



# ILO EVALUATION

- **Evaluation Title:** [Final Independent Evaluation: Dissemination of Employment and Labour Measures for Recovery from the Great East Japan Earthquake as International Public Resources](#)
- **ILO TC/SYMBOL:** [RAS/12/06/JPN](#)
- **Type of Evaluation :** [Final](#)
- **Country(ies) :** [Japan](#)
- **Date of the evaluation:** [3 October 2014](#)
- **Name of consultant(s):** [Eriko Ito](#)
- **ILO Administrative Office:** [ROAP](#)
- **ILO Technical Backstopping Office:** [\(CRISIS\)](#)
- **Date project ends:** [30 June 2014](#)
- **Donor: country and budget US\$** [Japan, US\\$1,529,882](#)
- **Evaluation Manager:** [Pamornrat Pringsulakah](#)
- **Evaluation Budget:** [US\\$12,683](#)
- **Key Words:** [Asia, Japan, Natural Disaster](#)

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 Unit.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS .....	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	2
Quick Facts .....	2
Background & Context .....	2
Main Findings and Conclusions .....	3
Recommendations & Lessons Learned .....	5
A. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	6
A.1 Background .....	6
A.2 Project Description .....	6
A.3 Project Implementation Status .....	7
B. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION .....	8
C. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND KEY QUESTIONS.....	8
D. EVALUATION FINDINGS.....	9
D.1 Project Achievement To Date .....	9
D.2 Relevance and Strategic Fit .....	11
D.3 Validity of Project Design .....	11
D.4 Project Effectiveness .....	12
D.5 Effectiveness of Management Arrangements including Monitoring & Evaluation .....	13
D.6 Efficiency of Resources Use .....	14
D.7 Impact and Sustainability .....	14
D.8 Gender Mainstreaming .....	15
E. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED.....	16
E.1 Conclusions .....	16
E.2 Recommendations .....	17
E.3 Lessons Learned .....	18
APPENDICES	
1. ILO Lesson Learned Template .....	19
2. Terms of Reference.....	21
3. Data Collection Plan.....	26
4. A. Evaluation Form sent to Study Tour/Expert Group Meeting/Symposium Participants in 2013 .....	28
B. Evaluation Form sent to Study Tour/Symposium Participants in 2014.....	34
5. Summary of Survey Results .....	38
6. List of Survey Respondents & Persons Interviewed.....	40
7. List of Documents Reviewed/Cited .....	41

## ACRONYMS

APRM	Asia and the Pacific Regional Meeting
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
ILO	International Labour Organization
ILO/CRISIS	ILO Programme for Crisis Response and Reconstruction
JILPT	Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MHLW	Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, Japan
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
ROAP	Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
SSN Fund	ILO/Japan Fund for Building Social Safety Nets in Asia and the Pacific
TC	Technical Cooperation
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
WHO	World Health Organization

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## *Final Independent Evaluation*

### *Dissemination of Employment and Labour Measures for Recovery from the Great East Japan Earthquake as International Public Resources*

---

#### Quick Facts

**Country:** Japan

**Final Evaluation:** 3 October 2014

**Mode of Evaluation:** Independent

**ILO Office Administratively backstopping the Project:** ROAP

**ILO Technical Backstopping Office:** (CRISIS)

**Evaluation Manager:** Pamornrat Pringsulaka

**Evaluation Consultant:** Eriko Ito

**Project End:** 30 June 2014

**Project Code:** RAS/12/06/JPN

**Donor & Project Budget:** Japan (US\$1,529,882)

**Keywords:** Asia, Japan, Natural Disaster

#### Background & Context

##### **Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure**

Since the immediate aftermath of the 11<sup>th</sup> March 2011 Tsunami that hit Northeast of Japan, a number of employment and labour measures have been carried out both by the public and private sector actors to respond to the need for employment. This project entitled “*Dissemination of Employment and Labour Measures for Recovery from the Great East Japan Earthquake as International Public Resources*” (*ILO/Japan Earthquake Project*) aims to collect and compile lessons and good practices from the recovery

efforts in Japan and to share them with a wide circle of the international community.

The project’s immediate objective is to enhance the knowledge on employment and labour related measures in the context of disaster recovery. The two main outputs are:

- 1) Good practices and lessons learnt from past and ongoing recovery efforts in Japan have been collected; and
- 2) Collected research findings have been disseminated to an international audience in the Asia and the Pacific region and beyond.

The target groups of the project are the ILO constituents in Asia and the Pacific countries and beyond who are responsible for planning and implementing disaster recovery policies resilient to natural disasters. By making the research findings widely available, the project aims at benefiting people living in disaster-prone countries, who are its ultimate beneficiaries.

The project was funded by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW) of Japan with a budget of US\$1,529,882. The project was implemented by the ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP), with the project team composed of a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), who also served as a Regional Crisis Specialist at the ROAP, and a Project Assistant, both based in Bangkok.

##### **Present Situation of the Project**

The project implementation started in August 2012 and was originally planned to be completed in March 2014. A no-cost extension of 3 months was approved by the donor and the ILO in March

2014 with four additional outputs<sup>1</sup>. Hence, the project end date became 30 June 2014.

### **Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation**

The primary *purposes* of this evaluation are (1) to assess whether the project has achieved its immediate objective; and whether it has produced the expected outputs on time and within the budget; and (2) to assess any key insights on the project achievements, its efficiency, impacts and sustainability.

The *scope* of the evaluation includes the entire project as specified in the project concept note. The evaluation focuses in particular on the following issues:

- Modality of project implementation including the project management, coordination mechanisms and collaboration among various stakeholders
- Outreach and dissemination strategy
- Challenges faced by the project

The *clients* of this evaluation are the ILO ROAP and the donor (Government of Japan). Target groups considered for interviews by the evaluator are: Government of Japan, Japan social partners, staff of ILO Office for Japan, the project management team, and participants of the study tours and symposiums organized by the project. The evaluation encompasses the work undertaken in Japan and the ROAP.

### **Methodology of evaluation**

The evaluation methodology consists of the following:

- Review of documents related to the project, including the project concept note, progress reports, technical reports, and relevant project monitoring documents
- Review of technical products and other documents and products developed by the project
- Interviews with the project team and

backstopping officials both in Bangkok

- Interviews with key stakeholders in Japan including the donor, social partners, and staff of ILO Office for Japan
- Develop a short questionnaire to be sent to the target groups and to follow up by email / skype / phone interviews

*Limitations of evaluation:* Due to the nature of the project which is research and dissemination of the research findings, it was agreed to focus on desk review of relevant documents and products as well as interviews of key stakeholders. Field visit was not included as an evaluation method to assess the project implementation status and its effectiveness in Japan.

## **Main Findings & Conclusions**

### **Project Achievement To Date**

The project carried out several researches, developed knowledge products, and organized several dissemination activities such as study tours for international delegates to the disaster-affected area, an expert group meeting and international symposiums in Japan as well as a knowledge sharing workshop in Thailand. The project was picked up by several Japanese media, including one of the five national newspapers, which showed a strong media interest in the issue of natural disaster recovery.

### **Relevance and Strategic Fit**

This project's objective to collect and compile lessons and good practices from the recovery efforts from the Great East Japan Earthquake and to share them with a wide circle of the international community remains very relevant and valid in the region which is prone to natural disasters. The project also represented a strategic fit within the context of the policy priorities adopted at the 15<sup>th</sup> Asia and the Pacific Regional Meeting.

### **Validity of Project Design**

This project does not have a standard ILO project document but has a concept note of nine pages.

<sup>1</sup> 1) Organising workshops in South East Asian countries to disseminate lessons and good practices; 2) Carrying out research on relief and recovery efforts by workers' and employers' organisations; 3) Compiling and translating research conducted by other institutions; and 4) Enhancing the project homepage.

Because of its fairly simple structure as well as the time constraint at the project design period, it was agreed between the ILO and the donor to skip the formulation process of the project document. The concept note described overall framework and strategy and its design had a logical sequence and was valid throughout the project duration. However, the concept note did not comprise a logical framework including indicators, stakeholders' analysis, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan, and exit strategy.

### **Project Effectiveness**

The project carried out several researches, developed knowledge products, and organized several dissemination activities such as study tours to the disaster-affected area, an expert group meeting and international symposiums in Japan as well as a knowledge sharing workshop in Thailand. However, the project's knowledge products and reports were not finalized at the timing of those meetings, thus, only draft versions or preliminary findings were shared. In addition, the project homepage<sup>2</sup>, a key means for wider dissemination, did not become an information sharing platform with full access to all the project outputs. Therefore, the project is still in its halfway of achieving its immediate objective.

### **Effectiveness of Management Arrangement**

This project was the first ILO technical cooperation project implemented in Japan, but the CTA was based in Bangkok. This was due to the consideration to the high personnel cost in Japan as well as the importance of collaboration from other technical specialists in the region for wider and effective dissemination of the project's knowledge products. For the research component, the absence of stakeholders' analysis in the concept note as well as the status of the CTA stationed far away from the research implementation had caused significant constraints and delay. In addition, collaboration with other agencies engaged in similar research activities in Japan was not easily established because the CTA

was not based in Japan. Thus, for the research component it could be concluded that it was not effective to have the CTA based in Bangkok.

Also, the work of the CTA, who also served as a Regional Crisis Specialist, was significantly interrupted when Typhoon Haiyan struck the Philippines in November 2013. The CTA's assignment as a Regional Crisis Specialist is beyond the scope of this evaluation, nevertheless, it could be concluded that a careful work planning between the project and the ROAP was necessary in that time of disaster recovery to minimize the delay in the project implementation.

### **Efficiency of Resource Use**

The project funds were delivered in a timely manner and the project's progress and expenditure was annually presented at the Annual Review Meeting of the ILO/Japan Multi-bilateral Programme, which is also funded by the Government of Japan. In terms of human resources, as mentioned above, the CTA's work was interrupted when Typhoon Haiyan struck the Philippines and perhaps a careful work planning and necessary arrangement should have been taken to avoid the delay in the project implementation.

### **Impact and Sustainability**

The project has certainly provided good opportunities for the 20 international representatives who participated in the study tours, an expert group meeting and international symposiums in Japan as well as a knowledge sharing workshop in Thailand. Yet the project's knowledge products and reports were not finalized at the timing of those meetings, thus, only draft versions or preliminary findings were shared. In addition, the project homepage, a key means for wider dissemination, did not become an information sharing platform with full access to all the project outputs. The project is still in its halfway of completing its outputs, therefore, it is not yet feasible to assess its impact and sustainability.

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.ilo.org/asia/whatwedo/projects/WCMS\\_209150/](http://www.ilo.org/asia/whatwedo/projects/WCMS_209150/)

## Gender Mainstreaming

The project does not contain any objective, outputs or activities that aim to promote gender equality. However, the background of the project concept note refers to the need of systematic gender analysis on the employment issues in research efforts in Japan and the main background research paper of the project contains gender analysis to the extent possible. Regarding the gender balance and representation among the social partners, among the 20 international invitees of the project dissemination activities, who are the key target group of the project, it was evident that more balanced representation should have been pursued.

## Conclusions

The project conducted several researches, developed knowledge products, and organized several dissemination activities. The project has certainly provided good opportunities for the 20 international representatives who participated in the project's dissemination activities. Yet the project's knowledge products and reports were not finalized at the timing of those events, thus, only draft versions or preliminary findings were shared. In addition, the project homepage, a key means for wider dissemination, did not become an information sharing platform with full access to all the project outputs. Documentation needs to be published and made available for the ILO constituents in the region and beyond. In this regard, the ILO/Japan Multi-bilateral Programme at the ROAP, which shares the same donor with the project, plans to undertake dissemination activities of the project outputs outside Japan, for example, by organizing a seminar with more participants from disaster-prone countries in the Asia and the Pacific region as well as holding a special session at the ASEAN Senior Labour Officials Meeting in 2015.

