



**Promotion of Decent Work in the  
South Africa Transport Sector (Phase 1)  
Port Work Development Project  
Project Code SAF/10/03/MUL**

**REPORT OF THE INTERNAL  
PROJECT MID-TERM EVALUATION**

**Submitted 30 August 2012**

**by the  
Evaluation Consultant: Prof. Dan Archer  
Principal, Meeting of Minds cc**



***Meeting Of minds cc***

	<b>Page</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1. PROJECT BACKGROUND</b>	<b>12</b>
1.1 Context of the Project	12
1.2 Project Objectives	12
1.3 Funding Arrangements	13
1.4 Organisational Arrangements	14
1.5 Contributions from Role-players	14
<b>2. EVALUATION BACKGROUND</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1 Purpose of the Evaluation	15
2.2 Scope of the Evaluation	15
2.3 Special Focus Areas	15
2.4 Operational Sequence of the Evaluation	15
2.5 Clients of the Evaluation	16
2.6 Evaluator	16
<b>3. METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1 Evaluation Criteria	17
3.2 Evaluation Questions	17
3.3 Evaluation Methods and Instruments	17
3.4 Relevance of the Methods and Instruments	17
3.5 Sources of Information	17
3.6 Limitations	18
3.7 Rational for Stakeholder Participation in the Evaluation Process	18
3.8 Norms, Standards and Ethics	18
<b>4. REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<b>19</b>

	<b>Page</b>
<b>5. MAIN FINDINGS</b>	<b>21</b>
5.1 Strategic Fit	21
5.2 Design	23
5.3 Project Progress and Effectiveness	25
5.4 Project Management and Resource Use	29
5.5 Sustainability	32
<b>6. CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>34</b>
6.1 Conclusions	34
6.2 Lessons Learned	36
6.3 Good Practices	36
6.4 Recommendations	37
<b>7. APPENDICES</b>	<b>39</b>
1. Steering Committee Members for the Port Work Development Project	40
2. Terms of Reference for the Mid-Term Evaluation	41
3. Evaluation Questions	54
4. List of Document provided for the Evaluation	55
5. List and Schedule of Persons Interviewed	57
6. List of Workshop Attendees	58
7. Project Implementation Plan (May 2012)	59
8. Strategy Map (May/June 2012)	63

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AIDS	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
APEC	Antwerp/Flanders Port Training Centre
BDS	Business Development Services
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DCT	Durban Container Terminals
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme (for South Africa)
DWST	Decent Work Support Team (for Southern and Eastern Africa)
EMC	eThekweni Maritime Cluster
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HRD	Human Resource Development
ILO	International Labour Organisation
ITC	International Training Centre (of the ILO)
MDWT	Mission Directed Work Teams
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NEDLAC	National Economic Development Labour Council
P&B	Programme and Budget (of the ILO for the biennium 2012-2013)
PMU	Project Management Unit (for the PWDP)
PO	Programme Officer
PWDP	Port Work Development Programme
SA	South Africa
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SATAWU	South Africa Transport and Allied Workers Union
SERV	Ports Commission of the Flemish Social Economic Council
SES	Senior Enterprise Specialist
SOP	School of Ports (operated by the TNPA)
SOPO	School of Port Operations (operated by TPT)
STC	Shipping and Transport College (Netherlands Maritime University)
TNPA	Transnet National Port Authority
TPT	Transnet Port Terminals
UN	United Nations
UTATU	United Transport and Allied Trade Union
ZAF	South Africa

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The project evaluator would like to acknowledge:

- members of the Project Management Unit for providing the documentation in a timely manner, for organising the interviews and the evaluation workshop, and for being approachable in regard to answering queries and providing additional information.
- the persons interviewed for giving freely of their time and their comments in regard to the project.
- attendees at the evaluation workshop for their frank inputs and lively discussions
- other members of the ILO for feedback on the first draft of the evaluation report.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **BACKGROUND & CONTEXT**

#### **Project Purpose, Logic and Structure**

The Port Work Development Programme (PWDP or the Project) is embedded in the Decent Work Country Programme for South Africa (DWCP) which identifies four priorities areas: strengthening labour market governance, promoting employment creation, extending social protection coverage and strengthening HIV/AIDS workplace responses.

The PWDP is focused on the Durban Container Terminal (DCT), a business unit of Transnet Port Terminals (TPT), a company within the Transnet group, a government parastatal. The Project aims to demonstrate the emerging systems approach to the development of decent work through the objectives of promoting social dialogue, creating an improved environment for “doing business” through focussing on Human Resource Development (HRD), strengthening the capacity of an internal training provider: the School of Port Operations (SOPO), and boosting the capacity of all stakeholders to unlock the benefits of the HRD effort. To meet these four objectives, the project aims for eight outputs.

