations done by buyers to place orders in this country. Some stakeholders underlined that there are clear signs that if BW is introduced, other buyers will be inclined to invest in Myanmar or enhance their business (including US buyers who are now relatively underrepresented).
<b>Donors</b>	According to some of the interviewed stakeholders several donors have already indicated their explicit interest to be involved in BW (e.g. SECO, EU, DFAT, US, and others).
<b>ILO</b>	Will initiate and facilitate the consultations with the Myanmar Tripartite Constituents on a possible follow-up intervention.

Recommended *components* to include in a follow-up intervention include:

- Build capacities of factories, especially of the WCC.
- Continue the different types of training initiated by ILO-GIP such as on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, on the Labour Law, on productivity, on gender equality and on social dialogue, while OSH could be undertaken in cooperation with ILO's VZF-OSH project.
- Training is also recommended for factories to actually implement and apply the tools produced in ILO-GIP.
- 'Violence and Harassment in the World of Work' (cf. the new Convention 190) and 'Women's Voice' (representation and leadership).
- Improving the legal framework for social dialogue, such as a draft law on collective bargaining and improved legislation on the registration of EO, WO and WCC.
- Dispute resolution mechanism needs improvement.

### 3.7 Other priority aspects: Cross-Cutting Issues

#### 25) To what extent the work has contributed toward promoting ILO's mandate on social dialogue, international labour standard, as well as the ILO's goal of gender equality, disability inclusion, non-discrimination? What were the facilitating and limiting factors in project's contribution to these cross-cutting issues?

The ILO-GIP project has contributed toward promoting ILO's mandate on several of the above-mentioned cross-cutting issues, but less so on others, as follows:

- ❖ Gender equality was specifically targeted through what can be called a twin-track strategy whereby gender equality issues were mainstreamed in almost all of the activities, while one out of five Immediate Objectives was specially directed at the empowerment of women. The basis for this strategy was laid through the comprehensive Gender Equality Assessment (GEA, entitled 'Weaving Gender') undertaken in 2017-18.
- ❖ Social dialogue and tripartite processes: The project organized training courses specifically targeted at these topics.
- ❖ Promotion of international labour standards: This was not directly addressed in the ILO-GIP project.

- ❖ Disability inclusion: This was not directly addressed in the ILO-GIP project.
- ❖ Non-discrimination: This was in part indirectly addressed through the training courses and capacity building programmes of the project.
- ❖ Constituent capacity development: There were targeted capacity building programmes for workers' and employers' organisations.

The facilitating and the limiting factors in the project's contribution to these cross-cutting issues have been extensively discussed in Section 3.3, and some of the important limiting factors were the almost complete absence of the government (i.e. MoLIP) in the project, the reluctance on the side of the MGMA to participate in the ILO-GIP project, and, at first, the lack of cooperation among trade unions, and as a result the difficulty in organizing tripartite consultations (e.g. there was no PAC).

## 4 Conclusions and Recommendations

In this chapter, Section 4.1 summarizes the conclusions for each of the six Evaluation Criteria used throughout this report. Section 4.2 introduces and explains the Recommendations made by the present Independent Final Evaluation.

### 4.1 Conclusions

The overall **Relevance** of the ILO-GIP project has been *very high* from the beginning in 2016 especially in light of the then feeble institutional capacities of both workers and employers' organizations; the scarce recognition of labour rights; poor working conditions; and gender inequities that exist in the Myanmar garment sector. The Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE; 2018) also concluded that the overall ILO-GIP goal of improving labour relations, social dialogue and gender equality in the garment industry is highly relevant, and the stakeholders interviewed have generally underscored the continuing relevance of the project even today. The project strategy and approach levels are consistent with the current and long-term development needs of Myanmar and is aligned with broader national policies and programmes of the Government of Myanmar (GoM). It was also concluded that this strategy was consistent with the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries and the tripartite constituents, while the project donors (Sida, H&M and M&S) all indicated the particularly high relevance of the approach taken by the project.

Furthermore, ILO-GIP is clearly aligned to the Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) for Myanmar and other ILO outcomes, to three Sustainable Development Goals (1, 5 and 8), as well as to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in Myanmar (2018-2022). Lastly, the ILO-GIP project has a clear focus on issues that are part of the requirements for the EU-EBA trade preferences, including the fundamental principles and rights at work.

The **Validity of Design** is overall not fully satisfactory. While the project design is in itself mostly logical and coherent, there are some substantial flaws with an (over-)ambitious design, the neglect of the very basic training needs of the main stakeholders, the lack of a theory of change and the almost complete absence of the Government (MoLIP). This was partly due to the fact that the design was not an easy process, taking a relatively long time with the involvement of various ILO units and (changing) experts, and the consultations between ILO, Sida and H&M. The project design was also not very realistic in the sense that three years would not be sufficient for the longer-term goals embedded in the five Immediate Objectives. The project set up as a Public Private Development Partnership (PPDP) was an interesting one, and worked out well in most respects; in fact, the intervention of H&M and M&S to convince their suppliers to join ILO-GIP's training programmes turned out to be a necessary condition for the project's progress and achievements. At the same time, the MTE (2018) identified a potential conflict of interest that might negatively influence the employers' and national owned factories' willingness to join in ILO-GIP. Ownership was quite low among MGMA and MoLIP, while it has been gradually increasing for the trade unions. The design was also not too realistic to the situation on the ground as the level of knowledge on labour laws and rights and responsibilities at work among stakeholders and beneficiaries was over-estimated and an additional immediate objective had to be added at

inception (the 5th one). The gender needs and interests were clearly addressed in all five immediate objectives, while the second one is even exclusively directed at the empowerment of women workers, resulting thus in a twin-track approach.

The monitoring and evaluation arrangements planned in the PRODOC were implemented only partially, especially because the project took long to actually start up with the CTA in place only in February 2017 then priority was given to move forward as quickly as possible with the activities themselves. The LogFrame was updated once in December 2017 and the risk matrix, mainly a series of assumptions, was updated also only once in July 2018. Neither the Implementation and the M&E plan, nor the Client Relationship Management (CRM) structure (created in June 2018 as an alternative) materialized. The indicators in the LogFrame were useful and realistic but the sheer number of indicators and its values were overambitious.

In terms of *Effectiveness*, it was concluded that the planned activities have in large majority taken place which is in itself a significant achievement. The MTE came to a similar conclusion in 2018, and the project has taken clear action on most of its 14 Recommendations (see Annex 5). A few recommendations have *not* been followed-up as some were delayed and were expected to be included in a follow-up project, while the inclusion in the project of nationally owned factories did not materialize especially because of the reluctance of the MGMA to jointly undertake this task. The substantial achievements in the area of training are summarized through the five types of training delivered (see Table 2) which were generally very much appreciated by beneficiaries and stakeholders. In addition, some very useful partnering by the ILO-GIP project has facilitated these trainings, in particular through the delivery of training by local service providers and through the support by other ILO projects. Several other important achievements are the extensive library of training tools, the Gender Equality Assessment ('Weaving Gender') and the Gender Profiles, the WCC-Toolkit, the formation of OSH committees in all 20 factories, the two research studies undertaken jointly with MGMA, and the production of informative and educational videos.

The ILO-GIP project suffered from a relatively large number of constraining factors often resulting in delays. This includes the ambitious project design, delays in the recruitment of project staff, the lack of a steering committee, limited institutional capacities among workers and employers' organisations, the challenge to engage with the two trade unions as well as with the MGMA which is still reluctant to participate in bipartite and tripartite dialogue, and the limited role of the government (which could have played a mediating role). Other, broader constraints related to the different international initiatives in the garment industry and a fragile enabling environment.

The important achievements described above were in particular made possible by several success factors, such as the importance of the garment sector for the economy; the Labour Organisation Law (LOL) making the establishment of WCC's mandatory; the crucial role of H&M and M&S stimulating their suppliers to participate; the hard work and professional capacities of the project team as well as the staff continuity; and the support from the ILO Liaison Office in Yangon. In addition, the PPDP project set-up was in the end crucial for the effectiveness of the ILO-GIP project because factories were often joining the project as advised and stimulated by their buyers. There was cooperation with some other projects in the garment sector, especially

EU Smart Myanmar and Aung Myin Hmu (AMH/CARE), but no clear coordination mechanism had been established. The project paid attention to gender equality through the twin-track approach.