It is possible to conclude that lack of logical framework, appropriate M&E plan and exit strategy had affected proper monitoring of the project performance and results. In addition, the

work of the CTA, who also served as a Regional Crisis Specialist, was interrupted when Typhoon Haiyan struck the Philippines in November 2013. The CTA's assignment as a Regional Crisis Specialist is beyond the scope of this evaluation, nevertheless, it is possible to conclude that a careful work planning between the project and the ROAP was necessary in that time of disaster recovery to minimize the delay in the project implementation.

## Recommendations & Lessons Learned

### Recommendations and follow-up

#### For the ILO ROAP:

1. Follow up the remaining work of the project:
  - (1) Publish the project knowledge products and reports;
  - (2) Upload those knowledge products and reports to the project homepage for wider reach and recognition; and
  - (3) Consider some evaluation exercise to be conducted after completion of above outputs in order to assess the project's impact and sustainability.
2. All TC projects should develop a standard ILO project document including a logical framework, stakeholders' analysis, M&E plan, and exit strategy.
3. CTA should be stationed where the majority of project activities are planned to be implemented.
4. In case CTA is assigned to work on other office responsibilities as a specialist, careful work planning is necessary especially for unexpected urgent operations in order to minimize possible delay in project implementation.
5. More gender-balanced representation as well as balanced representation among social partners should be promoted for future similar ILO events.

### Lessons learned

1. One basic but essential lesson is that a proper project document with a logical framework

including accurate and clear indicators for verifying outputs and objectives, stakeholders' analysis covering implementing partners, appropriate M&E plan, and exit strategy is indispensable for smooth and successful project implementation.

2. Duty station of CTA needs to be carefully examined. ROAP needs to ensure CTA to be stationed where the majority of project activities are planned in order to ensure effective and smooth implementation of the project activities.



# EVALUATION REPORT

## *Final Independent Evaluation*

### *Dissemination of Employment and Labour Measures for Recovery from the Great East Japan Earthquake as International Public Resources*

---

## A. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### A.1 Background

The Great East Japan Earthquake measuring magnitude 9.0 hit the northeast Japan on 11 March 2011. Since the immediate aftermath of the earthquake and subsequent tsunamis, a number of employment and labour measures have been carried out both by the public and private sector actors. In April 2011, the Government of Japan launched a job-creation scheme under its ‘Japan as One’ Work Project, and created new jobs through its public works and social protection schemes for the people affected by the disaster. Private sector actors have also extended their support to the disaster-affected areas with private initiatives. These experiences in Japan have demonstrated how crucial employment is in the recovery process. Thus, the post Great East Japan Earthquake recovery process has offered an opportunity to collect and document practical examples of employment and labour related efforts in the natural disaster recovery context.

Indeed, a large number of institutions as well as a few international organizations have been gathering examples and information on this recovery process in Japan. However, some crucial gaps have been identified in those research efforts. First of all, most information is available only in Japanese, which makes wide dissemination difficult. Secondly, the issue of livelihood and employment are one of the least researched areas. The third gap is related to thematic focuses and methodology. There seems no systematic gender analysis on the employment issues. Similarly, few studies have been done with a focus on the elder and persons with disabilities despite the fact that these groups have been disproportionally affected by the disaster. Also, efforts by the private sector actors deserve comprehensive research due to their unconventional and innovative recovery approaches.

### A.2 Project Description

This project entitled “*Dissemination of Employment and Labour Measures for Recovery from the Great East Japan Earthquake as International Public Resources*” (also called “*ILO/Japan Earthquake Project*”) aims to enhance the knowledge on employment and labour related measures in the context of disaster recovery.

The project’s **immediate objectives** is to collect and compile lessons and good practices from the recovery efforts in Japan and to share them with a wide circle of the international community. The two **main outputs** are:

- 1) Good practices and lessons learnt from past and ongoing recovery efforts in Japan have been collected; and
- 2) Collected research findings have been disseminated to an international audience in the Asia and the Pacific region and beyond.

The project consists of two **main activities**:

- 1) Conducting research activities (i.e. desk research and participatory research) and developing three knowledge products (i.e. (a) an inventory of employment and labour policy measures, (b) an inventory of good practices, and (c) a practical guideline on employment and labour policy measures); and

- 2) Disseminating research findings through study tours and a number of workshops and conferences, the publication of knowledge products and participation in various recovery-related conferences organized by other institutions.

The **target groups** of the project are the ILO constituents in the Asia and Pacific countries and beyond who are responsible for planning and implementing disaster recovery policies resilient to natural disasters. By making the research findings widely available, the project aims at benefiting people living in disaster-prone countries, who are its ultimate beneficiaries.

The project budget is US\$1,529,882 which is funded by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW) of Japan through a Framework for Cooperation signed in June 2012 which aims at bringing together the expertise of the ILO with the experience and know-how gained by Japan in dealing with the aftermath of the Great East Japan Earthquake.

This project does not have a standard ILO project document but has a concept note of nine pages due to a fairly simple structure of the project and the time constraint at the project design period in 2012.

### **A.3 Project Implementation Status**

The project was implemented by the ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP), with the project team composed of a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), who also served as a Regional Crisis Specialist at the ROAP, and a Project Assistant, both based in Bangkok. At the time of the project design, the ILO Programme for Crisis Response and Reconstruction (ILO/CRISIS) was assigned as a technical backstopping unit at the ILO headquarters, however, the ILO/CRISIS was dissolved in 2013.

This project was the first ILO technical cooperation (TC) project implemented in Japan. The ILO Office for Japan provided appropriate support to the project activities in Japan. Implementation partners for research as well as dissemination activities were identified after the beginning of the project. Implementation started on 1 August 2012 and was originally planned to be completed on 31 March 2014. A no-cost extension of three months was approved by the donor and the ILO in March 2014 with four additional outputs as below. Hence the project end date became 30 June 2014<sup>3</sup>.

- Organising workshops in South East Asian countries (e.g. the Philippines and/or Thailand) to disseminate lessons and good practices generated from the Japan's post-disaster recovery efforts;
- Carrying out research on relief and recovery efforts by workers' and employers' organisations;
- Compiling and translating research conducted by other institutions; and
- Project Homepage with a full access to all project outputs as well as other materials that will be produced between April and June 2014.

Desk research on impacts and damages caused by the Great East Japan Earthquake was conducted from late 2012 to early 2013 by an external collaborator, followed by an overall review of recovery measures conducted in 2013 by a Japanese research institute. Research findings have been compiled into a research paper entitled "Research on Employment and Labour Measures in the Post-Great East Japan Earthquake Recovery Process" and further edited as "ILO Japan Earthquake Project: Research Report". The research report provides an overview of policy measures taken by the Government and civil society actors including private companies as well as an inventory of 10 case studies. Based on the "Research on Employment and Labour Measures in the Post-Great East Japan Earthquake Recovery Process", two knowledge products have been produced under the project:

- "Highlights of Japan's Labour Response Strategy to the 2011 Tsunami", a summary of the research report; and
- "Guidelines for Developing an Employment Response Strategy for Disaster Victims" to assist practitioners

---

<sup>3</sup> The contract of the project CTA was extended by the end of July 2014.

respond to a major disaster.

The project organized several dissemination activities as follows:

- Study Tour in Kamaishi, Japan, 13 March 2013
- Expert Group Meeting in Morioka, Japan, 14 March 2013
- International Symposium in Morioka, Japan, 14 March 2013
- Study Tour in Kamaishi, Japan, 16 February 2014
- International Symposium in Tokyo, Japan, 18 February 2014
- Knowledge Sharing Workshop in Bangkok, Thailand, 27 June 2014

In addition, the CTA attended the following meetings as a resource person to share findings from the project:

- The 10<sup>th</sup> ASEAN and Japan High Level Officials Meeting on Caring Societies, Tokyo, Japan, 25 October 2012
- The 4<sup>th</sup> Expert Group Meeting on the Great East Japan Earthquake, Kobe, Japan, 21 January 2013
- Joint Seminar: ILO Office for Japan and the World Bank Tokyo Development Learning Center, Tokyo, Japan, 15 March 2013
- The 6<sup>th</sup> Tripartite Regional Seminar by the ASEAN-ILO/Japan Project on Industrial Relations, Makuhari, Japan, 26 February 2014

## **B. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION**

The primary **purposes** of this evaluation are (1) to assess whether the project has achieved its immediate objective; and whether it has produced the expected outputs on time and within the budget; and (2) to assess any key insights on the project achievements, its efficiency, impacts and sustainability (e.g. areas of replication, involvement of key stakeholders and any challenges).

The **scope** of the evaluation includes the entire project as specified in the project concept note. The evaluation focuses in particular on the following issues:

- Modality of project implementation including the project management, coordination mechanisms and collaboration among various stakeholders
- Outreach and dissemination strategy
- Challenges faced by the project

The **clients** of this evaluation are the ROAP and the donor (i.e. the Government of Japan). Target groups considered for interviews by the evaluator are: the Government of Japan, Japan social partners, staff of the ILO Office for Japan, the project team and relevant officials at the ROAP, and participants of the study tours and symposiums organized by the project. The evaluation encompasses the work undertaken in Japan and the ROAP.

The evaluation was managed by an ILO Evaluation Manager, Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka, Evaluation Officer based at the ROAP. An international consultant, Ms. Eriko Ito, led the evaluation. The evaluation process had an original duration of 2.5 months commencing from 17 March 2014, which was modified as 5.5 months to cover the project extension period of 3 months. The evaluation consultant conducted a mission to Bangkok on 26-28 March to meet with Evaluation Manager, the project team and other officials at the ROAP. Interviews with key stakeholders in Japan including social partners were conducted in late March while two questionnaires were developed and sent to the participants of the study tours and symposiums in April 2014.

## **C. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND KEY QUESTIONS**

As required by the purpose and objectives of the evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR) (Appendix 2), the evaluation methodology consists of the following:

- Review of documents related to the project, including the project concept note, progress reports, technical reports, project monitoring documents;
- Review of technical products and other documents and products developed by the project;
- Interviews with the project team and backstopping officials both in Bangkok;
- Interviews with key stakeholders in Japan including the donor, social partners, and staff of the ILO Office for Japan; and
- Develop and send short questionnaires (Appendix 4) to the total 15 study tour/symposiums participants organized by the project in 2013 and 2014, and follow up by email/skype/phone interviews.

Thus, the main sources of information for the evaluation are (1) documents and products produced by the project, (2) interviews with key stakeholders through face-to-face interviews, phone or skype interviews, and (3) a short survey conducted among the study tour/symposium participants.

The draft TOR for the evaluation and a draft evaluation report was shared with the donor and key stakeholders including social partners in Japan for comments and inputs.

*Limitations of evaluation:* Due to the nature of the project which is research and dissemination of the research findings, it was agreed to focus on desk review of relevant documents and products as well as interviews of key stakeholders. Field visit was not included as an evaluation method to assess the project implementation status and its effectiveness in Japan.

Main evaluation questions are listed in Appendix 2, that are in line with the evaluation criteria by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) as well as the ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation (e.g. relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and gender mainstreaming). A data collection plan is attached as Appendix 3.

## **D. EVALUATION FINDINGS**

### **D.1 Project Achievement To Date**

As stated in the project concept note, the project consists of two main activities: (1) conducting research activities and developing knowledge products; and (2) disseminating those research findings.

For the 1<sup>st</sup> component, the project conducted two main research activities as follows:

- Desk research on impacts and damages caused by the earthquake
- Overall review of recovery measures by collecting relevant data on employment measures and the recovery status, compiling 10 case studies, and extracting lessons learnt and recommendations from the recovery efforts in Japan. This research has been compiled as a research paper entitled “Research on Employment and Labour Measures in the Post-Great East Japan Earthquake Recovery Process” which served as a background paper of the project.

The project originally planned to carry out participatory research activities, such as semi-structured interviews with stakeholders including disaster-affected communities as well as participatory workshops with disaster-affected

community members. However, those activities were cancelled based on the discussion with the research team. Those methods of participatory approaches are in general widely used during the course of project cycle, for example to identify real needs of target beneficiaries and to assess the effectiveness of project activities, but not for one research which does not lead into an assistance programme or project. Also, the research team had difficulty in identifying appropriate respondents and they found some people in the target region conservative and not willing to participate in interviews with outsiders that involved revealing personal or private matters.