The focus on DCT derived from the weak competitive position of the terminal, which is due to both technical and people factors. In regard to human resources, a main concern is low productivity resulting from a weak skills base and confrontational workplace relations. Furthermore, the Project is seen as a pilot and Phase I of a programme that could be rolled out to other ports of South Africa and in the Southern African Region. Phase I is funded at a level of about US\$ 1,27 million and is scheduled to run over a two years period: 2011 - 2012.

To meet the above objectives, a Project Management Unit (PMU) has been established led by a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), backstopped by the Enterprise Development Specialist (EDS) and supported by staff of the DWCP and outside partners. The Project is overseen by a Steering Committee comprising representatives of the ILO, the donors, TPT management and the two unions representing workers in TPT: the South Africa Transport and Allied Workers Union (SATAWU) and the United Transport and Allied Trade Union (UTATU).

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

At the time of this evaluation, a total of 12 of the 40 activities are complete. The Project has faced a number of delays but is now proceeding in a satisfactory manner. The scope of the project has been narrowed to better address the objectives within the resources that are available and changes have been made to some activities to better meet the needs of the organisation.

## **Purpose, Scope and Clients of the Evaluation**

This Internal Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) aims to assess progress in the delivery of the outputs and outcomes of the Project.

The terms of reference requested the evaluation to focus on relevance and fit, validity of design, progress and effectiveness, effectiveness of management arrangements, efficiency of resource use, and sustainability.

The evaluation is aimed at project stakeholders in particular the Steering Committee, enabling them to take decisions regarding the interventions and emphasis during the remaining time of the Project.

## **Methodology of the Evaluation**

The evaluation is based on a review of documents and reports provided by the ILO, interviews with a selection of 17 key stakeholders and an evaluation workshop attended by 14 people. This choice of methodology is considered appropriate for a project of this nature: allowing the evaluator to measure progress against agreed outputs and targets and providing opportunities for personal and collective inputs.

Limitations to the evaluation include: an inability in the time available to interview all key stakeholders, an inability to unpack all issues, and distractions caused by interviewees and participants introducing issues beyond the scope of the Project.

A first draft of this report was prepared on 27 July 2012, for which feedback was received. However, one interview could not take place until 3 August 2012 and a meeting of the Project Steering Committee is scheduled for 8 August 2012. For this, the evaluator has been asked to prepare this second draft ahead of the meeting and to present a summary of draft recommendations at the meeting. A final report will be prepared after the meeting.

## **MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

In regard to strategic fit, the Project is appropriate to the objectives of the ILO, the South African DWCP, and key constituencies. In particular, the PWDP is anchored by, is in line with, and is supportive of a number of outcomes related to the promotion of sustainable enterprises creating productive and decent jobs: the ILO Programme and Budget Outcome 3, Country Outcomes ZAF 101 and 2.2, and DWCP Outcome 4; and, in particular, DWCP Output 4.5: support for increased competitiveness of large scale enterprises.

In addition, the Project is supportive of other outcomes such as DWCP Outcomes 5, 7 and 9 related to skills development, improved safety and health, and the capacitating of social partners to contribute to effective social dialogue and sound industrial relations.

With regard to the recipient organisation, TPT and in particular DCT, the Project Document acknowledges that the Port suffers from weak competitiveness which is due to both technical and people factors. In regard to human resources, a main concern is low productivity resulting from a lack of skills and confrontational workplace relations. Hence, this type of intervention - aimed at skills development and social dialogue - is critical to addressing such issues.

In regard to the design, the project is structured appropriately to meet the objectives and outcomes, particularly in regard to introducing social dialogue and strengthening the SOPO. However, it is difficult for the Project to address HRD policies as these are typically decided at a higher level in the organisation. Activities to address the objective of unlocking the benefits to port workers are mainly scheduled for the second half of the project.

Although there was extensive consultation at the outset, the Project faced issues related to staff changes within the constituent groups, and conflictive relationships and poor communication within some constituencies. As the project progressed, it was also necessary to adjust some activities to better address the needs of the recipient organisation, particularly the SOPO. Hence, in retrospect, more time should have been given in the design phase to forging and re-forging relationships, both within and between constituent groups, and a purposeful needs analysis at the outset would have assisted in a better definition of activities.

While women's concerns have been mainstreamed in the activities, the evaluator has not been made aware of any efforts to set and seek to attain minimum outreach targets for women.

In regard to progress, the Project has been subject to a number of delays but is now progressing in a reasonably satisfactory manner. Highlights of the project have included the Study Tour, the Chief Instructor Training, the implementation of the Mission Directed Work Teams Programme and the Social Dialogue Workshop, all of which are judged to have been of a high quality and beneficial. A mix of hard and soft skills is being imparted and tangible products will remain after the intervention. However, with the Project Strategy Map reporting only 12 of the 40 activities as being completed, an extension of time and an acceleration in delivery is required if the Project is to meet its goals.