Flexibility and creativity were shown by the project team to design various measures to timely address the problems or delays encountered; examples include adding basic training courses, adding productivity activities to engage MGMA, working through buyers to select/stimulate factories to participate in ILO-GIP; etc. Stakeholder participation of the social partners can at best be described as partial: while the commitment of the two trade unions has clearly increased since the start of the project, the reluctance of the MGMA to squarely join project activities continued until today, partly as a result of the very recent acceptance by them and by the UMFCCI of the importance to deal with labour issues. Knowledge management, lessons dissemination and the visibility effort on project branding, were additional tasks of the project team, and include among other things the distribution of publications, the website and the educational videos.

With respect to *Efficiency*, it was found that the resources were mostly used in an efficient manner but that on some occasions it could have been better managed (e.g. the training scheduling and the engagement with the MGMA). At the same time, there do not seem to have been many clear-cut options at hand to cut costs while still delivering the same level of achievements and outcomes. The expenditures indicated quite a balanced spending pattern with 40% for staff and 43% for activities (cf. Table 3). The yearly expenditures provide a logical pattern with the majority (68%) spent in 2018 and 2019 and having about 12% left for 2020 most of which has been spent by now. Considering the wide coverage of the project combined with the large quantity of the interventions, as well as the overall complexity of the project's context, the staffing for its implementation seems to be less than sufficient in the technical areas.

Since the planned activities were in majority completed and additional activities were undertaken, and since the financial resources were almost all spent in 2020, it could be concluded that the delivery was to a certain extent timely although a substantial no-cost extension was required and there were issues of trainings being overrepresented in the later phases of the project. The project has furthermore been able to arrive at substantial cost-sharing or in-kind contributions to complement its resources, and has received adequate support from the different ILO branches and offices in Yangon, Bangkok and Geneva.

The ILO-GIP project has laid a basis for improving labour relations in the future which is a first necessary step towards a contribution to broader and longer-term *Impact* and decent work goal in Myanmar. The project has mainly worked with beneficiaries in 20 garment factories and with workers' and employers' organisations and local service providers, most of whom learned for the first time about labour relations, social dialogue, gender equality, sexual and reproductive health and productivity through ILO-GIP. The project has gone beyond that and implemented training courses and capacity building programmes for specific target groups, in particular through the twin-track gender approach and through the tripartite dialogue training by the ITC. The specific impact achieved vis-à-vis the overall development objective, the five immediate objectives and the 17 outputs in the LogFrame vary: The majority of *outputs* (75%) were at least partly achieved (13 out of 17), while this is more difficult to conclude for the *immediate objectives* which concern quite long-term development goals usually not achievable in three years' time (see Table 5). The



project contributed to a certain degree to improved industrial relations especially in the 20 factories involved in the project and among the two trade unions as was illustrated with extensive *quotes* from beneficiaries interviewed such as management and workers representatives in WCC's, trade union staff and local service providers.

The **Sustainability** envisaged by the PRODOC was very much hinged on the full participation in the project of the workers' and employers' organizations, and as we have seen in the above this has been achieved only partially whereby the complete absence of the usually influential and steering PAC is exemplary. Still progress has been made and it would be very unfortunate if the efforts would stop here. A substantial degree of essential groundwork has been done in terms of demonstration effects through the training in 20 factories, the development of training programmes and tools and the capacity building programmes with the social partners, but now it has to be scaled up to start engaging all garment and leather factories, and broadened to move towards the enhancement of genuine bipartite and tripartite dialogue. Therefore, the major factors which will influence the continuity of the project's benefits are the crucial engagement of the tripartite constituents as well as the willingness of donors to invest in a follow-up phase.

The project does not have an explicit exit strategy apart from the activities and documents that were developed since January 2020 as preparations for a possible Phase II. The project team, in particular the CTA, has been working on these activities and documents, and they will provide follow-up until the end of May 2020. However, now is the time to decide which unit within ILO will take the lead after that. A possible follow-up intervention could be done either through a GIP Phase II, or through the starting of the consultation process with the Myanmar Tripartite Constituents about a possible introduction in Myanmar of the Better Work (BW) programme. It would be only logical if such a future intervention would partner with the other main garment sector interventions, i.e. EU SMART and CARE/AMH.

The very first crucial step is to build trust with as well as among the tripartite constituents by having individual and plenary consultations (whereby the NTDF could play a catalysing role). An analysis was made of the interest in a possible new intervention among the main stakeholders, i.e. Government, Trade unions, Employers' Organisation, nationally owned factories, internationally owned Factories, Brands/Buyers, Donors and the ILO (see Table 6). From this analysis it was concluded that most stakeholders would welcome BW to Myanmar *provided* sufficient consultations take place in particular with the tripartite constituents and *provided* there are special components on capacity building for all three constituents as well as for the nationally owned factories. A few additional methods and topics suggested by stakeholders to include into a future intervention are: the continuation of training of workers, the improvement of the Dispute resolution mechanism, the development of a Collective Bargaining draft law, as well as attention for the new ILO Convention 190 on Violence and Harassment in the World of Work.

The **Overarching Conclusion** of the present independent final evaluation is that the ILO-GIP project remains highly relevant for Myanmar, that its design was partially flawed and should have included more specific consultations with the tripartite constituents, and that a series of impressive achievements were made in the target factories and with the workers' and employers' organisations and local service providers, as well as through tools, publications and videos

produced. Gender equality has been approached and implemented through a twin-track strategy. The project team has been working hard to realize these concrete achievements, and this focus resulted to a certain degree in the neglect of M&E arrangements and of the forging of consultative structures such as a steering committee and coordination among like-minded projects. Resources have been found to be used mostly in an efficient manner but on some occasions it could have been better managed, and the delivery was to a certain extent timely although a no-cost extension was required. The project's expenditures are quite balanced, and the actual spending is on track. In terms of impact, the project contributed to a certain degree to improved industrial relations especially within the 20 factories involved in the project and among the two trade unions laying a basis for improving labour relations in the future as was documented by means of quotes from beneficiaries interviewed. In terms of sustainability, the major factors which will influence the continuity of the project's benefits are the crucial engagement of the tripartite constituents in Myanmar as well as the willingness of donors to invest in a follow-up phase.

## 4.2 Recommendations

The recommendations are presented in this section according to the six Evaluation Criteria distinguished throughout this report.

### Relevance

- 1) Continue activities on improving labour relations, social dialogue and gender equality** as this is no less relevant now than it was at the design stages of the ILO-GIP project and try to combine this with **emergency bridging programmes to mitigate the effects of the COVID-19 crisis** for the (laid-off) workers and for the factories as has been proposed by some of the social partners and as currently is being developed jointly by GIZ and ILO-GIP, while other donors have also expressed interest in such programmes. As the ILO Director-General Guy Ryder recently stated: "Workers and businesses are facing catastrophe, in both developed and developing economies. We have to move fast, decisively, and together. The right, urgent, measures, could make the difference between survival and collapse."<sup>8</sup>

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
GIP, ILO- Liaison Office (LO), Social Partners, MoLIP, NTDF, ILO-DWT, ILO-HQ, donors (e.g. GIZ)	<b>Very High</b>	As soon as possible	Partly ILO-GIP (staff), new interventions.

### Validity of Design

- 2) Follow more closely the ILO template for a Project Document (PRODOC) in follow-up interventions**, and include a Theory of Change, a clear M&E Plan, an appropriate Risk Matrix regularly updated, an Exit Strategy, and make sure that the Immediate Objectives are reachable within the project period.

<sup>8</sup> [https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS\\_740893/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS_740893/lang--en/index.htm)

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
LO, DWT, ILO-HQ, Donor(s)	Medium	At the design stages of a new multi-year project	Part of future investments.

### Effectiveness

- 3) **Involve always the official ILO counterpart from the side of the Government (viz. ministries of labour/Employment) in any follow-up intervention** and strive for enhanced ownership in the relevant department(s); this will in particular also **enhance the leverage** of the intervention vis-à-vis the employers' and workers' organisations to join consultative structures such as a project steering committee.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
LO, DWT, ILO-HQ, Tripartite Constituents, NTDF, project steering committee, Donor(s)	Medium to High	At the design stages of a new multi-year project	Part of future investments.

- 4) **Enhance cooperation between ILO and other interventions** in particular through the proposed **One ILO Approach**, which has been tried and tested in Ethiopia.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
LO, DWT, ILO-HQ, Tripartite Constituents, NTDF	High	As soon as possible	Partly ILO-GIP (staff) and ILO regular staff in LO, DWT & HQ.

### Efficiency

- 5) **Make sure that the size of the project team in follow-up interventions is appropriate to the amount of work proposed in the PRODOC** as in the case of ILO-GIP a three-person project team had to manage 56 activities in addition to Finance, M&E, Communication and Knowledge Management.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
LO, DWT, ILO-HQ, Donor(s)	Medium	At the design stages of a new multi-year project	Part of future investments.