Based on the research findings, it was originally planned to develop three knowledge products, namely (a) an inventory of employment and labour policy measures; (b) an inventory of good practices (target users: national government officials responsible for recovery policy formulation); and (c) a practical guideline on employment and labour policy measures. An inventory of employment and labour policy measures was submitted by the research team to the project, but the CTA found a long inventory consisting of a large number of similar policy measures neither useful nor user-friendly. The project therefore produced the following based on the research findings:

- “ILO Japan Earthquake Project: Research Report”, a final report for publication which provides an overview of policy measures taken by the Government and civil society actors including private companies with an inventory of 10 case studies;
- “Highlights of Japan's Labour Response Strategy”, a summary of the “ILO Japan Earthquake Project: Research Report”; and
- “Guidelines for Developing an Employment Response Strategy for Disaster Victims” to assist policy makers and practitioners develop a coherent response to promoting economic recovery post disasters through labour led initiatives.

For the 2<sup>nd</sup> component of the project, several dissemination activities of the preliminary findings of the research were organized by the project as below:

- Study Tour in Kamaishi, followed by Expert Group Meeting and International Symposium in Morioka, Japan (13-14 March 2013) with attendance of a total 8 international experts<sup>4</sup> from Bangladesh, Cambodia, Indonesia, Pakistan, Malaysia and the Philippines.
- Study Tour in Kamaishi, followed by International Symposium in Tokyo, Japan (16 and 18 February 2014) with attendance of a total 8 international experts<sup>5</sup> from the Philippines and Nepal.
- Knowledge Sharing Workshop in Bangkok, Thailand, 27 June 2014, with a total 27 participants<sup>6</sup> (of which 5<sup>7</sup> from the ILO constituents).

The study tours were organized for international delegates to have opportunities to directly observe the ongoing reconstruction efforts by the public and private sectors, including community members in the disaster-affected areas. The project originally planned to organize two dissemination workshops outside Japan, but one was cancelled due to the time constraint. On the whole, the dissemination activities were well received by the international representatives (please see Appendix 5: Summary of Survey Results). The study tours to disaster-affected areas and a talk event by disaster-survivors at the symposium in Tokyo were especially received well and worked as means of disseminating the practical measures that had been undertaken for recovery. For the 2<sup>nd</sup> Study Tour and Symposium which were organized three months after the Typhoon Haiyan struck the southern Philippines, a high-level delegation from the country, led by the Secretary for the Department of Labor and Employment, were present to learn more about the natural disaster recovery and gather experiences that could help create a long-term rebuilding strategy for Typhoon Haiyan victims.

---

<sup>4</sup> The breakdown of 8 persons is: 6 from government representatives, 1 from employers' organizations and 1 from workers' organizations, with 7 males and 1 female.

<sup>5</sup> The breakdown of 8 persons is: 5 from government representatives, 2 from employers' organizations and 1 from workers' organizations, with 6 males and 2 females.

<sup>6</sup> The breakdown of 28 participants is: 5 from government representatives (4 males and 1 female), 7 from academic institutes and NGOs, 9 from UN agencies and 7 ILO officials, with 18 males and 10 females.

<sup>7</sup> All 5 participants are government representatives with 4 males and 1 female.

The project has been picked up by several media in Japan, including the Yomiuri Shimbun, one of the five national newspapers, which shows a strong media interest in the issue of natural disaster recovery.

During the project 3-month extension period, two additional reports were developed to fill in gaps in research findings generated from the reports mentioned above:

- Report on recovery efforts by workers' and employers' organizations
- Report on research conducted by Japanese academia and think-tanks

The 1<sup>st</sup> report complements the project's previous research which primarily focused on the Government's efforts and in which documentation on activities by the workers' and employers' organizations was not sufficient. The 2<sup>nd</sup> report compiles emerging Japanese literature by Japanese think-tanks and academia on labour and employment matters related to the affected people.

The project also planned to enhance its homepage<sup>8</sup> during the 3-month extension period to disseminate its knowledge products and reports in order to reach the ILO constituents in the Asia and the Pacific region and beyond as well as the general public. The homepage was also planned to turn into an information sharing platform to exchange lessons and good practices, but as of end June 2014 the homepage contained only the project overview and linked to an article on 1 April 2013, an event announcement of Expert Group Meeting and International Symposium in 2013, and a press release on 19 February 2014.

## **D.2 Relevance and Strategic Fit**

Forty per cent of natural disasters in the world have occurred in the Asia and the Pacific region, with 82 per cent of the resulting casualties<sup>9</sup>. In December 2011, nine months after the catastrophic earthquake and tsunami that struck Japan, the Government of Japan hosted the ILO's 15th quadrennial Asia and the Pacific Regional Meeting (APRM) in Kyoto. Recognizing that rebuilding lives and livelihoods is central to planning recovery from such traumatic events, the Government also hosted a "Special Session on National Disaster Response with a Central Focus on Employment Policy" during the APRM. In the special session, governments, a trade union, an employers' organization and the ILO, which have rich knowledge of natural disaster response, briefed on their activities and exchanged opinions in line with the session's theme. It was reaffirmed that employment policy was essential during the process of recovering and rebuilding from natural disaster.

Following up with the special session, this project was conceptualized and the Government of Japan decided to extend its support to the ILO's natural disaster responses by funding this project. The project's aim of compiling and disseminating lessons from the recovery efforts in Japan is very relevant in this disaster-prone region. The project also represented a strategic fit within the context of the policy priorities adopted at the 15<sup>th</sup> APRM, in particular, "improving disaster preparedness and response capacity with a particular focus on the employment and social dimensions of relief and reconstruction"<sup>10</sup>.

The project has responded to the relevant need of the disaster-prone countries in the region to learn more about natural disaster recovery from the efforts in Japan by organizing study tours to the disaster-affected areas followed by meetings/symposiums to share the project findings as well as other countries' experiences by the participating country representatives.

## **D.3 Validity of Project Design**

---

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.ilo.org/asia/whatwedo/projects/WCMS\\_209150/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/asia/whatwedo/projects/WCMS_209150/lang--en/index.htm)

<sup>9</sup> Report of the 15<sup>th</sup> Asia and the Pacific Regional Meeting, ILO, December 2011

<sup>10</sup> Conclusions of the 15<sup>th</sup> Asia and the Pacific Regional Meeting, ILO, December 2011

This project does not have a standard ILO project document but has a concept note of nine pages. Because of its fairly simple structure, which consisted of research and dissemination of the research findings, as well as the time constraint at the project design period in 2012, it was agreed between the ILO and the donor to skip the formulation process of the project document as another exceptional case following the style of the ILO/Japan Fund for Building Social Safety Nets in Asia and the Pacific (SSN Fund). The SSN Fund, also funded by the Government of Japan, has introduced a flexible and time-sensitive project formation scheme to support countries in the region in building social safety nets, in which aid institutions make a proposal on a project based, with an average budget size of less than US\$200,000, on the particular needs and situation of recipient countries. Thus, the SSN Fund comprises various projects with much smaller budget scale than this project which has a budget of US\$1.5 million, and so its setting is quite different from that of this project. Prompt formulation was deemed essential at the time of this project design, however, probably it was necessary for the ROAP to examine those differences between the SSN Fund and this project carefully and make a different decision for this project to have a full project document as the absence of the full project document seems to have significantly affected the project implementation as described later.

The concept note does not comprise a logical framework including indicators. The concept note describes overall framework and strategy of the project. The project design has a logical sequence among activities, outputs and objectives, and was valid throughout the project duration. However, the project did not establish accurate and clear indicators for verifying both outputs and objectives, but rather listed activities of the project as indicators (e.g. “consult disaster relief and reconstruction specialists and refine a research design” as the 1<sup>st</sup> indicator in the project progress report).

The target groups of the project are broadly defined as “the ILO constituents in the Asia and Pacific countries and beyond who are responsible for planning and implementing disaster recovery policies resilient to natural disasters”. The concept note further states “By making research findings widely available, the Project is aimed to benefit people living in disaster-prone countries, who are its ultimate beneficiaries”. Since the project was not able to enhance its homepage as an information sharing platform with full access to all the outputs, it could not reach such a great number of people as originally targeted. Perhaps it would have been more practical and realistic for the project to narrow its target groups to direct recipients with a list of a few key target countries that have been particularly vulnerable to natural disasters in the region.

#### **D.4 Project Effectiveness**

The project’s immediate objectives is to collect and compile lessons and good practices from the recovery efforts in Japan and to share them with a wide circle of the international community. The project was originally planned to be completed in twenty months starting from August 2012. The project completion was extended for three months to June 2014. As listed in the section D.1 Project Achievement To Date, the project carried out several research and dissemination activities during the project duration, however, all of the project knowledge products and reports were not finalized at the timing of the meetings and symposiums, thus, only draft versions or preliminary findings were shared at those meetings and symposiums. In addition, the project’s homepage, a key means for wider dissemination, has not yet become an information sharing platform with full access to all project outputs as proposed as an additional output during the 3-month extension period. Therefore, the project is still in its halfway of achieving its immediate objective.

There are two main constraints described in the project’s progress reports that caused the delay in completion. First, the identification of bilingual researchers and research institutions in Japan took much longer than envisaged, and so the project’s main research only started in July 2013, after one year since the project’s beginning. Second, the CTA’s work was interrupted for nearly one month when Typhoon Haiyan struck the Philippines in November 2013 because she had to engage in subsequent response operations as a Regional Crisis Specialist. Then, she was assigned to take responsibility to design a new TC project to assist the victims of Typhoon Haiyan in rebuilding

their livelihoods. Since the CTA's assignment as a Regional Crisis Specialist is beyond the scope of this evaluation, details on her assignment as the Specialist will not be discussed further in this report. Nevertheless, those assignments as a Regional Crisis Specialist hindered her focusing on the quality control work of the project's knowledge products during the period of November 2013 and March 2014. Thus, the project hired two additional consultants in early 2014 to support the CTA in the quality control work. The project regrettably could not have overtaken its delays during the 3-month extension period from April to June 2014.

Regarding the project's stakeholders, the concept note refers to the target group as "the ILO constituents in the Asia and Pacific countries and beyond who are responsible for planning and implementing disaster recovery policies resilient to natural disasters" and the ultimate beneficiaries as "people living in disaster-prone countries". These descriptions are rather broad and do not provide any details such as their capacities, expectations, constraints and interests. Implementing partners are neither identified nor assessed in the concept note. The project identified its implementing partners after the project began and it caused delay in executing its research activities. A concise stakeholders' analysis should have been done during the project design period or even at the beginning of the project implementation.

One of the key stakeholders of the project is the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW) of Japan. It is the donor of the project which was executed in Japan. The MHLW was heavily consulted over the course of the project design and its implementation and the MHLW officials participated in all of the dissemination activities conducted by the project. For the other social partners in Japan, representatives from the workers' organizations and employers' organizations were present at the study tours and symposiums organized in Japan. For the other ILO constituents in Asia and the Pacific, a total 20 representatives<sup>11</sup>, from the Philippines, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Indonesia, Pakistan, Malaysia, Nepal, Thailand, Lao PDR and Myanmar, participated in the study tours and symposiums in Japan in 2013 and 2014 as well as the knowledge sharing workshop held in Bangkok in June 2014.

## **D.5 Effectiveness of Management Arrangement including Monitoring & Evaluation**

The project was implemented by the ROAP, with the project team composed of a CTA and a Project Assistant, both based in Bangkok. At the time of the project design, the ILO/CRISIS was assigned as a technical backstopping unit at the ILO headquarters, but it was dissolved in 2013, which was an unfortunate factor for the project.