In regard to management and resource use, the technical and financial resources are adequate and performance monitoring is effective. Project staff is considered approachable and responsive. Comment was received that the ILO could possibly have been more proactive in anticipating and troubleshooting issues (such as the communication "bottlenecks" described above and the TPT's international travel policy which prevented the Project sending staff on a scheduled training session in Antwerp).



And, comment was also received that, given that members of the PMU were new to the ILO and there was a need to adjust to the vagaries of working in a large, complex and dynamic organisation, the ILO could have provided the Project staff with more support to address such issues. However, taking note on the difficulties and possible repercussions of intervening in constituents' internal processes, the ILO probably did everything it possible could in the circumstances to address the issues.

In regard to sustainability, progress is being made toward building internal capacity. It is pleasing to see representatives of the two unions participating together but trust is fragile. There is a major concern about the level of participation from management, which is interpreted as a lack of commitment. This must be addressed if the Project is not to lose its credibility with other stakeholders. From a Union perspective, this Project will not be deemed successful unless there are tangible benefits to workers before it closes.

Change is uncomfortable and the organisational changes being initiated by this project will take a long time to achieve. There are some people who have not yet "bought in" to the value of changing the way they go about their work. Essential components of the next few months will be an exit strategy and mechanisms to ensure activities introduced through the PWDP continue to prosper.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED**

### **Main Recommendations**

At this mid-point of the project, and based on this Internal Mid-Term Evaluation, it is possible to make a number of recommendations with a view to addressing key issues and ensuring the PWDP remains on track.

In regard to the overall management of the Project, it is recommended that:

1. the Steering Committee at its 8 August meeting grant an extension in time to the Project (proposed as being to May/June 2013) at no extra cost, as being necessary if the objectives of the project are to be met.
2. the ILO, together with appropriate members of the Steering Committee within the month approach the key stakeholders of the Project (Transnet, TPT, SATAWU and UTATU) at the highest levels to discuss the concerns raised in this report and to seek to generate signals and, where appropriate, instructions to address the concerns, so that all parties fully participate in and secure the benefits of the remainder of the project. In the case of TPT, it is essential that the Chief Executive be seen to regard the Project as important, and the new General Manager Human Resources and DCT Terminal Executive be visible and active in its implementation. Delegation should occur only by exception and, in such a case, the delegate should be fully empowered.
3. the Steering Committee and the PMU consider forming project sub-committees to focus on key objectives such as social dialogue and training.
4. the PMU, together with the Project constituencies, within the month draw up a Communication Plan to ensure all avenues are being used to give publicity to the Project (including newsletters, internal publications such as *Portside*, e-mail news flashes) and, at the same time, manage expectations.

In regard to implementation, it is recommended that:

5. the Steering Committee consider locating the CTA at DCT for the reminder of Phase I; or, failing this, the CTA make more frequent visits to DCT so as to be more visible and approachable at the “coal face” of the intervention, and able to participate as a coach and team builder in a variety of forums.

In regard to individual activities, it is recommended that:

6. the CTA reconvene participants of the Study Tour to review the learning experience and progress since, and to then put in place a plan to ensure that appropriate interventions are implementation at DCT. One such project could be to explore “labour pools” a potentially contentious idea, but one that would enable the participants to draw on and test the social dialogue skills that they have acquired.
7. the Steering Committee, together with the CTA, explore the merger of the SOPO and the SOP as an opportunity to assist with institutional development and strategy formulation in the context of social dialogue.
8. the CTA ensure that the proposed activity regarding competency profiling and training plans fully reflects the needs for all training, including artisanal and technical training.
9. more attention could be given to gender during the remainder of the project. Selection criteria for training could explicitly recommend the inclusion of women, and the project targets could align with TPT’s gender targets/policies.
10. the Steering Committee give consideration to an activity to address an issue relevant to DCT (such as employee assistance) with the intent that recommendations may flow up for consideration and possible approval at a national level; thus exploring the ability for TPT to adjust its policies to take the particular concerns of each port into consideration.

In regard to planning and monitoring, it is recommended that:

11. the PMU update the key planning and reporting documents (including the Implementation Plan) to reflect the current status of and plans for activities (as well as incorporating new activities such as planner training). It is now understood revised plans will be submitted to the next Steering Committee meeting on 8 August 2012.
12. the PMU generate a monthly progress report for Steering Committee members to ensure they are aware of, and can interact with their constituencies, on progress and issues as they may arise between meetings of the Steering Committee.

In regard to sustainability:

13. the PMU give consideration now to an exit strategy to ensure continuity of the project, aspects of which may include confirming champions in the SOPO and at DCT, the development of a team active at the coalface to address issues at an early stage, and allowing the CTA to phase out his involvement with DCT over a period a time, so as to address the concern that subsequent phases of the project will see a roll out to other ports and into Africa, before stakeholders see the needs of DCT as being fully addressed.