- 6) **Pay more attention to a well-developed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan** established from the inception phase of a follow-up intervention **by employing an additional national staff member for M&E and Knowledge Management** from the start of the project.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
Project Team, M&E staff, ILO-LO, DWT, ILO-HQ, Donor(s)	Medium	At the design stages of a new multi-year project	Part of future investments.

**Impact**

- 7) **Continue the important work undertaken by ILO-GIP related to Gender Equality via a twin-track approach** in a follow-up intervention and include attention for the new **ILO Convention 190 on Violence and Harassment in the World of Work** as well as for **Women's Voice** (representation and leadership).

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
LO, DWT-ROAP, ILO-HQ, Donor(s)	Medium to High	From the middle of 2019	Reallocate budget lines.

**Sustainability**

- 8) **Nominate a unit and a person within ILO who will be in the lead to develop a follow-up phase** and who will take over from the CTA of the ILO-GIP project on June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020 when the ILO-GIP project closes.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO-LO, ILO-DWT, ILO-HQ	Very High	As soon as possible	ILO regular staff in Yangon, Bangkok and/or Geneva.

- 9) **Initiate as soon as possible the consultations with the Tripartite Constituents** (bilaterally and/or plenary for example through the NTFD) on a **follow-intervention either through a GIP Phase-II or by introducing the joint ILO and IFC programme 'Better Work' in Myanmar**, and gradually include in these consultations the other stakeholders identified in the present report such as the nationally owned factories, internationally owned factories, Brands/Buyers and Donors (see Table 6).

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO-LO, Government, Trade unions, Employers' Organisation, Nationally owned factories, Internationally owned factories, Brands/Buyers, Donors, and NTFD	High	As soon as possible	ILO regular staff in Yangon, Bangkok and Geneva.

## 5 Lessons Learned and Good Practices

This chapter compiles two lessons learned (LL) and two good practices (GP) from the experience gained by evaluating the ILO-GIP project in the present report, namely:

### **Lessons learned**

*LL1: Stakeholders' participation of all three Tripartite Constituents, including the Government (a Ministry of Labour or Employment), in the project design and in the implementation result not only in Ownership but also allows for leverage vis-a-vis the other constituents.*

*LL2: The Public Private Development Partnership (PPDP) Model used in this project has advantages and disadvantages which should be managed well especially concerning the different roles played by international private companies.*

### **Good practices:**

*GP1: The Twin-Track strategy on Gender Equality based on the comprehensive Gender Equality Assessment is a Good Practice that should be replicated (GEA, entitled 'Weaving Gender').*

*GP2: The collaboration between ILO-GIP and the local service provider Aung Myin Hmu (AMH/CARE International) resulted in the mainstreaming of Industrial Relations issues into the existing national training programme of AMH.*

### 5.1 Lessons Learned

One of the purposes of evaluations in the ILO is to improve project or programme performance and promote organizational learning. Evaluations are expected to generate lessons that can be applied elsewhere to improve programme or project performance, outcome, or impact. The ILO/EVAL Templates are used below for the two identified Lessons Learned (LL).

**LL1: Stakeholders' participation of all three Tripartite Constituents, including the Government (a Ministry of Labour or Employment), in the project design and in the implementation result not only in Ownership but also allows for leverage vis-a-vis the other constituents.**

## ILO Lesson Learned Template

**Project Title: Improving labour relations for decent work and sustainable development in the Myanmar garment industry (ILO-GIP)**

**Project TC/SYMBOL: MMR/16/01/MUL**

**Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop**

**Date: 17 May 2020**

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
<b>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</b>	<i>Stakeholders' participation of all three Tripartite Constituents, including the Government (a Ministry of Labour or Employment), in the project design and in the implementation result not only in Ownership but also allows for leverage vis-a-vis the other constituents.</i>
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	<i>Undertaking participatory design processes with national stakeholders is crucial. The employers' and workers' organizations were expected to play key roles the ILO-GIP as they were) expected to be jointly responsible for implementing the project intervention and monitoring the project progress via their participation in the ILO-GIP governance structure. The evaluation learned that the insufficient participation of the national social partners in the project's design stage proved to be critical in their lack of understanding and ownership of the project, and thus, largely contributed to significant challenges for creating an enabling environment for the successful implementation of the ILO-GIP. When one of the social partners is reluctant to join the project, as was the case in the ILO-GIP project for the employers' organisation, and the government is hardly included in the project set-up, there is no leverage to mediate for the government.</i>
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	<i>ILO Liaison Office, DWT-ROAP, ILO- HQ, Tripartite Constituents and Donors.</i>
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	<i>Ownership was not well developed among the tripartite constituents, and the employers' organisation was reluctant to join the project, while the government was left out and could thus not play a mediating role.</i>
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	<i>Positive was that gradually the two trade unions started working together for the first time.</i>
<b>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</b>	<i>In designing a project and writing a PRODOC, there have to be intensive consultations with all three tripartite constituents separately as well as plenary.</i>

**LL2: The Public Private Development Partnership (PPDP) Model used in this project has advantages and disadvantages which should be managed well especially concerning the different roles played by international private companies.**

## ILO Lesson Learned Template

**Project Title: Improving labour relations for decent work and sustainable development in the Myanmar garment industry (ILO-GIP)**

**Project TC/SYMBOL: MMR/16/01/MUL**

**Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop**

**Date: 17 May 2020**

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
<b>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</b>	<p><i>The Public Private Development Partnership (PPDP) Model used in this project has advantages and disadvantages which should be managed well especially concerning the different roles played by international private companies.</i></p> <p><i>In this particular project funded by public funds (Sida) and private funds (H&amp;M and in the final project year also M&amp;S), the role of H&amp;M has been assessed as crucial for the progress in implementation and for the achievements made. In fact, the role of H&amp;M is considered as one of the 'Success Factors'. The same can be said to a lesser extent of M&amp;S since they joined the project in a later phase (September 2019).</i></p>
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	<p><i>Stakeholders agreed that the brands' support to ILO-GIP has proved to be instrumental, as factories are willing to join the project if their buyers explicitly request them to do so. This is considered an advantage for the implementation of the activities in factories that participate in the project. However, at the same time it would be envisageable that the factories are convinced about the usefulness of taking part in a project and not being "strongly encouraged" by their buyers.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, in this particular case, H&amp;M partially funds ILO-GIP and is thus accountable towards H&amp;M as it would be to any other donor. Besides, the company is regarded by national stakeholders as a project partner (along with trade unions and the MGMA) as a project donor it participates as an observer in the project's governance processes. Furthermore, H&amp;M has a key role in the signing up of participating factories.</i></p> <p><i>According to several stakeholders' opinions gathered by the evaluator, this situation creates a conflict of interest, which, in turn translates into a disinclination on the side of the employers' and national owned factories to join ILO-GIP for reasons related to potential unfairness and competitiveness.</i></p> <p><i>Whereas ILO-GIP has sought the support and participation of additional brands in the project, this same argument may become more pertinent, as this potentially increases the risk of being seen as favouring international brands over nationally owned factories, especially if the latter continue to</i></p>

	<i>be absent from the project. This needs to be addressed with utmost diplomacy. On the basis of this analysis, and, in particular, in order to avoid potential conflicts of interest that might negatively influence the employers' and national owned factories' willingness to join in ILO-GIP (or other projects), the MTE arrived at the recommendation (No. 14) to manage private sector contributions through pooled funds at the ILO-HQ in Geneva (MTE 2018: 58).</i>
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	<i>ILO HQ, DWT-ROAP, ILO Liaison Office Yangon, Sida and other international and private sector donors.</i>
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	<i>The potential conflict of interest in a PPDP Model, could sometimes discourage employers' organisations as well as national companies to join the project.</i>
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	<i>The international brands substantially enhanced the effectiveness of the project by encouraging their suppliers to join the project.</i>
<b>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</b>	<i>ILO HQ in Geneva should consider to manage the private sector contributions through thematic/sectorial pool funds at the ILO-HQ level.</i>

## 5.2 Good Practices

ILO evaluation sees lessons learned and emerging good practices as part of a continuum, beginning with the objective of assessing what has been learned, and then identifying successful practices from those lessons which are worthy of replication. The ILO/EVAL Templates are used below. There are two Good Practices (GP) that emerged from the present evaluation that could well be replicated under certain conditions in other projects and/or countries.