This project was the first ILO TC project implemented in Japan. When the project was designed, it was decided to establish its project team in Bangkok at the ROAP, not in Japan, although most project activities had been planned in Japan. This was because of the high personnel cost in Japan as well as the importance of technical backstopping and collaboration from other technical specialists in the region for wider and effective dissemination of the project's knowledge products. However, the identification of bilingual researchers and research institutions in Japan took much longer than envisaged, which caused a significant delay in the project's research component. Also, it was not easy for the project to establish smooth collaboration with other agencies that were engaged in similar research activities in Japan, such as the Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training (JILPT), the World Bank, the World Health Organization (WHO), and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), because the CTA was not based in Japan and even though she went on mission to Japan at least every two months during the project duration. Therefore, for the research component it could be concluded that it was not effective to have the CTA based in Bangkok.

It was also agreed between the ROAP and the donor that the CTA would also serve as a Regional Crisis Specialist at the ROAP during the project implementation and that at least 10% of the CTA's salaries would be funded by the ROAP. Consequently, the CTA's work was interrupted for nearly one month when Typhoon Haiyan struck the

---

<sup>11</sup>The breakdown of 20 representatives is: 15 from government representatives, 3 from employers' organizations and 2 from workers' organizations, with 16 males and 4 females.



Philippines in November 2013 and she was assigned to take responsibility to design a new TC project for the assistance of Typhoon Haiyan victims during the following few months. This additional workload hindered her focusing on the project's work during the period of November 2013 and March 2014. The CTA's assignment as a Regional Crisis Specialist is beyond the scope of this evaluation, nevertheless it was probably necessary for the CTA and the ROAP to develop a clear work plan during that period so that the project could hold its delay to a minimum extent.

The ROAP provided adequate political support in conducting the project's dissemination activities. Regional Director participated in the study tour and the symposium held in 2014, and the Deputy Regional Director participated in the knowledge sharing workshop in Bangkok. The ROAP provided possible administrative support to the project, but for the dissemination activities in Japan the project subcontracted logistics and administrative work to other agencies based in Japan. In terms of technical support, since the CTA also served as a Regional Crisis Specialist, there were no other particular specialists in the region assigned to assist the project.

The ILO Office for Japan provided appropriate support to the project activities in Japan. The Office assisted the CTA in coordinating with the social partners in Japan including those in the disaster-affected areas. The Director supported the CTA by conducting a mission to Iwate in 2013 and visiting the prefectural and mayor's offices in order to garner high level political support for the project activities. She also attended the 2013 expert group meeting as a speaker, and joined the 2014 study tour as well as the symposium. The Office also supported the project's media relations which resulted in several Japanese articles about the project, including that of the Yomiuri Shimbun, one of the five national newspapers in Japan. In addition, the Office provided another dissemination opportunity for the project by organizing a joint seminar with the World Bank Tokyo Development Learning Center in March 2013. Several reports on the project activities were prepared by the Office in Japanese and published or placed in the website of the ILO Office for Japan.

The ILO/Japan Multi-bilateral Programme, that has been operational at the ROAP since 1974 with the funding support by the Government of Japan, also arranged a dissemination opportunity for the project during a tripartite regional seminar organized under the Programme in Makuhari, Japan on 26 February 2014. The CTA was given a special session to share lessons from the project at the 6<sup>th</sup> Tripartite Regional Seminar by the ASEAN-ILO/Japan Project on Industrial Relations, which was supported by the ILO/Japan Multi-bilateral Programme.

The MHLW of Japan, the donor of the project, also provided adequate political and technical support to the project. The MHLW officials participated in all of the dissemination activities conducted by the project and provided opening remarks and technical presentation. For the other social partners in Japan, representatives from the workers' organizations and employers' organizations were present at the study tours and symposiums and provided opening remarks.

In terms of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the project performance, the project concept note does not contain a section of monitoring and evaluation and a detailed M&E plan was not developed during the project start-up. There was no project's evaluation schedule either. Lack of appropriate M&E plan was probably one of the key factors that could not minimize the project's delay.

## **D.6 Efficiency of Resource Use**

The project's progress and expenditure were annually presented at the Annual Review Meeting of the ILO/Japan Multi-bilateral Programme between the ILO and the donor. As mentioned above, the ILO/Japan Multi-bilateral Programme has been operational at the ROAP since 1974 with the funding support by the Government of Japan. Since the project's donor is the same as this ILO/Japan Multi-bilateral Programme, the project attended the Annual Review Meetings to report the project's progress to the donor. Adequacy of resources was also reviewed and necessary adjustment was approved at the meeting. The project funds were delivered in a timely manner.

Although there was no particular concern casted over the usage of the project funds, it might be useful to draw an attention to the fact that the project used about US\$140,000 on the key research, which was a large amount of money relative to current international average price and standards, and that the research report has not yet been published as an ILO report and made available for wider dissemination. The original allocation for the background research in the concept note was US\$30,000. This does not indicate efficient use of the project fund which might be advisable to look over further.

In terms of human resources, as described earlier, the CTA also served as a Regional Crisis Specialist and her work as CTA was interrupted when Typhoon Haiyan struck the Philippines. Because of the nature of her technical area, which is crisis response, it was not possible to predict and plan her additional workload as a Regional Crisis Specialist for immediate disaster response operations. Perhaps a careful work planning between the project and the ROAP was needed in that time of disaster recovery and necessary arrangement should have been taken, such as hiring a consultant to work on the new project design, in order to minimize the delay in the project implementation.

## **D.7 Impact and Sustainability**

The project has certainly provided good opportunities for the 20 international representatives<sup>12</sup> who participated in the study tours, the symposiums and the knowledge sharing workshop to learn from a range of efforts to rebuild and restore employment in Japan. However, the project's knowledge products and reports were not completed as ILO publication during the project duration and only draft versions or preliminary findings were shared at the meetings and symposiums. Also, the project's homepage, a key means for wider dissemination, was not enhanced as an information sharing platform with full access to all the project outputs, therefore, the project could only reach the above-mentioned 20 representatives as its target group defined as "the ILO constituents in the Asia and Pacific countries and beyond who are responsible for planning and implementing disaster recovery policies resilient to natural disasters". Some respondents of the evaluation questionnaires referred to the absence of available materials distributed during the events and asked for a complete documentation, including the research report, technical presentations, and the part where disaster-survivors themselves talked about their efforts, to be shared. Documentation needs to be published and made available for the ILO constituents in the region and the general public.

The project is still in its halfway of completing its outputs, therefore, it is not yet feasible to assess its impact and sustainability. In addition, the project concept note does not have specific reference to the project's exist strategy and how the project will ensure sustainability of the project's impact, which should have been considered at the time of the project design.

## **D.8 Gender Mainstreaming**

The project does not contain any objective, outputs or activities that aim to promote gender equality. However, the background section of the project concept note refers to the need of systematic gender analysis on the employment issues in research efforts in Japan. Therefore, at the onset of research activities, the CTA emphasized the importance of gender analysis as well as issues of people with specific needs to be covered. The main background research paper developed under the project, entitled "Research on Employment and Labour Measures in the Post-Great East Japan Earthquake Recovery Process", provides an overview of damages and losses and recovery measures in employment, labour and livelihoods with gender analysis to the extent possible. It also provides an overview of characteristics of the damage by the earthquake from the viewpoint of social vulnerable groups such as women, the elder and persons with disabilities and draws a conclusion that "socially vulnerable groups suffered more damage than others in the earthquake and tsunami" and refers to the importance of examining the damage by

---

<sup>12</sup> The representatives are from the following countries: the Philippines, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Indonesia, Pakistan, Malaysia, Nepal, Thailand, Lao PDR and Myanmar. The breakdown of 20 representatives is: 15 from government representatives, 3 from employers' organizations and 2 from workers' organizations, with 16 males and 4 females.

detail data with different social variables. Consideration and support given to those socially vulnerable groups in recovery measures as well as some challenges faced by women are also mentioned in the report.

About the gender balance among the resource persons of the meetings and symposiums organized by the project, it was often difficult to identify and invite female speakers, but the 2014 talk event in Tokyo managed to have gender-balanced speakers: a half of the four speakers were female. Regarding the gender balance of the international invitees of two study tours, one expert group meeting, two symposiums and one knowledge sharing workshop, among the total 20 international participants there were only 4 females. It is evident that more gender-balanced representation needs to be promoted in future similar events. It was even suggested by one respondent of the evaluation questionnaires to “develop a program design and event management strategy that will improve the participation of women in the symposium and meetings”. Representation among the social partners was not balanced either. Among the 20 participants, 15 came from the government, 3 from employers’ organizations and 2 from workers’ organizations. Since the project’s target group was defined as “the constituents in the Asia and the Pacific countries and beyond who are responsible for planning and implementing disaster recovery policies resilient to natural disasters”, more balanced representation should have been pursued among the social partners, too.

Gender dimensions were occasionally mentioned in some presentations at the expert group meeting and the symposiums but there was no systematic reference to gender issues. The ILO should emphasise that all data in presentations should be sex-disaggregated as appropriate and lessons and/or good practices on tackling gender disparity evolving around the meeting topics should be addressed.

## **E. CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **E.1 Conclusions**

The project’s objective to collect and compile lessons and good practices from the recovery efforts in Japan and to share them with a wide circle of the international community remains very valid in the region which is prone to natural disasters. The project also represented a strategic fit within the context of the policy priorities adopted at the 15<sup>th</sup> APRM, in particular, “improving disaster preparedness and response capacity with a particular focus on the employment and social dimensions of relief and reconstruction”.

The project consists of two main components: (1) conducting research activities and developing knowledge products; and (2) disseminating those research findings. The project carried out several researches, developed knowledge products, and organized several dissemination activities such as study tours to the disaster-affected area, international symposiums in Japan and a knowledge sharing workshop in Thailand during the project duration.

This project has two unusual aspects. First, it does not have a standard ILO project document but has a concept note of nine pages. The concept note describes overall framework and strategy of the project and its design has a logical sequence and was valid throughout the project duration. However, the project concept note does not comprise of the following elements which set an essential basis for the smooth project implementation: a logical framework including indicators, stakeholders’ analysis including implementing partners, M&E plan including evaluation schedule, and the project’s exist strategy. Second, it was the first ILO TC project implemented in Japan, but the project CTA was based in Bangkok.

For the research component, the absence of stakeholders’ analysis as well as the status of the project CTA stationed far away from the research implementation had caused significant constraints and delay. In addition, collaboration with other agencies engaged in similar research activities in Japan was not easily established because the CTA was

not based in Japan. Thus, for the project research component it could be concluded that it was not effective to have the CTA based in Bangkok.

For the dissemination component, on the whole, those activities were well-received by the international participants, including a high-level delegation from the Philippines. The MHLW, the donor of the project, the other social partners in Japan, the ROAP and the ILO Office for Japan provided adequate support for those dissemination activities. The project was picked up by several Japanese media, including one of the five national newspapers, which shows a strong media interest in the issue of natural disaster recovery. Yet all of the project knowledge products and reports have not yet been published and only draft versions or preliminary findings were shared at the meetings and symposiums. Since dissemination was the main objective of the project, all materials/hand-outs including presentations at the meetings and symposiums should have been made available in English to the participants so that they could share them to others such as their direct colleagues upon their return to their home countries. In addition, the project's homepage, a key means for wider dissemination, has not yet become an information sharing platform with full access to all the project outputs and knowledge products. Therefore, the project is still in its halfway of achieving the immediate objective. Documentation needs to be published and made available for the ILO constituents in the region and the general public. In this regard, the ILO/Japan Multi-bilateral Programme at the ROAP, which shares the same donor with the project, plans to undertake dissemination activities of the project outputs outside Japan, for example, by organizing a seminar with more participants from disaster-prone countries in the Asia and the Pacific region as well as holding a special session at the ASEAN Senior Labour Officials Meeting in 2015.