## Important Lessons Learned

The lessons learned in the Project include:

1. The interventions, in particular those relating to social dialogue and skills development, are suitable to the needs of the recipient organisation and are supportive of promoting the emerging systems approach to the development of decent work
2. While it was expected that the Project would face the inherent tensions between management and labour, the Project has also illustrated the importance of addressing suspicions between labour organisations, as well as communication and conflicts *within* the structures of each of the constituencies.
3. Such issues can easily resurface with each new person introduced into the Project and with each new issue that arises; hence consensus may have to be built and rebuilt several times.
4. For this Project, the implementation deadlines were overly optimistic and it is clear that adequate time is needed at the project design and inception to cope with the various issues that can arise; and, during implementation, the Project should be ready for and able to cope with such issues and the delays that may arise.
5. Given that troubleshooting is almost inevitably needed during a project, a plan should and could be in place for a door to be open at the appropriate level within the structures of all the stakeholders to be able to address the concern at an early stage, before it escalates and causes consternation and delays..
6. It is noted that the Project does not aim to address all the issues at DCT and Transnet and TPT are evolving their own plans at various levels independently of the Project; hence, it is appropriate to ask the question as to whether there is a lesson here that the Project is (as one interviewee described it) “fixing leaks”, rather than seeking to address the needs of TPT and DCT in a holistic manner.

## Good Practices

1. To date, the interventions most appreciated and relevant have been the Study Tour, Social Dialogue Workshop and the various training initiatives.
2. Where appropriate to needs, these are suitable to be rolled out to other ports in South and Southern Africa, as well as to other large scale enterprises. Given that the Project has been able to considerably enhance the capacity of the SOPO, the School is becoming well positioned to play a wider skills development role.
3. The open door, participatory and responsive stance of the PMU has been well appreciated by all stakeholders and should be reproduced.
4. The Project has had the flexibility to adjust activities and timeframes when issues arise, which is inherently useful during other projects.

## **1. PROJECT BACKGROUND**

### **1.1 Context of the Project**

The Port Work Development Project (PWDP) is embedded in the Decent Work Country Programme for South Africa (DWCP) which was launched in September 2010 by the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the Government of South Africa (SA), Representative Employers' and Workers' Organisations and the Community Constituency, after a consultative process through the National Economic Development and Labour Council (NEDLAC).

The ILO's involvement in the DWCP derives from the ILO Programme and Budget (P&B) for the Biennium 2012-13, which emphasises decent work for balanced and equitable growth and which is, in turn, supported by five strategic objectives and 19 outcomes.

The DWCP for South Africa (refer to page 21) provides a summary of the constituents' priorities which are the following: (i) strengthening fundamental principles and rights at work, (ii) promotion of employment, (iii) strengthening and broadening social protection coverage and (iv) strengthening tri-partism and social dialogue. The Programme in turn identifies nine outcomes, each of which has its own outputs. In support of the foregoing, a number of specific initiatives or programmes have been established, the PWDP being one of these.

### **1.2 Project Objectives**

The overall objective of the PWDP is described as "the creation of decent employment for women and men" and the project outcome is "sustainable port businesses that create decent and productive jobs including for youth, women and people living with disabilities".

The PWDP is conceived as having three phases:

- Phase I: a pilot project in KwaZulu-Natal, of 18 – 24 months duration, which aims to demonstrate the emerging systems approach to the promotion of decent work.
- Phase II: a replication in other ports of South Africa.
- Phase III: a roll-out into other ports in Africa.

Phases II and III depend on progress and lessons learned from Phase I, as well as securing additional funding support.

The focus of this Internal Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is on Phase I of the PWDP, the pilot project, which in this report is also referred to as "the Project".

There are four immediate objectives of the Project, which are inspired by the system enterprise development approach of the ILO, viz to:

- promote a more dialogue driven mediation of stakeholder interests, with the Project having influence at a meta level of impacting on norms, values and perceptions. In this report, this is simplified and referred to as Objective 1: Social Dialogue.
- create a more conducive policy and regulatory framework with an emphasis on Human Resource Development (HRD), working at the macro level of doing business. This is referred to as Objective 2: HRD Policies.
- strengthen the capacity of local Business Development Services (BDS), predominantly the School of Port Operations (SOPO) to provide workforce centred training and advisory services, working at a meso-level. This is referred to Objective 3: SOPO.
- boost the capacity of all DCT stakeholders to fully unlock the benefits of the HRD effort, working at the micro level. This is referred to as Objective 4: Unlocking the Benefits.

The above immediate objectives are supported by a variety of activities with appropriate outputs and outcome indicators, as set up in the Logical Framework and which are subject to monitoring, reporting and now this Internal Mid-Term Evaluation.