**GP1: The Twin-Track strategy on Gender Equality based on a comprehensive Gender Equality Assessment is a Good Practice that should be replicated.**

### ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

**Project Title:** Improving labour relations for decent work and sustainable development in the Myanmar garment industry (ILO-GIP)

**Project TC/SYMBOL:** MMR/16/01/MUL

**Name of Evaluator:** Theo van der Loop

**Date:** 17 May 2020

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

GP Element	Text
<b>Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)</b>	<p><i>The project employed de facto a Twin-Track strategy on Gender Equality based on a comprehensive Gender Equality Assessment (GEA, entitled 'Weaving Gender') and this strategy is a Good Practice that should be replicated in other projects.</i></p> <p><i>The gender needs and interests were clearly addressed in all five immediate objectives of the ILO-GIP project, while the second objective is even exclusively directed at the empowerment of women workers resulting overall in what can be called a 'twin-track approach' to gender equality.</i></p>
<b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>	<p><i>The twin-track strategy employed by the project is considered by the evaluation as a good practice for the following reasons:</i></p> <p><b>Firstly</b>, <i>the design of the project did pay a lot of attention to gender issues with a separate Immediate Objective on the empowerment of women workers and with gender mainstreamed in all other immediate objectives (Table 1).</i></p> <p><b>Secondly</b>, <i>it is considered a good practice to undertake fact-finding in the early stages of the project implementation and this was done by ILO-GIP through the Gender Equality Assessment (GEA); it may not have been perfect (although most respondents indicated it was a useful report), but it provided a good starting point for the design of the training and other activities.</i></p> <p><b>Thirdly</b>, <i>the gender profiles produced are considered by many to be a useful product.</i></p> <p><b>Fourthly</b>, <i>the percentages of women that participated in the various training activities are by any means quite high (Table 2).</i></p> <p><b>Fifthly</b>, <i>the interviews indicated some positive outcomes; for example one Local service provider stated "There is an increased awareness on sexual harassment in the factories; previously they were quite sensitive on this issue. Now seven factories <b>have a sexual harassment policy in place.</b>" (emphasis added). This was also generally confirmed by the five female representatives in the WCC's interviewed (from 3 different factories).</i></p>
<b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b>	<p><i>Employing a twin-track strategy towards gender equality and basing it on a comprehensive assessment results in sustained as well as specific attention for issues of gender equality.</i></p>

<b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>	<i>See above.</i>
<b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>	<i>Replication of this twin-track strategy can be done in most projects.</i>
<b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, CPOs or ILO's Strategic Program Framework)</b>	<i>This links directly to ILO's Mandate on Gender Equality.</i>
<b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>	<i>See the 'Weaving Gender' report of 2018 (GEA), the present final evaluation report on the ILO-GIP project and the project's progress reports.</i>

**GP2: The collaboration between ILO-GIP and the local service provider Aung Myin Hmu (AMH/CARE International) resulted in the mainstreaming of Industrial Relations issues into the existing national training programme of AMH.**

### ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

**Project Title: Improving labour relations for decent work and sustainable development in the Myanmar garment industry (ILO-GIP)**

**Project TC/SYMBOL: MMR/16/01/MUL**

**Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop**

**Date: 17 May 2020**

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

<b>GP Element</b>	<b>Text</b>
<b>Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)</b>	<i>The collaboration between ILO-GIP and the local service provider Aung Myin Hmu (AMH/CARE International) having their own well-established training centre (funded under the LIFT fund in Myanmar) resulted in the mainstreaming of Industrial Relations issues into the existing national training programme of AMH (and potentially in the TVET national core competencies).</i>
<b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>	<i>The collaboration between ILO-GIP and Aung Myin Hmu (AMH) is considered a good practice of the project as it allows for the mainstreaming of industrial relations issues into an already existing national training programme that is provided by a specialized institution in the garment sector. Likewise, it offers the possibility to train future workers before they are employed in the garment industry. Furthermore, it has a strong potential to be scaled-up to include other topics of interest to the ILO-GIP. Also, the combined efforts of the ILO-GIP- Aung Myin Hmu to develop a new set of national occupational competencies standards, along with the National Standard Setting Agency (NSSA), has enormous potential to improve the quality of both the technical and the industrial skills provided by TVET institutions. However, the MGMA did not approve these standards yet.</i>

<b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b>	<i>The collaboration between ILO-GIP and a local service provider (i.e. AMH) resulted in the mainstreaming of Industrial Relations issues into an existing national TVET training programme (e.g. integrating soft skills on industrial relations as one of the workers' competency standards).</i>
<b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>	<i>See above.</i>
<b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>	<i>The cooperation of projects with well-established local service providers can be mutually beneficial and provide a good practice to be replicated.</i>
<b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, CPOs or ILO's Strategic Program Framework)</b>	<i>The Good Practice links to Myanmar's DWCP Priority 2 on "Application of fundamental principles and rights at work", and to Outcome 2.3 on "Strengthened industrial relations system at the national, township, sectorial, plant and enterprise levels". It also links to ILO Strategic Policy Outcomes including P&amp;B Outcome 7 -Promoting workplace compliance through labour inspection including in global supply chains; P&amp;B Outcome 1: More and better jobs for inclusive growth and improved youth reemployment prospects; and P&amp;B Outcome 8: Protecting workers from unacceptable forms of work.</i>
<b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>	<i>See the MTE and the Final Evaluation Reports of the ILO-GIP project, and the project's progress reports.</i>

# Annex 1 Terms of Reference (TOR)

*The final version of the ToR (dated 31 January 2020) is provided as a separate document.*

## Annex 2 Inception Report

*The final version of the Inception Report (dated 5 March 2020) can be provided as a separate document.*

## Annex 3 Mission Schedule, Skype Calls and List of Stakeholders interviewed

### This Annex includes:

- A) The Mission Schedule
- B) The Skype calls
- C) The list of persons and stakeholders prepared by the Project Team.

**Table A: The Mission Schedule.**

Date (in 2020)	Time	Contact Person	Address
<b>Monday 9 March</b>		Theo van der Loop	Arrival in Yangon from Netherlands
<b>10 March</b>	09h00-12h00	GIP Project	ILO Office
	13h00-14h00	Donglin Li	ILO Office
	14h00-15h00	Nyein Chain, ACTEMP Project	ILO Office
	15h30-16h30	Mariana Infante, ILO VZF OSH	ILO Office
<b>11 March</b>	10h00-11h00	Soe Lay, Dr Zaw Win Aung IWFM (CTUM)	ILO Office
	14h00-15h00	FGD with MIR-Lab Participants	ILO Office
<b>12 March</b>	09h00-10h00	Mr Serkan, Mr Hlwan Moe Kyaw H&M	H&M, Sule Square
	11h00-12h00	Smart Myanmar Jacob Clere	Smart Office, 56M1, Thiri Marlar Street, Near Kone Myint Thar Restaurant
	13h00-14h00	Aung Myin Hmu Sue Tym	AMH Care Office, 3/89 Kant Kaw Myaing Street, 8Qtr, Yankin Tsp
<b>13 March</b>	09h00-11h00	Harvey Handbags	No 20, Plot No K1 (A) and B, Anawrahta Industrial Zone, Hlaing Tharyar Township,
	13h00-15h00	FGD with Local Service Providers: CBI, 5th Pillar, MSI, CARE, Kaizen, Converge and Legal clinic.	ILO Office
<b>Saturday 14 March</b>		Theo van der Loop	Study newly received documents; Work on interview notes
<b>Sunday 15 March</b>		Theo van der Loop	Work on interview notes; Start with PowerPoint
<b>16 March</b>	8h45-09h30	ILO: Donglin Li and CTA	ILO Office
	10h30-12h00	SIDA: Ms Maria Hauer	Nordic House, Pyay Road
	13h30-17h00	ILO-GIP: CTA	Dibar restaurant and ILO Office
<b>17 March</b>	10h00-11h00	MICS - U Thet Hnin Aung, General Secretary	MICS Office
<b>17 March</b>	13h00-14h00	ILO-GIP: CTA	ILO Office

<b>17 March</b>	14h00-15h00	MGMA- Kyaw Zayar Phyo, Junior Labour Officer	ILO Office
<b>17 March</b>	15h00-15h45	Two Employers' Representatives from two Factories (on the WCC and OSH Committee)	ILO Office
<b>17 March</b>	15h50-16h35	Two Workers' Representatives from two Factories (on the WCC and OSH Committee)	ILO Office
<b>17 March</b>	16h35-17h00	ILO-GIP: CTA	ILO Office
<b>18 March</b>		Theo van der Loop	Work on interview notes and on PowerPoint
<b>Thursday 19 March</b>	05h45	Theo van der Loop	Departure from Yangon to Amsterdam