It is possible to conclude that lack of a logical framework, appropriate M&E plan and exit strategy had affected proper monitoring of the project performance and results that would lead to sustainable impact. If the exit strategy was properly considered at the project design stage, boosting the project's homepage, for example, should have been executed during the whole project duration considering the project title of "dissemination of employment and labour measures for recovery from the Great East Japan Earthquake as international public resources". In addition, the work of the CTA was interrupted when Typhoon Haiyan struck the Philippines in November 2013. The CTA also served as a Regional Crisis Specialist and it was not feasible to predict and plan her additional workload for immediate disaster response as a Regional Crisis Specialist. Perhaps a careful work planning between the project and the ROAP was necessary in that time of disaster recovery to minimize the delay in the project implementation.

## **E.2 Recommendations**

Below are recommendations to be considered by the ILO ROAP:

1. Follow up the remaining work of the project, namely:

(1) Publish the project knowledge products and reports as follows:

- "ILO Japan Earthquake Project: Research Report"
- "Highlights of Japan's Labour Response Strategy"
- "Guidelines for Developing an Employment Response Strategy for Disaster Victims"
- Report on recovery efforts by workers' and employers' organizations, as a concise working paper
- Report on research conducted by Japanese academia and think-tanks, as a concise working paper
- Report on Study Tour in Kamaishi, Expert Group Meeting and International Symposium in Morioka, Japan (13-14 March 2013) including full contents of presentations, materials distributed and points discussed at the Q&A sessions
- Report on Study Tour in Kamaishi and International Symposium in Tokyo, Japan (16 and 18 February 2014) including full contents of presentations, materials distributed and points discussed at the talk event, as strongly requested by the survey respondents

- Report on Knowledge Sharing Workshop in Bangkok, Thailand (27 June 2014) including full contents of presentations, materials distributed and points discussed
- (2) Enhance the project's homepage and upload those knowledge products and reports for wider reach and recognition; and
  - (3) Consider some evaluation exercise to be conducted after completion of above outputs in order to assess the project's impact and sustainability (e.g. whether any of the learning from Japan has been applied to any ILO's natural disaster responses).
2. All TC projects should develop a standard ILO project document with a logical framework with accurate and clear indicators for verifying outputs and objectives, stakeholders' analysis including implementing partners, appropriate M&E plan, and exit strategy.
  3. Duty station of CTA needs to be carefully examined. CTA should be stationed where the majority of project activities are planned to be implemented.
  4. In case CTA is assigned to work on other office responsibilities as a specialist, careful work planning is necessary especially for unexpected urgent operations in order to minimize possible delay in project implementation.
  5. More gender-balanced representation as well as balanced representation among social partners should be promoted for ILO events.

### **E.3 Lessons Learned**

1. One basic but essential lesson is that a proper project document with a logical framework including accurate and clear indicators for verifying outputs and objectives, stakeholders' analysis covering implementing partners, appropriate M&E plan, and exit strategy is indispensable for smooth and successful project implementation. Even if a proposed new project has a simple structure and time constraint is severe at the project design stage, ROAP needs to ensure quality design of all TC project documents.
2. Duty station of CTA needs to be carefully examined. ROAP needs to ensure CTA to be stationed where the majority of project activities are planned in order to ensure effective and smooth implementation of the project activities.

## APPENDIX 1: ILO Lesson Learned Template

### ILO Lesson Learned Template

**Project Title:** Dissemination of Employment and Labour Measures for Recovery from the Great East Japan Earthquake as International Public Resources

**Project TC/SYMBOL:** RAS/12/06/JPN

**Name of Evaluator:** Eriko Ito

**Date:** 8 September 2014

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>	One basic but essential lesson is that a proper project document with a logical framework including accurate and clear indicators for verifying outputs and objectives, stakeholders' analysis covering implementing partners, appropriate M&E plan, and exit strategy is indispensable for smooth and successful project implementation. Even if a proposed new project has a simple structure and time constraint is severe at the project design stage, ROAP needs to ensure quality design of all TC project documents.
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	The project did not have a standard ILO project document but had a concept note of nine pages. Because of its fairly simple structure, which consisted of research and dissemination of the research findings, as well as the time constraint at the project design period in 2012, it was agreed between the donor and the ILO to skip the formulation process of the project document. The concept note described overall framework and strategy of the project and its design had a logical sequence and was valid throughout the project duration. However, the project concept note did not comprise of the following elements which set an essential basis for smooth project implementation: a logical framework including indicators, stakeholders' analysis including implementing partners, M&E plan including evaluation schedule, and project's exist strategy.
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	ROAP
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	Lack of a logical framework, an appropriate M&E plan and exit strategy had affected proper monitoring of the project performance and resulted in significant delays in implementation which could not lead to sustainable impact.
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	
<b>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</b>	Even if a proposed project has a simple structure and time constraint is severe at the project design stage, ROAP needs to ensure quality design of all TC project documents.

LL Element	Text
<b>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</b>	Duty station of CTA needs to be carefully examined. ROAP needs to ensure CTA to be stationed where the majority of project activities are planned in order to ensure effective and smooth implementation of the project activities.
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	The project was the first ILO TC project implemented in Japan, but the project CTA was based in Bangkok at ROAP. When the project was designed, it was decided to establish its project team (i.e. CTA and Project Assistant) in Bangkok, not in Japan, although most project activities had been planned in Japan. This was based on the consideration to the high personnel cost in Japan as well as the importance of technical backstopping and collaboration from other technical specialists in the region for wider and effective dissemination of the project's knowledge products.
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	ROAP
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	The duty station of the CTA had caused significant constraints and delay in the project's research component which was one of the two main components of the project. Identification of eligible researchers/research institutes in Japan took much longer than envisaged, and perhaps closer monitoring of the research activities by the CTA could have resulted in higher quality outputs. In addition, collaboration with other agencies engaged in similar research activities in Japan was not easily established because the CTA was not based in Japan and even though she went on mission to Japan at least every two months during the project duration. For the research component, it was not effective to have the CTA based in Bangkok.
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	
<b>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</b>	ROAP needs to ensure CTA to be stationed where the majority of project activities are planned to be implemented.

## APPENDIX 2: Terms of Reference

### Terms of Reference - Final Independent Evaluation

#### Dissemination of Employment and Labour Measures for Recovery from the Great East Japan Earthquake as International Public Resources

RAS/12/06/JPN

Administrative unit: ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific

Technical Unit: ILO/Crisis

### 1. Background

---

Since the immediate aftermath of the 11<sup>th</sup> March 2011 Tsunami that hit Northeast of Japan, a number of employment and labour measures have been carried out both by the public and private sector actors to respond to the need for employment. From March 2011 and January 2012, about 220,000 applicants have filed for the unemployment scheme. In April 2011, the Government of Japan launched a job-creation scheme under its “Japan as One” Work Project, which was followed by a number of other efforts to protect existing jobs, create new jobs through public works and flexible apply existing social protection schemes to disaster-affected people. The private sector actors have extended their support in the disaster-affected areas through a wide range of efforts as well. The experience from Japan since March 2011 demonstrates how crucial employment is in the post-disaster recovery process. The post-Earthquake recovery process thus offers an opportunity to collect and document practical examples of employment- and labour-related efforts in the natural disaster recovery context.

This ILO/Japan Project aims to collect and compile lessons and good practices from the recovery efforts in Japan and to share them with a wide circle of the international community. It is hoped that the final outputs of the Project will better inform future natural disaster recovery efforts and policies including the post-Hyogo Framework of Action (HFA) in the Asia and Pacific region and beyond.

The project is being implemented by ILO, and is funded by Government of Japan through a Framework for Cooperation agreement that assists Asia Pacific countries in dealing with the effects of natural disasters and strengthens the role of employment in early recovery and reconstruction. The project budget is approximately USD 1,529,882 million. The project is being implemented between August 2012 and March 2014.

A Chief Technical Adviser (CTA), based in Bangkok with ROAP's Policy and Programmes Unit, leads the implantation of the Project. ILO/Tokyo provides office space and other appropriate support to the CTA and other personnel working on the Project upon the preparation for project activities in Japan. Throughout the research activities, the CTA consults respective technical units and department in ROAP and HQ. ILO/CRISIS provides support to create and expand a network for the dissemination of research findings.

The project aims to enhance the knowledge on employment and labour related measures in the context of disaster recovery. The Project has collected good practices and lessons learnt from past and ongoing recovery efforts in Japan and disseminate research findings to an international audience in the Asia and Pacific region and beyond. The Project consists of two main activities: conducting research and disseminating research findings.

The project immediate objective is to enhance the knowledge on employment and labour related measures in the context of disaster recovery. The two main outputs are

- 1) good practices and lessons learnt from past and ongoing recovery efforts in Japan have been collected
- 2) research findings have been disseminated to an international audience in the Asia and the Pacific region and beyond.

The project will end in March 2014 and as per ILO policy, a final independent evaluation is to be conducted as per this TOR. The evaluation will comply with evaluation norms and standards and follow ethical safeguards, all as



specified in ILO's evaluation procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations system evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

## **2. Purpose, objective and scope of the evaluation**

---

**The purposes of the evaluation:** the findings, lessons learnt and recommendations of the final evaluation will feed into the design and implementation of ILO projects of similar kind and projects that respond to crisis in the future.

The final evaluation has the following **objective**: -

- To assess whether the Project has achieved its immediate objectives; and whether it has produced the expected outputs on time and within budget.
- To assess any key insights on project achievements, its efficiency, impacts and sustainability e.g. areas for replication, involvement of key stakeholders and any challenges.

**Scope of the evaluation:** The scope of the evaluation includes the entire project as specified in the project concept note. The evaluation encompasses the work undertaken in Japan, ROAP and the outreach country.

The evaluation should focus in particular on the following issues:-

- Quality of the lessons learnt and good practices produced by the project
- the modality of project implementation including the project management, coordination mechanisms and collaboration among various stakeholders
- Outreach and dissemination strategy
- Challenges faced by the project

Target groups to be considered for interviews by the evaluator: - Government of Japan, Japan social partners, staff of ILO Japan Office, project CTA, recipients of the lessons learnt produced by the project.

The evaluation process will have a total duration of 2.5 months (from TOR preparation till finalization and approval of the final report). The evaluator will conduct the evaluation in March 2014.

## **3. Evaluation Criteria and Questions**

The independent final evaluation addresses the OECD/DAC and UNEG evaluation criteria (e.g. relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and/or sustainability) as per ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations 2nd edition (2013) [http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_168289/lang-en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_168289/lang-en/index.htm) Additional cross-cutting issues (on gender mainstreaming, labour standards, and social dialogue) will also be assessed.

*Main evaluation questions:* -

### **3.1 Relevance and strategic fit**

- Does and to what extent the project respond to the stakeholders' needs in the Asia and the Pacific region?

### **3.2 Validity of design**

- Does the project design (immediate objectives, outputs, activities) logical and valid throughout the project duration?
- Does the project interact with the right target stakeholders and target recipients? If not, why? Who else should have been included as key stakeholders?
- Have appropriate indicators been described to measure the achievement of the project?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

### 3.3 Project Effectiveness

- Is the project achieving the planned immediate objectives? If so, what are the main contributing factors, if not what are the main constraints and problems.
- How and to what extent have the stakeholders been involved in the project?

### 3.4 Effectiveness of Management arrangements including monitoring and evaluation

- Were management capacities and arrangement adequate and did they facilitate good results and efficient delivery? Was there a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?
- How effectively did the Project management and ILO monitor project performance and results?
- Does the project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from ILO and relevant key stakeholders and partners?

### 3.5 Efficiency of resource use

- In what ways has the Project used the ILO managed programme resources efficiently (funds, human resources, etc.)? Could things have been done differently or more efficiently?
- Have Project funds and activities been delivered by ILO in a timely manner? What are the factors that have hindered timely delivery of project funds and the counter-measures that were put in place in lights of delayed delivery of project funds?

### 3.6 Impact and sustainability

- What have been the impacts of the Project?
- How likely is it that the procedures and tools developed by the project will be replicated in future disaster situations?

### 3.7 Gender mainstreaming

- To what extent the project has mainstream gender into its implementation and has relevant gender expertise been sought? Have available gender mainstreaming tools been utilized?