Two target groups are described:

- immediate beneficiaries: unions, terminal management, and the SOPO as a service provider (the prime targets of the Project)
- ultimate beneficiaries: employees, as well as other employers and external stakeholders (reachable through the immediate beneficiaries, thus creating local ownership).

### **1.3 Funding Arrangements**

The Project (i.e., Phase 1 only) has secured commitments as follows:

- US\$ 635 000 from the Government of Flanders
- US\$ 635 000 from the Government of the Netherlands
- US\$ 250 000 from Transnet, in cash and kind.

These amounts total US\$ 1,52 million though, for reporting purposes, the Project only reports on the donor funds totalling US\$ 1,27 million.

## **1.4 Organisational Arrangements**

A Project Management Unit (PMU) has been established for the Project comprising:

- Neeran Ramjuthan, Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), based in Durban, who acts as the full time project manager/coordinator
- Luzelle Lestrade, Programme Officer (PO), based in Pretoria who, on a 50% shared basis, provides quality control, monitoring and evaluation and assistance with implementation of the Project
- Likomang Moeketsi, Finance and Administration Assistant (FAA), based in Pretoria who, on a full-time basis, provides finance and administrative support to the project.

The CTA reports to Andreas Klemmer, Senior Enterprise Specialist (SES), based in Pretoria, who in turn reports to Vic van Vuuren, ILO Area Office Director for South Africa.

It is understood that the PO reports both to the CTA and to the SES.

The CTA is presently based with the People Transformation Unit, within the Human Resources Division of the TPT Offices in Morningside, Durban.

## **1.5 Contributions from Role-players**

Other than the roles played by the ILO/PMU and the contributions from the funders, the Project is:

- guided by a Project Steering Committee, comprising representatives from the ILO, the donors, TPT and the relevant unions: the South African Transport and Allied Workers Union (SATAWU) and the United Transport and Allied Trade Union (UTATU). Members of the Steering Committee are listed in Appendix 1. The Steering Committee was first convened in August 2011 and has met a total of four times (August 2011, September 2011, February 2012 and April 2012). The next meeting is scheduled for 8 August 2012.
- supported by TPT through the provision of an office for the CTA and rooms for meetings.
- supported further by the ILO through the provision of specialist inputs from the office of the ILO DWCP Decent Work Support Team (DWST) for Southern and Eastern Africa in Pretoria.
- forging strategic development partnerships between TPT and the Antwerp/Flanders Port Training Centre (APEC) and the Shipping and Transport College (STC) of the Netherlands Maritime University in Rotterdam (which both provide port-specific training and advisory services) and the Ports Commission of the Flemish Social Economic Council (SERV).

## 2. EVALUATION BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of the Internal Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is described as enabling project staff, constituents and other relevant stakeholders to assess the progress in the delivery of the project outcomes and, based on this assessment, to take decisions regarding the interventions and the emphasis during the remaining time of the project.

### 2.2 Timing and Scope of the Evaluation

The period to be evaluated runs from the start of the Project in Jan 2010 to the end of June 2012.

The period over which this evaluation was conducted runs from 9 July – 7 August 2012.

The operational areas of the evaluation are:

- People Transformation Unit, TPT Offices in Morningside, Durban
- Durban Container Terminals, Port of Durban
- Meeting of Minds' office, Pietermaritzburg.

### 2.3 Special Focus Areas

The Terms of Reference requests the evaluator to focus on:

- relevance and strategic fit
- validity of design
- progress and effectiveness of project
- effectiveness of management and efficiency of resource use
- sustainability.

### 2.4 Operational Sequence of the Evaluation

The operational sequence of the evaluation is summarised as:

Activity	9 – 13 Jul	16 – 20 Jul	22 – 27 Jul	30 Jul – 3 Aug	6 – 7 Aug
Inception					
Doc. Review					
Interviews					
Workshop					
Draft Report					
Comments					
Final Report					

A first draft of this report was prepared on schedule 27 July 2012, for which feedback was received. However, one interview could not take place until 3 August 2012 and a meeting of the Project Steering Committee was scheduled for 8 August 2012. For this, the evaluator was asked to prepare a second draft ahead of the meeting and to present a summary of draft recommendations at the meeting. The meeting determined that Steering Committee members should also be given an opportunity to comment on the draft report, which comments were received by the evaluator on 30 August 2012 and were taken into consideration in this final report.

## **2.5 Clients of the Evaluation**

The clients of the evaluation include the Project Steering Committee, the ILO (project staff, senior staff and other field staff), the donors, TPT/DCT, the Unions and other constituencies.

## **2.6 Evaluator**

This evaluation was carried out by Prof. Dan Archer, principal of Meeting of Minds cc, which is a consultancy that specialises in organisational and institutional development, business planning, project management and project evaluation.

The logistics of the evaluation (supply of documents, interviews and workshop) were organised by staff of the PMU, which coordination and liaison is gratefully acknowledged.