**Table B: The Skype calls.**

<b>Name/Organization</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Date / Time</b>
Mr. Dzung Bui Van and Ms Catherine Vaillancourt-Laflamme	Evaluation Manager ILO Country Office for Viet Nam, and Chief Technical Advisor, ILO-GIP	Tue 4 Feb 1030 am
Mr Paolo Salvai	Former ILO ACTEMP, Yangon	Mon 17 Feb 3 pm
Mr Dong Eung Lee	Senior Specialist, ILO ACTEMP, Bangkok	Tue 18 Feb 9 am.
Ms Lydia Hopton and Isaac	Marks & Spencer, LONDON (- 1 hour)	Wed 26 Feb 11.00 am
Mr. Philippe Marcadent / Mr Chris Land- Lazlauskas	ILO-INWORK, Geneva: Branch Chief and Specialist, Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining	Mon 2 March 10 am
Ms Catherine Vaillancourt-Laflamme	Chief Technical Advisor, ILO-GIP	Tue 3 March 10 am
Mr Conor Boyle	Global Operation Manager, ILO Better Work, Geneva	Fri 27 March 14.00 pm
Pong Sul Ahn	ACTRAV, ILO Bangkok	Mon 30 March 10 am
Mr John Ritchotte	INWORK, ILO Bangkok	Mon 30 March 11 am
Ms. Anne Boyd	ILO CTA Labour Law Project	Tue 31 March 10.30 pm
Mr. Jun Kitano	UNIQLO	Tue 31 March 11.30 am
Ms. Eike Feddersen	GIZ	Tue 31 March 16.00 pm
Ms. Brigitte Junker	EU	Wed 1 April 10.30 pm
Ms Joni Simpson	Senior Specialist, Gender, Equality and Non-discrimination, ILO Bangkok	Wed 1 April 11.30 pm
Mr Rory Mungoven	UNHCHR, Geneva (Former ILO Liaison Officer, Yangon)	Wed 1 April 13.45 pm
Mr Javier Diez Pena Mr Robin Hu Mr Andrew Feng	CSR, HQ, Spain CSR, Based in China CSR, based in China, Inditex	Could not be reached due to the COVID-19 crisis in China.

**Table C: List of stakeholders to consult for final evaluation of the ILO-GIP project.**

Organization Name	Position	
<b>International Labour Organization</b>		
1	Mr Donglin Li	ILO Liaison Officer, ILO Yangon
2	Mr Rory Mungoven	Former ILO Liaison Officer, Yangon, now at UNHCHR
3	Ms Lin Lin Oo	Finance and Administration Officer, ILO Yangon
4	Ms Piyamal Pichawongse	ILO Deputy Liaison Officer, ILO Yangon
5	Mr Chris Land-Lazlauskas	Specialist, freedom of association & collective bargaining, INWORK
6	Mr Arun Kumar Mr John Ritchotte	INWORK
7	Mr Paolo Salvai	Former ILO ACTEMP, Yangon
8	Mr Dong Eung Lee	Senior Specialist, ILO ACTEMP, Bangkok
9	Ms Joni Simpson	Senior Specialist, Gender, Equality & Non-discrimination, ILO Bangkok
10	Mr Conor Boyle	Global Operation Manager, ILO Better Work, Geneva
11	Ms Mariana Infante	ILO Vision Zero Fund, ILO Yangon
12	Ms Anne Boyd	ILO Labour Law Reform, ILO Yangon
13	Mr Nyien Chan	ILO ACTEMP, ILO Yangon
14	Ms Catherine Vaillancourt-Laflamme	Chief Technical Advisor, ILO-GIP
15	Ms Aye Thet Oo	National Project Coordinator, ILO-GIP
16	Ms Thit Thit Su Mon	Finance and Administration Assistant
17	Mr Zaw Naing Htun	Translator, ILO-GIP
<b>ILO-GIP Constituents</b>		
18	U Myo Aung	Permanent secretary, MoLIP
19	U Win Shein	Director General, Department of Labour Relations, MoLIP
20	U Myint Soe	Chairman, MGMA
21	Daw Khine Khine Nwe	Assistant General Secretary, MGMA
22	Ma Khaing Zar Aung	President, Industrial Workers Federation of Myanmar
23	Ma Win Theingi Soe/Soe Lay	CEC Member, IWFM
24	U Thet Hnin Aung	General Secretary, Myanmar Industries Crafts and Services
25	Ko Nay Lin Aung	MICS
<b>ILO-GIP Donors</b>		
26	Ms Maria Hauer	First Secretary, SIDA, Emb. of Sweden
27	Mr Anders Frankenberg	Ambassador, SIDA, Embassy of Sweden
28	Mr Tobias Fisher	Former country director, H&M
29	Mr Serkan Tanka	Country director, H&M
30	Ko Hlwan Moe Kyaw	Sustainability Manager, H&M
31	Ms Lydia Hopton	Marks & Spencer
<b>ILO-GIP local service providers and beneficiaries</b>		
3	U Ngwe Thein Ma Kay Khine Oo	Director, Capacity Building Initiative Program Coordinator
33	U Ye Min Oo / Alex	Managing Director / Public relations - Converge
34	Mr Vijay Alaham Ms Ngwe Shin (Shin Lay)	Finance Officer Trainer, Kaizen International
35	U Hlaing Min Swe Ma Thiri Lwin Ma Aye Chan Saint	Director of Programme Quality Project Manager Project officer, Marie Stopes International
36	Ma Mya Hpone Thant Ko Ko Zaw	HR Advisor Project Manager, Care International
37	U Nay Win Naing	The Fifth Pillar
38	Daw Hla Hla Yee	Director and Advocate, The Legal Clinic
<b>ILO-GIP participating factories</b>		
39	Mr Gary Lee	Myanmar Jiale (H&M)
40	Mr Ricki Li	Myanmar York (H&M)
41	Ms Lili & Mr Johnny	Hung Kiu (H&M)
42	Ma Yu Par	Musung (M&S)
43	Mr Jeroen Herms	BSK (Independent)
44	Mr Hu	Solamoda



Organization Name	Position	
45	Mr Jeff Lan	Harvey Handbags
46	The project has been delivering training services in 20 factories and information will be sought from some of these, and from a variety of trainees in these factories. Names will be provided in due course.	
ILO-GIP – Other beneficiaries - Myanmar Industrial Relations Lab (Mir-Lab)		
47	Daw Kyin Aye	CEC Member, MGMA
48	U Ye Thu Ra	President, Township Textiles and Garment, Hlaing Thar Yar IWFM
49	U Thein Min Tun	Staff Officer DLR, Shwe Pyi Thar Tsp, MOLIP
ILO-GIP – Other beneficiaries – Trade union capacity building		
50	Dr Zaw Win Aung	CTUM
51	U Myo Thein	MICS ,trainee from MICS
52	Daw Moe Wathan	CTUM, trainee from CTUM
ILO-GIP other partners		
53	Mr Javier Diez Pena Mr Robin Hu Mr Andrew Feng	CSR, HQ, Spain CSR, Based in China CSR, based in China, Inditex
54	Mr Jun Kintano	Uniqlo
55	Ms Suzanne Tym	Director, Aung Myin Hmu
56	Ms Eike Feddersen	GIZ
57	Mr Jacob Clere	Smart Myanmar

## Annex 4 Data Collection Worksheet

The Data Collection Worksheet as it has been developed in the Inception Report (see Annex 2) is as follows:

Evaluation Criteria and Questions	Sources of Data	Stakeholder Interviews	Specific Methods
<b>A. Relevance and strategic fit</b>			
1) To what extent are the project strategy and approach levels consistent and pertinent to current and long-term development needs of Myanmar, the needs and priority of beneficiaries, tripartite constituents and policies of partners and the donors?	Government Policies, Tripartite partners' priorities, PRODOC, MTE, Donors' doc's, DWCP, SDGs	Project Team, Tripartite stakeholders, Donors, Liaison Office (LO) Yangon, DWT-ROAP, HQ	Documents review; Stakeholder Interviews; FGDs
2) To what extent is the project design aligned with or informed the Myanmar DWCP for 2018-2021? To what extent is the project design aligned with SDG 1, 5, and 8 (particularly the principle of 'leaving no one behind') and other relevant development policy frameworks and the requirements under the EBA trade preference?	DWCP, P&B, SDGs, UNDAF, PRODOC, National Plans, EBA	Project team, LO, DWT-ROAP, HQ, Other UN-organisations	Documents review & Interviews
3) To what extent are the project strategy and approach levels consistent with the gender equality goals of ILO?	ILO Gender Equality Goals, DWCP, P&B, GEA, MTE	Project team, Liaison Office, DWT-ROAP, HQ,	Documents review; Interviews; FGDs
4) Were the project strategies and the selected means of action appropriate considering the cultural setting, capacity of institutional partners for project implementation and the capacities of intended men and women beneficiaries in Myanmar?	PRODOC, National policies, Progress Reports, MTE	Project team, LO, Tripartite constituents, DWT-ROAP, HQ, Donors, Local Service Providers	Documents review & Interviews
<b>B. Validity of interventions design</b>			
5) To what extent are the project design (objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities) and its underlying theory of change logical and coherent?	PRODOC, MTE, Updated LogFrame, Progress Reports	Project Team, Tripartite const., Donors, DWT-ROAP, HQ	Documents review; Interviews; FGDs
6) Was the project design realistic and adequate to meet the project objectives? To what extent was the project design, including the PPDP-project set up, adequate to be able to achieve the goal and addressing the needs of ultimate beneficiaries, tripartite constituents and the capacities of the project partners?	PRODOC, MTE, National policies, Progress Reports, LogFrames	Project team, LO, Tripartite const., DWT-ROAP, HQ, Donors, Local Service Providers	Documents review; Interviews; FGDs
7) Were the planned project objectives, means of action and outcomes, relevant, coherent and realistic to the situation on the ground?	PRODOC, MTE, National policies, Progress Reports, LogFrames, EBA	Project team, LO, Tripartite const., DWT-ROAP, HQ, Donors, Local Service Providers	Documents review; Interviews; FGDs
8) Did it address <b>gender</b> needs and interests?	GEA, PRODOC, MTE, Progress Reports	Project team, LO, Tripartite const., DWT-ROAP, HQ, Donors	Documents review; Interviews; FGDs
9) Were the capacities of various project's partners taken into account in the project's strategy and means of action?	PRODOC, MTE, National policies, Progress Reports	Project team, LO, ILO Tripartite constituents, Brands, Donors	Documents review; Interviews; FGDs

		DWT-ROAP, HQ, , Local Service Providers	
10) Which risks and assumptions were identified and were they the appropriate ones?	PRODOC, MTE, Progress Reports, LogFrames	Project team, LO, Tripartite const., DWT-ROAP, HQ, Donors	Documents review; Interviews; FGDs
11) Were the planned monitoring and evaluation arrangements adequate? Were the targeted indicator values realistic and can they be tracked?	PRODOC, MTE, Progress Reports, LogFrames, M&E Plan	Project team, LO, DWT-ROAP, HQ	Documents review; Interviews
<b>C. Effectiveness of project implementation and management arrangements</b>			
12) To what extent did the project achieve the intended objectives? a. The extent to which the recommendations from the MTE have been taken into consideration? b. How effectively has the project delivered core services to stakeholders including direct beneficiaries? c. What have been major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the project's objectives? d. Examine the effectiveness of project institutional framework, its management arrangement and coordination mechanism with other relevant ILO projects, and with other implementing partners,,,,, including the PPDP project-set-up. e. To what extent did the project achieve the objectives related to gender equality?	PRODOC, MTE, LogFrames, Progress Reports, Project website, Government & Partner Policies, Websites & Documents of Donors, GEA, Donor/Partner assessments (if any)	Project Team, LO, Tripartite const., Donors, DWT-ROAP, HQ, Local Service Providers, Selected Factories & Trainees, MIR-Lab, Other relevant partners and ILO projects, Direct beneficiaries	Documents review; Stakeholder Interviews; FGDs; Observation
13) To what extent do the measures adopted by the project management appropriately and timely address the problems or delays encountered and attribute to achieving the immediate objectives of the project? Examine the extent that the project has adjusted/modified its strategy to respond to changing situation on the ground or challenges faced. To what extent were the mitigation strategies effective in addressing the risks during the implementation of the project?	Progress Reports, MTE	Project Team, LO, Tripartite const., Donors, DWT-ROAP, HQ	Documents review; Stakeholder Interviews; FGDs; Observation
14) To what extent have stakeholders, particularly workers' and employers' organizations been involved in project implementation, and how can stakeholder commitment be described?	Progress Reports, LogFrames, Tripartite const. documents (if any)	Project Team, LO, Tripartite const., Donors, DWT-ROAP, HQ	Documents review & Interviews;
15) To what extent the project has managed the practice of knowledge management and lessons dissemination and visibility effort on project branding?	Progress Reports, Project Websites, Various project documents	Project Team, LO, Tripartite const., Donors, DWT-ROAP, HW	Documents review & Interviews; Observation
<b>D. Efficiency of resource use and project set-up</b>			
16) How efficiently have resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) been allocated and used to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader project objectives and results? And have they been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the factors that have hindered timely delivery of outputs? Have any measures to mitigate the delays been put in place?	Financial Reports, Progress reports, MTE	Project team, LO, Tripartite const., DWT-ROAP, HQ, Donors	Review of Financial Reports; Stakeholder Interviews
17) Has the project been implemented in the most efficient way vis-à-vis its financial and human resources? What aspects of the project could be done differently to cut costs while still delivering achievements and achieve outcomes? Has the project been able to arrive at cost-sharing or in-kind contributions to complement its	Financial Reports, Progress reports, MTE, Documentation from other (ILO) projects	Project team, LO, Tripartite const., DWT-ROAP, HQ, Donors, Staff of other (ILO) projects	Review of Financial Reports; Stakeholder Interviews

resources? (e.g. from other ILO projects, inter-agency collaborations and private sector contributions).			
<b>E. Impact orientation by the project set-up, and impacts achieved vis-à-vis defined objectives and outcomes</b>			
18) What has happened as a result of the project? To what extent did the project make contribution to broader and longer-term impact and decent work goal in Myanmar? In how far the activity contributed to improved labour relations?	Progress Reports, MTE	Project team, LO, Tripartite const., DWT-ROAP, HQ, Donors	Documents review & Interviews
19) What real difference has the project made to the ultimate beneficiaries, capacity of local authorities, and to <b>gender equality</b> ?	Progress Reports, National policies, SDG-reporting	Project team, LO, Tripartite const., DWT-ROAP, HQ, Donors	Documents review & Interviews
20) To what extent can observed changes be attributed to the intervention?	Progress Reports, MTE	Project team, LO, Tripartite const., DWT-ROAP, HQ, Donors	Documents review & Interviews
21) Are there unintended impacts (including consideration of different segments of society)?	Progress Reports, MTE	Project team, LO, Tripartite const., DWT-ROAP, HQ, Donors	Documents review & Interviews
22) What interventions and approaches delivered the impact? Which are key contextual features for these interventions (e.g. gender, poverty, ethnicity etc.) so we can get deeper understanding on the factors that drive the immediate changes/impact?	Progress Reports, MTE, GEA	Project team, LO, Tripartite const., DWT-ROAP, HQ, Donors	Document review & Interviews
<b>F. Sustainability and continuation of project-induced activities &amp; impact beyond the project's lifespan</b>			
23) To what extent the project's outcomes are likely to be durable and can be maintained or even scaled up and replicated by intervention partners after major assistance has been completed?	Progress Reports	Project team, LO, Tripartite const., DWT-ROAP, HQ, Donors	Documents review & Interviews
24) What are the major factors which will have or will influence the continuity of the project's benefit?	Progress Reports	Project team, LO, Tripartite const., DWT-ROAP, HQ, Donors	Documents review & Interviews
<b>Other priority aspects: Cross-Cutting Issues</b>			
25) To what extent the work has contributed toward promoting ILO's mandate on social dialogue, international labour standard, as well as the ILO's goal of gender equality, disability inclusion, non-discrimination? What were the facilitating and limiting factors in project's contribution to these cross-cutting issues?	Progress Reports, MTE, GEA	Project team, LO, Tripartite const., DWT-ROAP, HQ, Donors	Documents review & Interviews

## Annex 5 Recommendations of the MTE and Updates on Follow-up

This Annex includes the Recommendations of the MTE (2018), the follow-up taken by the ILO-GIP project as per April 2019, and the Update by the evaluator with inputs from the project team as per March 2020.