*Clients of the evaluation:* ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, ILO technical unit and the donor.

The evaluation will comply with evaluation norms and standards and follow ethical safeguards, all as specified in ILO's evaluation procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations system evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

## 4. Methodology

---

Several methods will be used to collect information including:

- Review of documents related to the project, including the initial project document, progress reports, technical assessments and reports, project monitoring documents.
- Review of technical products (training manuals, technical guidelines, etc) and other documents and products developed by the project.
- Interviews with the project team and backstopping officials both in Bangkok
- interviews with key stakeholders in Japan including the donor, Government and social partners, and staff of ILO Japan Office
- Develop a short questionnaire to be sent to the target groups and to follow up by the skype/phone interviews.

The draft terms of reference for the evaluation and a draft evaluation report will be shared with the donor and key stakeholders for comments and inputs.

Relevant data should be sex-disaggregated and different needs of women and men should be considered through-out the evaluation process. The suggested analytical framework for the final evaluation of the Project is set out below and shall guide the assessment of each strategic component of the Project.

*Limitations of evaluation* – due to the nature of the project which is research and dissemination of the research findings, it has some effect on the methods to be employed by this evaluation.

## 5. Deliverables

---

The evaluator will provide:

1. A short inception report, after the review of documentations and initial discussion with the project CTA, including the work plan and details on methods, data sources, draft interviews schedule, and draft report format. This report should also provide a review of the available documents. It should set out the evaluation instruments (which include the key questions, participatory workshop and data gathering/and analysis methods) and any changes proposed to the methodology or any other issues of importance.
2. A draft evaluation report of no longer than 25 pages, excluding annexes. It will contain an executive summary, a section with project achievements to date, findings and recommendations for similar future initiatives. The report should be set-up in line with the ILO's 'Quality Checklists 5 and 6' for Evaluation Reports which will be provided to the evaluator.
3. A final evaluation report, which integrates comments from ILO and other project stakeholders. The evaluation summary according to ILO template will also be drafted by the evaluator together with the finalised evaluation report.

The evaluation report will be in English. The evaluation report should include

- Title page (standard ILO template)
- Table of contents
- Executive summary (standard ILO template)
- Acronyms
- Background and project description
- Purpose of evaluation
- Evaluation methodology and evaluation questions
- Evaluation findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons learnt and potential good practices (please provide also template annex as per ILO guidelines on Evaluation lessons learnt and good practices) and models of intervention
- Annexes (list of interviews, overview of meetings, proceedings stakeholder meetings, other relevant information)

The deliverables will be circulated to stakeholders by the evaluation manager and technical clearance for the deliverables will come from the evaluation manager.

## 6. Management arrangements and time frame

---

The evaluation will be managed by an ILO Evaluation Manager, Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka, Evaluation Officer who is based in Bangkok. The Project will bear the cost of the evaluation, including the cost of the Evaluator and phones/skype' interviews.

The project will handle all contractual arrangements with the evaluation team and provide any logistical and other assistance as may be required.

The evaluation team reports to the evaluation manager, Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka. The evaluator is an international consultant selected through a competitive process from a list of available and qualified consultants.

The international consultant will lead the evaluation and will be responsible for delivering the above evaluation outputs using a combination of methods as mentioned above

## 7. Qualification of the evaluator

---

- One independent evaluation specialist with a degree on social science and/or economics and other relevant degree.
- He/she should have a proven track record in the evaluation of UN agencies' projects or programmes.
- Experience in the research particularly in the field of employment will be an advantage.
- Background in employment related issues will be a distinct advantage.
- Able to communicate in Japanese will be an advantage.

### **Stakeholders' role:**

All stakeholders particularly the project teams ILO ROAP, DWT/CO-Bangkok, ILO technical unit at HQ (ILO/CRISIS) and donor will be consulted and will have opportunities to provide inputs to the evaluation report.

### **The tasks of the Project:**

The Project team will provide logistic support to the evaluation team and will assist in organising a detailed evaluation mission agenda. Also the project needs to ensure that all relevant documentations are up to date and easily accessible by the evaluation team.

## APPENDIX 3: Data Collection Plan

Suggested Evaluation Criteria & Questions (as per TOR)	Indicators	Source of Data	Method
<b>1. Relevance and strategic fit</b>			
- Does and to what extent the project respond to the stakeholders' needs in Asia and the Pacific region?	- Quantity and quality of dissemination activities - Proven participation of key stakeholders in project activities - Degree of appreciation by key stakeholders towards project activities	- Project Concept Note - Project Progress Reports - Reports on Dissemination Activities - ILO website - Questions/discussions - Responses to Questionnaires to key stakeholder	- Desk review - Interviews - Questionnaires to key stakeholders
<b>2. Validity of project design</b>			
Does the project design (immediate objectives, outputs, activities) logical and valid throughout the project duration? - Does the project interact with the right target stakeholders and target recipients? If not, why? Who else should have been included as key stakeholders? - Have appropriate indicators been described to measure the achievements of the project? - What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?	- Consistency of project rationale (cause-effect logic) with perceived needs - Achievements against Project Implementation Plan - Existence of SMART indicators	- Project Concept Note - Project Implementation Plan - Project Progress Reports - Research Reports - Reports on Dissemination Activities - ILO website - Questions/discussions	- Desk review - Interviews
<b>3. Project effectiveness</b>			
- Is the project achieving the planned immediate objectives? If so, what are the main contributing factors, if not what are the main constraints and problems? - How and to what extent have the stakeholders been involved in the project?	- Achievements against Project Implementation Plan - Degree of participation of key stakeholders in decision making and implementation - Degree of satisfaction / dissatisfaction of key stakeholders	- Project Concept Note - Project Progress Reports - Research Reports - Reports on Dissemination Activities - Mission Reports - ILO website - Questions/discussions - Responses to Questionnaires to key	- Desk review - Interviews - Questionnaires to key stakeholders

Suggested Evaluation Criteria & Questions (as per TOR)	Indicators	Source of Data	Method
		stakeholders	

4. Effectiveness of management arrangements including monitoring and evaluation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Were management capacities and arrangement adequate and did they facilitate good results and efficient delivery? Was there a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?</li> <li>- How effectively did the project management and ILO monitor project performance and results?</li> <li>- Does the project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from ILO and relevant key stakeholders and partners?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Achievements against Project Implementation Plan</li> <li>- Intensity and timeliness of reporting</li> <li>- Degree of participation of relevant ILO officials in project activities</li> <li>- Extent and quality of support activities by relevant ILO officials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Concept Note</li> <li>- Project Progress Reports</li> <li>- Annual Review Meeting Reports</li> <li>- Mission Reports</li> <li>- Job descriptions</li> <li>- Questions/discussions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Desk review</li> <li>- Interviews</li> </ul>
5. Efficiency of resource use			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In what way has the project used the ILO managed programme resources efficiently (funds, human resources, etc.)? Could things have been done differently or more efficiently?</li> <li>- Have project funds and activities been delivered by ILO in a timely manner? What are the factors that have hindered timely delivery of project funds and the counter-measures that were put in place in lights of delayed delivery of project funds?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adequacy for allocations</li> <li>- Time lines for fund allocations and expenditure approvals</li> <li>- Quantity and quality of outputs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project budget and expenditures</li> <li>- Implementation Plan</li> <li>- Project Progress Reports</li> <li>- Research Reports</li> <li>- Reports on Dissemination Activities</li> <li>- Questions/discussions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Desk review</li> <li>- Interviews</li> </ul>
6. Impact and sustainability			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What have been the impacts of the project?</li> <li>- How likely is it that the procedures and tools developed by the project will be replicated in future disaster situations?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quantity and quality of outputs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Progress Reports</li> <li>- Research Reports</li> <li>- Reports on Dissemination Activities</li> <li>- ILO website</li> <li>- Questions/discussions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Desk review</li> <li>- Interviews</li> <li>- Questionnaires to key stakeholders</li> </ul>
7. Gender mainstreaming			

- To what extent the project has mainstreamed gender into its implementation and has relevant gender expertise been sought? Have available gender mainstreaming tools been utilized?	- Extent of inclusion of principle and tools of relevant gender issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Concept Note</li> <li>- Project Progress Reports</li> <li>- Research Reports</li> <li>- Reports on Dissemination Activities</li> <li>- Questions/discussions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Desk review</li> <li>- Interviews</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---



## APPENDIX 4-A: Evaluation Form sent to Study Tour/Expert Group Meeting/Symposium Participants in 2013

### *Evaluation Form for ILO/Japan Earthquake Project*

#### *Study Tour/Expert Group Meeting/Symposium* *Kamaishi & Morioka, Japan (13-14 March 2013)*

To enable us to assess the project activities, we would highly appreciate it if you could complete this evaluation form by indicating the answer that best describes the extent to which you agree with the statements below. Please feel free to write your comments, views and suggestions in the spaces given. These will provide the basis for us to improve the future programmes.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Job Position: \_\_\_\_\_

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Country: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Skype Name (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

#### 1. Contents of *Study Tour in Kamaishi* (13 March 2013)

Please place an "X" in the appropriate box to rate (for example, if you fully agree that the session was very useful to your work, please place an "X" under the 4<sup>th</sup> box). Please write your comments, views and suggestions in the spaces given.

(4: fully agree; 3: agree; 2: disagree; or 1: strongly disagree)

Session Name:	The Session was very useful to your work				The Session Content was very relevant to your work				Any Comments
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
1. Briefing on "Miracle in Kamaishi" and Damage at the Disaster Evacuation Centre									
2. Local Efforts to Restore Livelihoods (1): "Gohanya Ka-chan" ("Mom & Rice") – local cuisine restaurant									
3. Local Efforts to Restore Livelihoods (2): Yamakiichi Co., Ltd. – Quality Seafood from Sanriku Region									

#### 2. Overall Assessment of *Study Tour in Kamaishi* (13 March 2013)

Please place an "X" in the appropriate box to rate. Please write your comments, views and suggestions in the spaces given.

	1	2	3	4	
1. Were you satisfied with your participation in the study tour? <b>Any comments:</b> _____ _____					1.- Fully unsatisfied 2.- Unsatisfied 3.- Satisfied 4.- Fully satisfied

	1	2	3	4	
2. Was the information provided prior to the study tour sufficient (e.g. information on the program, background information on the sites, etc.)? <b>Comments:</b> _____					1.- Extremely insufficient 2.- Not sufficient 3.- Sufficient 4.- Very sufficient
3. How do you rate the logistics of the program? <b>Comments:</b> _____					1.- Poor 2.- Fair 3.- Good 4.- Excellent
4. How do you rate the length of the program? <b>Comments:</b> _____					1.- Too short 2.- Short 3.- Appropriate 4.- Too long

### 3. Contents of *Expert Group Meeting* in Morioka (14 March 2013)

Please place an “X” in the appropriate box to rate (for example, if you fully agree that the topic was clearly presented, please place an “X” under the 4<sup>th</sup> box). Please write your comments, views and suggestions in the spaces given.