### **3. METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Evaluation Criteria**

The Terms of Reference (included as Appendix 2) requests the evaluator to focus on the following criteria:

- relevance and strategic fit
- validity of design
- progress and effectiveness of project
- effectiveness of management and efficiency of resource use
- sustainability.

#### **3.2 Evaluation Questions**

In keeping with the above evaluation criteria, a number of evaluation questions were suggested, as outlined in Appendix 3.

#### **3.3 Evaluation Methods and Instruments**

The evaluation was based on:

- a review of documents provided by the PMU (listed in Appendix 4)
- interviews with a selection of key stakeholders. Although the contract suggested 10 interviews, the evaluator has conducted 12 in-person interviews and 6 telephone interviews for a total of 18 interviews. One proposed interviewee did not respond and a further proposed interviewee was incorporated into the workshop. The List and Schedule of Persons Interviewed is provided as Appendix 5.
- a workshop which was attended by 14 participants (listed in Appendix 6).

The interviews and the workshop were structured and guided by the evaluation questions (Appendix 3). In addition, the evaluator allowed time for free-flowing conversation and discussion to enable the interviewees and participants to focus on aspects of the Project important to them: positive and negative, as well as the challenges to be faced.

This evaluation report is structured in line with Checklist 4: Formatting Requirements for Evaluation Reports (ILO, July 2010) and the Terms of Reference (Appendix 2).

#### **3.4 Relevance of the Methods and Instruments**

The evaluator considers the above methods and instruments to be relevant to the evaluation.

#### **3.5 Sources of Information**

The sources of information are listed in Appendix 4.

### **3.6 Limitations**

The limitations of the evaluation would include:

- inability in the time available to interview all key stakeholders
- inability to unpack all issues
- distractions caused by interviewees and participants introducing issues beyond the scope of the Project.

### **3.7 Rational for Stakeholder Participation in the Evaluation Process**

The reasons for stakeholder participation in the evaluation process would include:

- securing a sample of opinions from key constituencies
- demonstrating to stakeholders the value of their inputs
- cementing stakeholder buy-in to the continuation of the project.

### **3.8 Norms, Standards and Ethics**

The evaluator has to the best of his ability conducted this evaluation in line with United Nations Evaluation Group Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System.

#### 4. REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION

Discussions about the Project were initiated in 2009 and, once the terms of reference were agreed and a budget secured, it was anticipated that the Project would be implemented in January 2011 and be completed by November 2012. However, a variety of delays have been encountered both at the beginning and during the Project, and a number of changes have been made to the Project.

The delays at the beginning of the project were due to such factors as:

- securing staff for the PMU, with the CTA only being appointed in July/August 2011, the PO being appointed in August 2011 and the FAA being appointed in November 2011.
- changes in leadership of organised labour and port management that required re-starting the discussions repeatedly
- communication “bottlenecks” inside union structures and between unions.

Delays during the project have been due to such factors as:

- securing a response from and discussing an appropriate project for STC
- scheduling and securing participants for training and workshops
- being prevented by TPT’s international travel policy from sending staff on a scheduled training session in Antwerp.

Changes to the Project have included a narrowing in the scope and reach of the Project so as to strengthen the impact of the interventions and make the Project more manageable within the resources and time available. The Project now:

- focuses only on Durban Container Terminals (DCT), an operating unit of Transnet Port Terminals (TPT), a company within Transnet, a wholly-owned government entity or parastatal. The pilot Project does not therefore include other TPT operating terminals in Durban or terminals in Richards Bay, as was first envisaged.
- does not involve the Transnet National Port Authority (TNPA), a sister company of TPT within the Transnet group, which is responsible for port management.
- does not significantly involve external stakeholders, which may have included private terminal operators through the Container Terminal Forum (CTF). However, the Project has opened a dialogue with the eThekweni Maritime Cluster (EMC), a tripartite structure aimed at enhancing the role of Durban’s maritime sector.
- focuses only on the SOPO (and therefore is not including other training service providers).
- is not seen as being able to extend benefits to other external stakeholders.

During the Project, a variety of activities has and continue to be changed. For example:

- an evaluation of the SOPO is considered redundant
- new activities are being introduced to better reflect local needs (e.g. planner training and curriculum development).

The timeframe for each outcome and activity are summarised in the Project Implementation Plan, which was first prepared in November 2011 and revised in May 2012. The May 2012 version is included as Appendix 7.

In summary, the key milestones have been:

- Project Launch: August 2011
- Inception: Completed by September 2011
- Objective 1: Social Dialogue: activities commenced July 2011 and are on-going
- Objective 2: HRD Policies: activities commenced October 2011 and are on-going
- Objective 3: SPO: activities commenced March 2012 and are on-going
- Objective 4: Unlocking the Benefits: activities commenced March 2012 and are on-going.