MTE Recommendations (November 2018)	Follow up taken by ILO-GIP as per April 2019 (cf. Technical Progress Report on 2018)	Update by Evaluator (31 March 2020) with inputs from the Project Team (March 2020)
<p>1. Extension of the project's implementation schedule and budget. In order to allow the ILO-GIP to consolidate achievements, and to address the remaining challenges, the evaluation recommends Sida to consider approving an extension of the project's implementation schedule (1 year).</p>	<p>The ILO-GIP is in the process of formalizing a 6 months no-cost extension to the project. Within the resources of the project, a one-year extension, if desirable, was not financially possible.</p>	<p>The 6 months no-cost extension until 31 March 2020 was approved by Sida and H&amp;M. Due to circumstances resulting from the COVID-19 situation, Sida and H&amp;M have also accepted to grant another 2 months no-cost extension on 18 March 2020 until 31 May 2020.</p>
<p>2. Capacity building for trade unions. ILO-GIP must keep on delivering the recently started capacity building plan for the garment sector trade unions. However additional time may be needed to ensure the delivery of the actual training of the trainers as well as larger scale implementation of training activities foreseen under the different training modules.</p>	<p>The ILO-GIP has continued to deliver its capacity building training programme to trade unions and, expects to be able to deliver all the scheduled training within the timeframe of the project.</p>	<p>GIP has delivered all the planned activities under the trade union capacity building project, and even produced a series of 15 educational videos: 9 in Myanmar, and 6 in English. There is thus no need to add additional time. The recommended 'Larger scale implementation' was not feasible as the project was already too ambitious.</p>
<p>3. Availability of quality training materials and trainers. ILO-GIP, along with INWORK and the ITC-ILO in Turin needs to finalize the development and adaptation of the social dialogue training material to make it suitable to the Myanmar context. Once finalized, it be submitted to the Sub-working group on industrial relations training (SWG-IRT) for its validation and approval. Upon approval, when needed, select and hire (and eventually train) local service providers and/or conduct the actual ToT.</p>	<p>In collaboration with an external service provider, the ILO-GIP has produced a first version of all the social dialogue training material. The project has recruited a local training service provider. A first training of trainers will be organized between 25-30 April 2019.</p>	<p>The ILO-GIP has developed training material on Social Dialogue (8 modules) and on OSH. The draft ILO global toolkit on social dialogue was used, when possible. Training of trainers has taken place for the 2 local service providers. Converge has required significant ToT time and the GIP also brought in Better Work to help with this task. The international training providers based in Myanmar, Kaizen, Care and MSI, are more experienced and they developed/used their own training material, under the oversight of the GIP. SWG-IRT was never operational.</p>
<p>4. Delivery and monitoring of the trainings in the participating factories. Implement the delivery of training at the enterprise level, based on a realistic delivery schedule. It would be advisable to initiate trainings related to: social dialogue; sexual and reproductive health; prevention of sexual and other harassment and discrimination; gender equality; occupational health and safety at work. Furthermore, priority should also be given to the finalization and piloting of the Client</p>	<p>The ILO-GIP has started the delivery of its training on the prevention of sexual harassment, promotion of sexual and reproductive health and productivity. The project is still reviewing the material for OSH and social dialogue and ensuring that local service providers will be able to deliver quality training by</p>	<p>The GIP has delivered almost all of the planned training at the factories.</p> <p>The NPC had a major job in liaising with the factories and the local service providers; she therefore had to travel often to the factories.</p> <p>The (piloting of) CRM was never implemented.</p>

Relationship Management Data Base (CRM).	investing resources in training of trainers.	
5. Development of a pilot on productivity. Identify, among the participating factories, those in greater need to improve their productivity and be willing to participate, to develop pilot trainings on productivity.	The ILO-GIP has actively tried to secure the buy-in of ten suppliers for its productivity pilot. Eight assessments, basis for the further engagement have been conducted. 5 Factories have announced their interest to continue. The project will invite M&S suppliers to join in.	It was not easy to engage factories for this productivity training as it involved a financial contribution from their side (i.e. 30% of the training costs or \$ 7,000 per factory). It was thus not feasible to target factories "in greater need". In the end <u>five</u> factories actually participated.  Those five factories received every month a one-day seminar (collective training at the ILO) and 2 days of in-factory customized training.
6. Support to WCCs and improvement plans. If the project indeed is granted the requested one-year extension, it is recommended that, along with finalizing the deployment of the training programme, the ILO-GIP prioritizes the establishment/strengthening of WCCs; the development of bipartite improvement plans; the establishment of bi-partite OSH committees, and to develop a gender equality action and inclusion plan in participating factories.	The project is indeed working to strengthen the WCC in its participating factories.	The social dialogue and the sexual harassment training focus on the WCC. OSH training focused on OSH committees. WCC have been trained on the development of action plans. In some cases, during the training, management and workers came up with their own improvement plans. Gender action plans were part of the training by CARE.
7. Participation of nationally owned factories. In order to continue efforts directed at engaging with nationally owned factories, the evaluation recommends that the ILO-GIP: (a) mainstreams industrial relations in other garment sector/projects working with nationally owned factories; and, (b) step up advocacy efforts directed at employers/nationally owned factories, in order to seek their active engagement with the project.	The project has, early on, invested significant time and efforts to recruit locally owned factories. At this point in time, these efforts have not succeeded. In order to deliver the project in the scheduled time frame, the ILO-GIP invested efforts in recruited its additional factories by soliciting the efforts of other garment producing brands whom all operate through foreign owned suppliers.	In spite of all the efforts undertaken by GIP, MGMA never really committed to select nationally owned factories jointly with the ILO. Apart from the ten factories which were suppliers to H&M, the GIP also engaged another ten internationally owned factories through other buyers such as M&S, UNIQLO and INDITEX, arriving at a total of 20 factories which participated in the project. In addition, the project was already over-ambitious according to the MTE.
8. Coordination mechanisms for the different garment-sector initiatives. The high number of actors, stakeholders and projects underlines the need for enhanced coordination mechanisms for the different garment-sector initiatives in the country in order to avoid duplication, maximizing knowledge sharing and sharing lessons learned, while using comparative advantages of different stakeholders as well as clearly dividing labour amongst different actors.	The project is constantly reaching out to other garment sector projects. It has a close collaboration with the German funded project (Tchibo/GIZ), and the Danish one (MyPod). In addition, whenever possible, the project reaches out to Smart Myanmar (e.g. MoU for the delivery of the GIP productivity training) and Aung Myin Hmu for the delivery of industrial skills training for garment workers and the development of supervisor's skills training.	The project has continuously tried to seek collaboration with other garment initiatives, especially with the two other large projects in the garment sector (i.e. EU-SMART and AMH). A consortium of these three projects was proposed by ILO in order to market the interventions better in a single approach to the industry but this did not materialize in the end.
9. Garment sector initiatives mapping conference. ILO-GIP to lead, jointly with other garment sector initiatives, the organization of a national conference with	This recommendation has not yet been acted upon. As the project will soon be seeking additional funding	Such a Conference was not budgeted in GIP. The coordination efforts were explained under recommendation 8 above.

<p>the participation of the main international brands operating in Myanmar. The purpose of this is mapping what has been done, with what results, and what current actors are currently doing/planning, and most importantly, which institutions are best equipped to deliver what.</p>	<p>for an eventual Phase 2, the need to reconcile the many garment initiatives will arise.</p>	<p>Connection could possibly be sought in a Phase II with EuroCham which has a WG on garments Donor (and perhaps a Donor Consultative Group could be formed related to this sector).</p>
<p><b>10.</b> ILO's support to the promotion of social dialogue and sound industrial relations. For this purpose, it is recommended: (a) that the recently appointed ILO-Yangon ACTEMP focal point coordinates and provides assistance to ILO-GIP to further encourage engagement and commitment from employers; (b) To make explicit the linkages between ILO-GIP with the different components of the newly adopted DWCP 2018-2021; and (c) to enhance the on-going coordination amidst ILO initiatives/projects by developing joint work-plans.</p>	<p>The project and office are following up on this recommendation on a regular basis. The local support of ILO/ACTEMP has been strengthened.</p>	<p>(a) The GIP has established a good collaboration with ACTEMP. It yielded for example the four tools/researches that were presented at the MGMA event in February 2020. (b) GIP is fully embedded in the ILO DWCP. (c) This probably refers to the Joint Portfolio on OSH within ILO, but such a portfolio is presently not existing but could be installed as the number of projects on the garment sector increase.</p>
<p><b>11.</b> MIR Lab and MIRI. The outcomes of the feasibility studies for MIRI should be used to inform the design/inception of Phase II, and possibly be mainstreamed into the national labour market and industrial relations policies as these should not be stand-alone efforts under ILO-GIP.</p>	<p>The report of the feasibility assessment of more permanent industrial relations training have been introduced to tripartite constituents and will be further discussed with the goal to increase the sustainability of all training efforts.</p>	<p>The MIRI Feasibility Studies will be published/printed and then made available to the tripartite constituents and other main stakeholders before the end of the project. They can also serve as a basis to enhance consultations among constituents.</p>
<p><b>12.</b> ILO-GIP Phase II: An outcome of the remaining implementation schedule should be the design of an ILO-GIP phase II. The design process must be based on: the results attained by GIP Phase I; the acquired knowledge and experience; a mapping of existing/complementing projects/interventions (see above); a broad and thorough national participatory process with all relevant national stakeholders (trade unions; MGMA, MoLIP and other relevant Ministries); as well as, the participation of the relevant ILO experts/Departments/Branches (ILO-GIP, ILO-Yangon, INWORK, ACTEMP, ACTRAV, etc.).</p>	<p>The project will imminently start seeking its tripartite constituent's inputs into the strategic orientations a GIP phase 2 could adopt. It is planned that before the end of the current phase, a project concept note and possibly proposal will be developed by the current team.</p>	<p>A few things were undertaken with respect to a possible Phase II of ILO GIP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In February 2020, the GIP has funded the mission of ACTRAV and INWORK specialists from DWT-Bangkok to Yangon, so that they could meet with the tripartite constituents in view of developing a new project on Industrial Relations. ACTEMP also joined in some of these discussions in February 2020.</li> <li>• A short-term Concept Note (Feb. 2020) for GIZ on the Myanmar Garment Workers "Open University", currently being revised as a result of the impact of COVID-19.</li> <li>• A medium-term draft Concept Note (Jan. 2020) on Collaboration between ILO and partner Brands, focusing on social dialogue, OSH and prevention of sexual harassment. This note was shared with 9 brands (e.g. H&amp;M, C&amp;A, M&amp;S and Primark). Each Brand would have to fund \$60,000 and appoint 5-6 or their suppliers (not only garments, but also footwear and handbags). It may be hard for brands to join the ILO in this effort at this moment. It was intended as a bridge between the GIP and a possible Phase II.</li> <li>• A longer-term note on Ideas for consultation (Jan. 2020) regarding a One-ILO coordinated approach in support of Myanmar Tripartite constituents.</li> </ul>