(4: fully agree; 3: agree; 2: disagree; or 1: strongly disagree)

Session Name:	Topic was clearly presented				Topic was adequately covered				The session was very useful to your work				Any Comments
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
<b>Keynote Speech:</b> <i>Employment Measures After Disaster: Experience and Lessons in Iwate Prefecture</i> Mr. Ken Kobayashi, Director of Iwate Labour Bureau													
<b>Report:</b> <i>Features of Japan's Efforts for Recovery of Employment and Issues on Employment Recovery Efforts After Disasters in the Asia-Pacific Region</i> Ms. Shukuko Koyama, ILO ROAP													
<b>Session 1:</b> 1. Reports on Recovery Efforts in Japan <i>Labour Employment and Policy Measures Taken by the National Government (The “Japan As One” Work Project)</i> Mr. Eisaku Oyake, Employment Security Bureau, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare													

Session Name:	Topic was clearly presented				Topic was adequately covered				The session was very useful to your work				Any Comments
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
<b>Session 1: 2. Local Survey Report</b> <i>Industrial Reconstruction Situation and Issues in Future in Disaster-Stricken Area in Tohoku</i> Mr. Minoru Ito, Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training													
<b>Session 1: 3. Actions of Private Sector Companies and Organisations to Restore Livelihoods</b> <i>Actions of the Private Sector for Reconstruction and Young People's Successful Work in the Field</i> Mr. Takafumi Okamoto, RCF Reconstruction Team													
<b>Session 1: 4. Towards Inclusive Recovery: Perspectives on Elderly and People with Special Needs</b> <i>Support for Persons with Disabilities in Great Eastern Japan Earthquake</i> Ms. Yoshino Horikoshi, Association for Aid and Relief, Japan													
<b>Session 2 Lessons on Recovery Processes in Asian and Pacific Countries (1) Bangladesh:</b> <i>Employment and Livelihood Recovery Efforts in Bangladesh</i> Mr. Shamsur Rahman, Department of Disaster Management, Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief													
<b>Session 2 (2) Cambodia:</b> <i>Natural Disaster Management</i> Mr. Chuop Narath, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training													
<b>Session 2 (3) Indonesia:</b> <i>Indonesia Responses to Aceh – Nias Tsunami - Earthquakes</i> Dr. Rusnadi Padjung, Economic Adviser to the Ministry for Regional Development													
<b>Session 2 (4) Pakistan:</b> <i>Experiences on Employment-Led Recovery in Pakistan</i> Mr. M. Idrees Mahsud, National Disaster Management Authority													
<b>Session 2 (5) Philippines:</b> <i>The Philippine Employment-Led Disaster Risk Solutions</i> Mr Ciriaco A. Lagunzad III, Dep. of Labour and Employment													



#### 4. Overall Assessment of *Expert Group Meeting in Morioka*

Please place an "X" in the appropriate box to rate. Please write your comments, views and suggestions in the spaces given.

	1	2	3	4	
1. Overall, the content of the meeting was well-planned to provide an overview of policies and measures on employment, labour and livelihoods recovery issues in disaster affected areas in Japan. <b>Any comments:</b> _____ _____ _____					1.- Strongly disagree 2.- Disagree 3.- Agree 4.- Fully agree
2. Overall, the meeting provided good opportunities to share lessons learned from the past and existing natural disaster responses efforts in Japan and other countries in Asia and the Pacific. <b>Comments:</b> _____ _____ _____					1.- Strongly disagree 2.- Disagree 3.- Agree 4.- Fully agree
3. The duration of the meeting was just right. <b>Comments:</b> _____ _____ _____					1.- Strongly disagree 2.- Disagree 3.- Agree 4.- Fully agree
4. The time allocated for Q&A and open discussion was just right. <b>Comments:</b> _____ _____ _____					1.- Strongly disagree 2.- Disagree 3.- Agree 4.- Fully agree

#### 5. Contents of *International Symposium on Employment-led Post-Disaster Recovery* in Morioka

Please place an "X" in the appropriate box to rate. Please write your comments in the spaces given.

(4: fully agree; 3: agree; 2: disagree; or 1: strongly disagree)

Session Name:	Topic was clearly presented				Topic was adequately covered				The session added to my pre-existing knowledge				Any Comments
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
<b>Report:</b> <i>Employment-led Recovery from Mega Disaster: Global Policy Framework and Lessons from Japan</i> Ms. Shukuko Koyama, ILO ROAP													
<b>Recovery Efforts by Public &amp; Private Sectors in Japan</b> <b>(1) Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare:</b> Employment Measures in Areas Affected by the Great East Japan Earthquake Mr. Eisaku Oyake, Employment Security Bureau, MHLW													

[illegible]

6. Overall Assessment of International Symposium on Employment –led Post-Disaster Recovery in Morioka (14 March 2013)

Please place an “X” in the appropriate box to rate. Please write your comments, views and suggestions in the spaces given.

	1	2	3	4	
<p>1. Overall, the content of the symposium was well-planned to provide an overview of policies and measures on employment, labour and livelihoods recovery issues in disaster affected areas in Japan.</p> <p><b>Any comments:</b> _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>					<p>1.- Strongly disagree</p> <p>2.- Disagree</p> <p>3.- Agree</p> <p>4.- Fully agree</p>

	1	2	3	4	
2. Overall, the symposium provided good opportunities to share lessons learned from the past and existing natural disaster responses efforts in Japan and other countries in Asia and the Pacific.  <b>Comments:</b> _____ _____					1.- Strongly disagree 2.- Disagree 3.- Agree 4.- Fully agree
3. The duration of the symposium was just right.  <b>Comments:</b> _____ _____ _____					1.- Strongly disagree 2.- Disagree 3.- Agree 4.- Fully agree
4. The time allocated for Q&A and open discussion was just right.  <b>Comments:</b> _____ _____ _____					1.- Strongly disagree 2.- Disagree 3.- Agree 4.- Fully agree
5. It was useful to participate in both the Expert Group Meeting and the International Symposium.  <b>Comments:</b> _____ _____ _____					1.- Strongly disagree 2.- Disagree 3.- Agree 4.- Fully agree

What did you do within your organization after coming back from the study tour/symposium? For example, any new activities/initiatives established within your domain as results of participating in the study tour/symposium?

In your opinion, what is the biggest challenge in your country to respond to natural disasters?

Any other suggestions or comments to help us improve future study tours/ meetings/ symposiums:

## APPENDIX 4-B: Evaluation Forms sent to Study Tour/Symposium Participants in 2014

### *Evaluation Form for ILO/Japan Earthquake Project*

#### **Study Tour & International Symposium** ***Kamaishi & Tokyo, Japan (16 & 18 February 2014)***

To enable us to assess the project activities, we would highly appreciate it if you could complete this evaluation form by indicating the answer that best describes the extent to which you agree with the statements below. Please feel free to write your comments, views and suggestions in the spaces given. These will provide the basis for us to improve the future programmes.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Job Position: \_\_\_\_\_

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Country: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Skype Name (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

---

#### 1. Contents of *Study Tour in Kamaishi* (16 February 2014)

Please place an “X” in the appropriate box to rate (for example, if you fully agree that the session was very useful to your work, please place an “X” under the 4<sup>th</sup> box). Please write your comments, views and suggestions in the spaces given.

(4: fully agree; 3: agree; 2: disagree; or 1: strongly disagree)

Session Name:	The Session was very useful to your work				The Session Content was very relevant to your work				Any Comments
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
1. Visiting the Earthquake Reminders (1) Former Town Office of Ootouchi-machi									
2. Visiting the Earthquake Reminders (2) Unosmai District, Kamaishi									
3. Visiting the Companies in Kamaishi & Discussion with Managers (1) Riasu Kaisou Ten (2) Yamakiichi Shoten (3) Sanriku Iriya Suisan									



## 2. Overall Assessment of *Study Tour in Kamaishi* (16 February 2014)

Please place an "X" in the appropriate box to rate. Please write your comments, views and suggestions in the spaces given.

	1	2	3	4	
1. Were you satisfied with your participation in the study tour? <b>Any comments:</b> _____ _____					1.- Fully unsatisfied 2.- Unsatisfied 3.- Satisfied 4.- Fully satisfied
2. Was the information provided prior to the study tour sufficient (e.g. information on the program, background information on the sites, etc.)? <b>Comments:</b> _____ _____ _____					1.- Extremely insufficient 2.- Not sufficient 3.- Sufficient 4.- Very sufficient
3. How do you rate the logistics of the program? <b>Comments:</b> _____ _____ _____					1.- Poor 2.- Fair 3.- Good 4.- Excellent
4. How do you rate the length of the program? <b>Comments:</b> _____ _____ _____					1.- Too short 2.- Short 3.- Appropriate 4.- Too long

## 3. Contents of *International Symposium: Working out of Disasters: Job-led Recovery after Natural Disasters* in Tokyo (18 February 2014)

Please place an "X" in the appropriate box to rate. Please write your comments, views and suggestions in the spaces given.

(4: fully agree; 3: agree; 2: disagree; or 1: strongly disagree)

Session Name:	Topic was clearly presented				Topic was adequately covered				The session added to my pre-existing knowledge				Any Comments
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
<b>Report:</b> Job-Rich Recovery after Natural Disasters: Lessons from Japan and Guidance Note (ILO) Ms. Shukuko Koyama, ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific Mr. Erik Davies, ILO ROAP													
<b>Building Resilient Livelihoods: Examples from the Philippines</b> (1) Post-Haiyan Response Ms. Rosalinda Baldoz, Secretary, Department of Labor and Employment													

Session Name:	Topic was clearly presented				Topic was adequately covered				The session added to my pre-existing knowledge				Any Comments
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
<b>Building Resilient Livelihoods: Examples from the Philippines</b> <b>(2) ILO's Support</b> Mr. Lawrence Jeff Johnson, Director, ILO Country Office for the Philippines													
<b>Talk Event: Report for Job-led Recovery by Disaster-Survivors in Tohoku</b> - Ms. Yoko Tanaka, Executive Director: Japan Workers' Co-operation Union (JWCU), Director: Tohoku Reconstruction Head Office, JWCU - Mr. Takeichi Kimigahora, Executive Director, Yamakiichi Co., Ltd. - Ms. Megumi Hikichi, Representative Director, WATALIS General Incorporated Association - Mr. Kenichi Aoki, Executive Director, Aoki DOBOKU Co., Ltd., Representative, NEXT Kamaishi													

4. Overall Assessment of *International Symposium: Working out of Disasters: Job-led Recovery after Natural Disasters* in Tokyo (18 February 2014)

Please place an "X" in the appropriate box to rate. Please write your comments, views and suggestions in the spaces given.

	1	2	3	4	
1. Overall, the symposium was well-planned to provide an overview of policies and measures on employment, labour and livelihoods recovery issues in disaster affected areas in Japan since March 2011. <b>Any comments:</b> _____ _____ _____					1.- Strongly disagree 2.- Disagree 3.- Agree 4.- Fully agree
2. Overall, the symposium provided good opportunities to share lessons learned from the past and existing natural disaster responses efforts in Japan. <b>Comments:</b> _____ _____ _____					1.- Strongly disagree 2.- Disagree 3.- Agree 4.- Fully agree

	1	2	3	4	
3. The symposium provided good opportunities to share lessons learned from the past and existing natural disaster responses efforts in the Philippines. <b>Comments:</b> _____ _____ _____					1.- Strongly disagree 2.- Disagree 3.- Agree 4.- Fully agree
4. The duration of the symposium was just right. <b>Comments:</b> _____ _____ _____					1.- Strongly disagree 2.- Disagree 3.- Agree 4.- Fully agree
5. The time allocated for Q&A was just right. <b>Comments:</b> _____ _____ _____					1.- Strongly disagree 2.- Disagree 3.- Agree 4.- Fully agree

What did you do within your organization after coming back from the study tour/symposium? For example, any new activities/initiatives established within your domain as results of participating in the study tour/symposium?

In your opinion, what is the biggest challenge in your country to respond to natural disasters?

Any other suggestions or comments to help us improve future study tours and symposiums:

## APPENDIX 5: Summary of Survey Results

Since the key dissemination activities carried out by the project was organizing two study tours, one expert group meeting and two international symposiums on employment-led recovery<sup>13</sup>, a short survey was conducted to assess effectiveness and usefulness of those events. Two evaluation forms (Appendix 4-A and 4-B) were developed, sent to Evaluation Manager for comments and inputs, then finalized and sent to the total 15 study tour/expert group meeting/symposium participants. The 15 persons<sup>14</sup> were the invitees by the project, excluding ILO officials and Japanese social partners<sup>15</sup>. In total 11 evaluation forms<sup>16</sup> were returned to the evaluation consultant. The summary results are presented below.