With the delays and changes, it is now clear that the Project will not be able to meet all its goals by November 2012 and a request is being prepared to extend the Project until May 2013, with no increase in budget.

## 5. MAIN FINDINGS

The main findings are structured in line with the evaluation questions relating to strategic fit, design, project progress and effectiveness, project management and resource use, and sustainability.

### 5.1 Strategic Fit

#### 5.1.1 National Development Priorities and the Decent Work Country Programme

From a national perspective, the Project can be seen as being in support of South Africa's priorities to:

- mitigate the impact of the global financial and economic crisis that has threatened employment gains made in South Africa since 1994, posing a threat to many business activities and being a serious threat to vulnerable workers and the poor.
- create an enabling policy environment for job rich growth.
- promote sustainable enterprises.
- focus on an *employment intensive industry with a decent work deficit*, in this case the choice of the South African transport sector and, in particular, to boost the industry competitiveness of Durban Container Terminals (DCT) a key industry player
- enhance national capacities for relevant skills development (such as outlined in Vision 2014, 2012-2014 Medium Term Strategy Framework, National Industrial Policy Framework and various pieces of legislation, such as the Labour Relations Act.

From an ILO and the DCWP perspective, the Project is in support of various strategic objectives and outcomes desired by and outlined in the P&B and a number of the strategic objectives and outcomes of the DWCP, such as: employment creation, skills development, enhancing social protection and strengthening social dialogue.

In particular, the PWDP is anchored by, is in line with, and is supportive of:

- ILO P&B Outcome 3: sustainable enterprises create productive and decent jobs.
- Country Outcomes ZAF 101 and 2.2: sustainable enterprises create productive and decent jobs, as well as other similar outcomes related to skills development and safety and health.
- DWCP Outcome 4: sustainable and competitive enterprises create productive and decent jobs.
- DWCP Output 4.5: support for increased competitiveness of large scale enterprises.
- DWCP Outcome 5: skills development increases the employability of workers and the inclusiveness of growth.
- DWCP Output 5.2: improved enterprise level productivity and competitiveness through relevant skills training.

From the perspective of the recipient, Transnet, the focus on DCT is appropriate and relevant given its lack of competitiveness which, in turn, is seen to be due to such factors as: infrastructure development bottlenecks, human resource constraints, low labour productivity, lack of skills, poor communications, distrust and confrontational relations between workers and management, and animosities between the two unions – all of which are being addressed in the programme.

#### **5.1.2 Relevance to other ILO projects in South Africa**

The ILO and, in particular the country office in Pretoria, is implementing a number of projects within the DWCP ([www.ilo.org/public/english/region/afpro/pretoria](http://www.ilo.org/public/english/region/afpro/pretoria)). These projects provide for interventions in a variety of sectors to address a variety of issues, including public procurement, labour law, small and medium size enterprise development, social enterprise development, women entrepreneurship, child labour and labour statistics. Each project supports and is relevant to one or more of the goals of the DWCP. However, the evaluator is not aware of any linkages between the PWDP and these other projects.

#### **5.1.3 Links with other similar activities of the UN or non-UN international development organizations at the country level.**

The evaluator is not aware of any links with similar activities of the UN in South Africa.

The PWDP does however link with the international interests of the two donors: the Governments of Flanders and the Netherlands, both of which have previously been active in SA and which continue to maintain an interest in the maritime and logistics sectors, from both a developmental and economic/commercial perspective. Flanders indicates that previous efforts in the maritime sector have been directed at the higher levels of the organisation and this project presents an opportunity to influence the total spectrum of the organisation.

#### **5.1.4 Alignment with ILO's mainstreamed strategy on gender equality**

Stated goals of the Project are to mainstream the concerns for women (as well as youth and people living with disabilities) through the intervention mix, to set minimum outreach targets for each of these subgroups and to give particular emphasis on the practical implementation of the ILO conventions related to gender. These goals are in line with the ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2010- 2015 and the resolution of the ILO to mainstream gender equality into the strategic objectives of decent work.

## 5.2 Design

### 5.2.1 Adequacy of Design

The design of the PWDP derives from a desire to respond to the needs of and to influence a major sector of the SA economy (i.e. the Transport Sector) and, in particular, a major player in this sector, Transnet. Although now reduced in scope, the design is generally appropriate to addressing this need.

The ILO and its partners have credibility and are well equipped to address these needs, having:

- in-house capacity, skills and experiences in promoting a systems approach to decent work, in particular drawing on those of the DWCP support team.
- an ability to make use of particular materials and skills available from the ILO Port Work Development Programme, the ILO International Training Centre, the ILO/MARIT unit and other ILO programmes, in particular the ILO's experience in the Russian port and maritime sector in 2005 – 2007.
- the available skills of its development partners: APEC and STC, which are both recognised centres of excellence in the provision of port-specific training and advisory services.