		The Project CTA will provide follow-up until the end of May 2020, but who will take over after that?
13. ILO integrated strategy in the garment sector: Adopting a comprehensive and coordinated ILO response to the needs of the Myanmar constituents and other key industry stakeholders to advance decent work and sound industrial relation in the garment sector, would be highly advisable.	This approach will be weaved in the GIP Phase 2 proposal.	MTE means a 'Programmatic Approach' of ILO: That is the One-ILO proposal meant under Recommendation 12 above.
14. Private sector contributions: In order to avoid conflicts of interest that might negatively influence the employers' and national owned factories willingness to join in ILO-GIP (or other projects) it is recommended to manage the private sector contributions through thematic/sectorial pool funds at the ILO-HQ level.	This recommendation has been brought up to the attention of the ILO in Bangkok and Geneva.	This was found necessary by the MTE due to the assessment that a potential conflict of interest might negatively influence the employers' and national owned factories' willingness to join in ILO-GIP (or other projects). The Final Evaluation agrees with the recommendation to transfer <i>private</i> funds to a multi-donor trust fund based in ILO-Geneva. This was also intended for the collaboration with the 6 - 7 Brands mentioned above.



# Annex 6 Selection of Documents Consulted

## **List of documents consulted:**

- Terms of Reference for Independent Final Evaluation (January 2020): See Annex 1.
- Inception Report for the Final Independent Evaluation (March 2020): See Annex 2.
- ILO (2016): Project Document (PRODOC) including Annexes.
- Original LogFrame (in PRODOC)
- Updated LogFrame (dated December 2017)
- ILO-GIP Project website: [https://www.ilo.org/yanon/projects/WCMS\\_568604/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/yanon/projects/WCMS_568604/lang--en/index.htm)
- MTE 2018
- ILO (2018): Weaving gender. Gender-Equality Assessment (GEA) 2018 (see ILO-GIP website).
- ILO: Five Profiles of Women in Garment sector on ILO-GIP Website
- ILO's DWCP for Myanmar 2018-2021.
- Donor documents and donor agreements
- Annual Progress Reports on 2016-17 and 2018
- Financial overviews of expenditures.
- EU: Everything But Arms (EBA):
  - <https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/10102/2020/EN/SWD-2020-19-F1-EN-MAIN-PART-1.PDF>.
  - [https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip\\_20\\_229](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_20_229).
- ILO (2020): COVID-19 causes devastating losses in working hours and employment. Source: [https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS\\_740893/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS_740893/lang--en/index.htm)
- Government documents,
- Policy frameworks,
- Any draft regulations or laws that relate to the influencing agenda aspects of the project in regard to the garment industry
- UNDAF (2018-2021)
- World Food Programme - WFP (2017): <https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/resources/wfp292739.pdf>
- Workshop and mission reports,
- Websites of Donors
- Other documents/materials/publications that were produced through the project or by relevant stakeholders.

## Annex 7 Details of Types of Training

Type of training	Type of Training	Beneficiaries reached	National and International Service Providers (Trainers)	Immed. Object.
<b>1. Individual</b>	Workers trainings	2,189 garment workers (2 hours awareness raising session on labour law; 1474 women and 715 men)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Fifth Pillar</li> <li>The Legal Clinic</li> </ul>	<b>5</b>
		903 garment workers (45 hours of training on industrial skills and labour law; 157 men and 746 women)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aung Myin Hmu</li> </ul>	
	Supervisors training	206 supervisors (ILO Better Work 2 days supervisors skills training programme; 193 women and 13 men)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aung Myin Hmu and</li> <li>CBI Capacity Building Initiative</li> </ul>	
<b>2. Factory level</b>	Social dialogue (workplace cooperation and collective bargaining)	Workers and trade union representatives as well as management representatives of the WCC of 19 factories There are total 71 (51 women, 20 men) management representatives, total 43 worker representatives (34 women, 9 men) and total BLO representatives (27 women, 23 men) from WCC have attended modular trainings	Capacity Building Initiative - CBI	<b>1</b>
	Occupational safety and health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>28 OSH Safety officers (5 days training programme; 20 men and 8 women)</li> <li>18 Joint OSH committee were successfully established at 18 different factories</li> <li>251 Joint OSH committee members (92 men and 159 women) received 1 day training on functioning JOSH committee</li> <li>587 workers and management (215 men and 372 women) reached through two and half day follow up visits on further OSH knowledge and practice at workplace</li> </ul>	Converge Safety	<b>1</b>
	Sexual and reproductive health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>22 Clinic staff for the 5 days training programme and 19 for the refresher course</li> <li>645 peers' workers (1 day training programme)</li> <li>17 trade unions trainers (1 day training programme)</li> <li>4,771 workers received a (1 hour awareness raising)</li> </ul>	Marie Stopes International - MSI	<b>2</b>

Type of training	Type of Training	Beneficiaries reached	National and International Service Providers (Trainers)	Immed. Object.
	Productivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implemented In 5 different factories</li> <li>Monthly seminars for WCC (7 seminars in total) average 17 participants from 5 different factories (IE person, supervisor, operator from selected one pilot production line and BLO) attended each seminar</li> <li>Each seminar is followed by average (2-3 days onsite training at the production floor in the factory) total 26 days of follow up visit for each factory</li> </ul>	Kaizen Institute	<b>1</b>
	Gender equality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WCC members from 16 different garment factories are trained on sexual harassment prevention policy and implementation (total 173 participants; 28 male and 145 female attended from 16 different factories)</li> <li>Gender campaign to sensitize sexual harassment prevention policy reached out to 1657 workers (1458 female and 199 male) in 9 factories</li> <li>Awareness training on detail policy and prevention reached out to 3717 workers (2924 female and 793 male) in 7 factories</li> </ul>	Care International/Myanmar	<b>2</b>
<b>3.Sector level</b>	MIR Lab	20 days of training on 5 social dialogue topics for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10 (5 male and 5 female) sectoral trade union leaders</li> <li>7 (4 male and 3 female) sectoral employers' leader</li> <li>10 (3 male and 7 female) government officials</li> </ul>	By the ILO Interntaional training center (ITCILO) delivered in Yangon	<b>4</b>
		5 days of training on Building effective labour dispute prevention and resolution systems to three outstanding participants of the MIR-Lab	By and at ITCILO, in Turin (Italy)	
		10 days of training of the Industrial relations Academy for a tripartite delegation of sectoral leaders	By and at ITCILO, in Turin (Italy)	
<b>4.Trade union</b>	TU capacity building	20 Trade union trainers from IWFM and MICS	Few international specialists MDF training and consultancy	<b>3</b>
<b>5.Employers</b>	Employers capacity building	<i>Did not materialize due to reluctance of MGMA to be involved; instead 4 products were developed (see below)</i>	--	<b>3</b>