Overall, the respondents were very positive about the events they participated in. All 10 respondents<sup>17</sup> were satisfied with their participation in the *study tours* and found the tours useful and relevant to their work in the areas of disaster preparedness and post-disaster recovery. One respondent commented that it was extremely useful to be exposed to practical recovery efforts at community level that actually worked after such a devastating earthquake followed by Tsunami disaster. The only little negative point about the study tour was its duration: three respondents commented that it was short/too short and in particular one commented that it would have been better to allocate more time to interact with disaster affected people and those working on recovery efforts. Logistics were well-rated including background information provided prior to the tours which was regarded very detailed and helpful in understanding the whole program.

About the *expert group meeting* and the *international symposium* organized in 2013, all 5 respondents fully agreed that it was useful to participate in both events, and 4 respondents fully agreed that both events provided good opportunities to share lessons learned from the past and existing natural disaster responses efforts in Japan and other countries in Asia and the Pacific. All sessions were well-received, in particular country presentations at the expert group meeting which were regarded very useful to the respondents' work. The variety of country presence of 6 countries besides Japan was also appreciated. Two respondents commented that the expert group meeting and the symposium could have been merged into one event as most of the presentations were repetitive, and one commented further that the two events should not have covered overlapping topics and suggested the expert group meeting focusing on policy areas and the symposium on sharing practices and experiences, for example. But, another respondent affirmed that both events were equally valuable especially the Q&A sessions where more time was allocated at the expert group meeting than the symposium. One respondent requested to explore an Asian round of similar meeting or symposium outside Japan.

About the *international symposium* organized in 2014, all sessions were well-evaluated by all 6 respondents and topics chosen were regarded very appropriate. Respondents agreed that job was essential for disaster victims for their livelihood recovery. Two respondents commented that the time allocated for Q&A was not enough and one commented that the duration of the symposium was too short. In addition, 2 respondents strongly requested a complete documentation of the symposium, including the talk event<sup>18</sup> where disaster survivors themselves talked

---

<sup>13</sup> The study tour organized in 2013 was followed by an expert group meeting and an international symposium, while the study tour in 2014 was followed by an international symposium.

<sup>14</sup> The breakdown of 15 persons is: 10 from government representatives, 3 from employers' organizations and 2 from workers' organizations, with 13 males and 2 females. In addition to these 15 persons, there was another female participant in the study tour and the symposium held in 2014; namely, Secretary of the Department of Labor and Employment, Republic of the Philippines.

<sup>15</sup> Key ILO officials as well as Japanese social partners relevant to the project were interviewed separately.

<sup>16</sup> The breakdown of 11 respondents is: 7 from government representatives, 3 from employers' organizations and 1 from workers' organizations, with 9 male and 2 female respondents.

<sup>17</sup> Out of the 11 respondents one person could not attend the study tour.

<sup>18</sup> Respondents commented that some materials distributed at the talk event were available only in Japanese.

about their recovery efforts. Since dissemination was the main objective of the project, all materials/hand-outs including presentations at the symposium should have been made available in English to the participants so that they could share them to others such as their direct colleagues upon their return to their home countries.

Other suggestions for improving future similar events are:

- Increase the number of participants from each country because there are many relevant authorities dealing with natural disaster management and recovery.
- Promote gender-equal representation and develop a program design and event management strategy that will improve participation of women in meetings and symposiums.
- Include more statements and/or presentations from disaster survivors and community leaders.
- Topics should cover issue/situation of migrants.
- If organizing two events: an expert group meeting and a symposium, avoid overlapping topics. Purpose and objectives of each event should be properly identified. A livelier discourse and exchange of different perspective should be encouraged. Below are possible options in organizing two events:
  - a. An expert group meeting to cover policy areas and a symposium for technical presentations. The symposium can precede the expert group meeting and technical inputs from the symposium can feed into the expert group meeting.
  - b. An expert group meeting to cover policy areas and a symposium for practices and experiences because of the public composition of participants/audience of the symposium and its usual purpose for awareness raising/information diffusion.
  - c. An expert group meeting to cover research outputs and conceptual/strategy frameworks (i.e. what could have been done) and a symposium to cover government policies and programmes, stakeholders' experiences, practices, efforts and perspectives (i.e. what have been done or what were viable or practical to accomplish within given resources).
- Give prior assignments to participants to prepare a short brief on their own country experiences with respect to disaster responses and management, and organize a round-table discussion to share those experiences (suggested by a participant of 2014 events where there was no expert group meeting).
- Make the duration longer like 15 days in order to have in-depth knowledge and understanding of policy and practices including tools and techniques applied prior to disaster and during post-disaster recovery.
- Involve more social partners in meetings, symposiums and post-disaster recovery programmes.
- Evaluation questionnaire should be distributed within the shortest possible time after the study tour to assess its usefulness and effectiveness.

## APPENDIX 6: List of Survey Respondents & Persons Interviewed<sup>19</sup>

### Survey Respondents:

- Mr. Golam Mainuddin, Executive Committee Member, Bangladesh Employers Federation (BEF), Bangladesh
- Mr. Chuop Narath, Deputy Director, Department of Employment and Manpower, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training, Cambodia
- Mr. Rusnadi Padjung, Economic Advisor to Minister, Ministry for Development of Disadvantaged Area, Indonesia
- Mr. Jhanka Nath Dhakal, Under Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Nepal
- Mr. Muhammad Idrees, Director, Disaster Risk Reduction Department, National Disaster Management Authority, Pakistan
- Ms. Ahmma Charisma Lobrin-Satumba, Director, Bureau of Workers with Special Concerns, Department of Labor and Employment, Philippines
- Ms. Mary Grace L. Riguer, Officer in Charge - Deputy Executive Director, Institute for Labor Studies, Department of Labor and Employment, Philippines
- Mr. Clifford A. Paragua, Former Labor Attache, Embassy of the Republic of the Philippines in Japan, Philippines
- Mr. Arturo R. Barrit, Director, Education and Information Department, Associated Labor Unions – Trade Union Congress of the Philippines (ALU-TUCP), Philippines
- Mr. Ferdinand T. Diaz, President, Center for Disaster and Emergency Management (CDEM), and Co-chair, Technical Working Group on Labor and Social Policy, Employers Confederation of the Philippines (ECOP), Philippines
- Mr. Romeo Garcia, Research and Advocacy Manager, Employers Confederation of the Philippines (ECOP), Philippines

### Persons Interviewed:

- Mr. Yasuo Ariga, Deputy Director for Technical Cooperation on Labour, International Affairs Division, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW), Japan
- Mr. Toyomu Nakano, Director, General Affairs Division, Toyama Prefectural Labour Bureau, MHLW, Japan
- Mr. Hiroyuki Matsui, Co-Director, International Cooperation Bureau, Keidanren, Japan
- Mr. Ryuichi Ikota, Section Chief, International Division, JTUC-RENGO, Japan
- Ms. Miyoko Taniguchi, Senior Consultant, IC Net Limited, Japan
- Mr. Yoshiteru Uramoto, Regional Director, ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP)
- Ms. Alcestis A. Mangahas, Deputy Regional Director, Policy and Programmes, ROAP
- Ms. Karin Klotzbuecher, Chief, Regional Programming Services Unit, ROAP
- Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka, Evaluation Officer, Regional Programming Services Unit, ROAP
- Ms. Shukuko Koyama, CTA, Japan Earthquake Project, ROAP
- Mr. Panupol Phrommanukul, Project Assistant, Japan Earthquake Project, ROAP
- Mr. Shinichi Ozawa, CTA and Overall Coordinator, ILO/Japan Multi-bilateral Programme, ROAP
- Mr. Sho Sudo, Programme and Operations Specialist, ILO/Japan Fund for Building Social Safety Nets in Asia and the Pacific, ROAP
- Ms. Keiko Kamioka, Director, ILO Office for Japan
- Mr. Shunichi Uemura, Deputy Director, ILO Office for Japan
- Ms. Kumiko Omachi, Programme/Administrative Officer, ILO Office for Japan

---

<sup>19</sup> All titles are at time of interview.



## APPENDIX 7: List of Documents Reviewed/Cited

- Project Concept Note
- Project Implementation Plan (Annex A of the Project Concept Note)
- Project Work Plan for April – June 2014
- Framework for Cooperation by ILO/Japan Fund for Dissemination of Employment and Labour Measures for Recovering from the Great East Japan Earthquake as International Public Resources between The Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare of Japan and The International Labour Organization
- Project Pamphlet
- Project Progress Report (September – December 2012)
- Project Progress Report (January – December 2013)
- ILO Japan Earthquake Project: Research Report
- Research on Employment and Labour Measures in the Post-Great East Japan Earthquake Recovery Process, IC Net, November 2013
- Technical Proposal for Research on Employment and Labour Measures in the Post-Great East Japan Earthquake Recovery Process
- Executive Summary, Research on Employment and Labour Measures in the Post-Great East Japan Earthquake Recovery Process (distributed at the Symposium, 2014)
- Highlight of Japans Labour Response Strategy to the 2011 Tsunami, Erik Davies, March 2014
- Report on recovery efforts by workers' and employers' organizations
- Report on research conducted by Japanese academia and think-tanks
- Guidelines for Developing and Employment Response Strategy for Disaster Victims: A Checklist for Practitioners

About Study Tour, Expert Group Meeting and International Symposium in Japan (13-14 March 2013):

- TOR for Organizing the One-day Study Tour
- List of Participants of the Study Tour
- Study Tour Report by RCF (in Japanese)
- Concept Note and TOR for Expert Group Meeting and the International Symposium on Employment-led Post-disaster Recovery
- Leaflet of the Symposium
- Summary Report of the Expert Group Meeting (in Japanese)
- Summary Report of the International Symposium (in Japanese)
- Final Report by Remote Sensing Technology Center of Japan (RESTEC)
- Report of the Study Tour by Ms. Kumiko Omachi, ILO Office for Japan (in Japanese), "Work & Life: 2013.3", The Japan Association for Advancement of ILO Activities

About Study Tour and International Symposium in Japan (16 and 18 February 2014):

- Concept Note for Study Tour and Symposium on Employment-led Post-disaster Recovery
- List of Participants of the Study Tour
- Leaflet of the Symposium
- Final Report by Remote Sensing Technology Center of Japan (RESTEC)
- Report of the Symposium by the ILO Office for Japan (in Japanese)

About Knowledge Sharing Workshop in Thailand (27 June 2014):



- Concept Note for Knowledge Sharing Workshop: “Job-rich Recovery after Natural Disasters: Lessons from the Great East Japan Earthquake”
- List of Participants
- Meeting Report

Relevant ILO Press Release, Articles and Announcements:

- ILO & Japan Sign Agreement to Support Natural Disaster Recovery in Asia-Pacific, 12 June 2012
- Nurturing Life After Japan’s Tsunami, 27 September 2013
- Expert Group Meeting and International Symposium on Employment-led Post-disaster Recovery, 14 March 2013
- Back to Life after the great East Japan earthquake, 1 April 2013
- Lessons From Japan’s Tsunami Response to Aid Philippines Typhoon Haiyan, 19 February 2014

Relevant Japanese Newspaper Articles (all in Japanese):

- Op-Ed, Yomiuri Shimbun, 5 March 2013
- Article, Iwate Nippo, 15 March 2013
- Article, Morioka Times, 16 March 2013
- Article, Yomiuri Shimbun, 27 February 2014

Relevant Documents by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, Japan (all in Japanese):

- Dissemination of Employment and Labour Measures for Recovering from the Great East Japan Earthquake as International Public Resources (New Project) (Ref.7-2-10-1)
- Project Implementation Status of Dissemination of Employment and Labour Measures for Recovering from the Great East Japan Earthquake as International Public Resources, September 2012 (Ref.4-8-1)
- Concept and Objectives of the ILO/Japan Fund for Dissemination of Employment and Labour Measures for Recovering from the Great East Japan Earthquake as International Public Resources (Ref.4-8-2)
- Project Implementation Status of Dissemination of Employment and Labour Measures for Recovering from the Great East Japan Earthquake as International Public Resources, March 2013 (Ref.4-8)
- Concept Note, ILO/Japan Fund for Building Social Safety Nets in Asia (Ref.9-1-1)