While the design is generally appropriate, from comments received and in retrospect, it would seem:

- it is difficult for the Project to address HRD policies as these are typically decided at a higher level in the organisation.
- more time should have been given in the design phase to forging and re-forging relationships, both within and between constituent groups. Although there was extensive consultation at the outset, the Project faced issues related to staff changes within the constituent groups, and conflictive relationships and poor communication within some constituencies.
- as the project progressed, it was also necessary to adjust some activities to better address the needs of the recipient organisation, particularly the SOPO. Hence, in retrospect, and a purposeful needs analysis at the outset would have assisted in a better definition of activities.

Notwithstanding the above, it is admirable that the Project has been able to respond to the issues that have so far arisen.

### **5.2.2 Link to intended outcomes/objectives**

As indicated earlier, the four objectives/outcomes of the Project relate to promoting social dialogue, improving HRD policies, strengthening the School of Port Operations and unlocking the benefits to port workers.

In regard to promoting social dialogue, the evaluator considers the interventions are appropriate and essential.

In regard to improving HRD policies and management, the Project faces a difficulty in that policies are generally discussed and determined in Johannesburg at the level of the parent company, Transnet. This limits the Project's ability, working at the level of TPT and DCT, to deliver on this objective though there may be scope for discussions at the level of the Local Business Committee (operating at the level of each terminal), as well as through the National Business Committee and the Employment Equity/Skills Development Committee (operating at the level of TPT) which may flow upward into improved HRD policies.

In regard to strengthening the School of Port Operations, and with the changes in activities made, the evaluator considers the Project is well designed to deliver on this objective.

In regard to unlocking the benefits to port workers, it is noted that the principal target of the PWDP is the immediate beneficiaries (management and unions), but that there is an expectation that the ultimate beneficiaries should see benefits beginning to accrue via the immediate beneficiaries before the end of the Project.

### **5.2.3 Addressing gender concerns in the Project objectives and outcomes.**

In general terms the Project Document describes the objectives, outcomes and activities as being directed at addressing the concerns of women, youth and people with disabilities as target groups.

### **5.2.4 Considering the gender dimension in the planned interventions.**

The Project has mainstreamed gender concerns and where possible voice has been given to the concerns of women. Gender has been promoted in activities such as training, consultations and coaching sessions. For example, one out of the group of three trained as Chief Instructions in the international Portworker Development Programme was a woman; gender representation was taken into account in the initial social dialogue sessions in August and September 2011; two out of eleven people who were trained in the principles and practices of social dialogue were women; two out of the sixteen study tour participants were women; and, a number of women also participated in the Container Terminal Management training in Durban.



However, in an industry that is predominately male, it has been impossible to achieve gender parity. More attention could be given to gender during the remainder of the project. For example, selection criteria for training could explicitly recommend the inclusion of women, and the project targets could align with TPT's gender targets/policies.

### **5.3 Project Progress and Effectiveness**

#### **5.3.1 Delivery and Quality of Outputs**

The objectives of the project are each supported by a number of Activities/Outputs, as set out in the Project Document, and adapted and supplemented during the course of the Project.

The Project has achieved:

- separate stakeholder engagement sessions with TPT/DCT Management and Labour in August and September 2011
- a two-day joint project planning and social dialogue session with Management and Labour representatives in September 2011
- the look and learn experience of the Study Tour to Antwerp, Belgium and Rotterdam Netherlands. Participants have subsequently reviewed the lessons learned and a number of recommendations have been implemented.
- the Chief Instructor training in Turin, which resulted in the update of the local PDP content and the training of 29 port workers by end-June 2012; training in the updated content will continue up to the end of the project and well thereafter.
- the creation of Mission Directed Work Teams (MDWT) which are based on a team approach to addressing the quality, speed, costs, safety and the people aspects of various components of DCT's operations, each of which are each treated as a "mini-business". Since November 2011, at least six MDWT training and coaching sessions with frontline managers, shop stewards and operational workers have been made possible by the project.
- the three-day Social Dialogue Workshop, which introduced the parties to social dialogue.

From the evaluation reports summarising the participants views on the activities and comments from interviewees, these activities and inventions have generally been accepted as being of a high standard, meeting expectations, appropriate to the needs of the organisation, beneficial and applicable.

In regard to delivery and, as indicated in the Review of Implementation (Section 4 of this report), the Project has faced a number of changes and delays, which now results in it being narrower in reach than first proposed and behind schedule, with an extension in time (proposed as being to May/June 2013) being necessary to complete the objectives.

Transnet is a large and complex organisation, with its own plans, agendas, priorities, activities, issues and procedures. These have impacted on the Project and have had to be accommodated in various ways, examples being:

- the Mission Directed Work Teams Programme (MDWT) was initiated by TPT at DCT in September 2011 (flowing from some success with this intervention at Transnet Rail Engineering). While this has its own management and reporting structure within TPT, it has been possible to embrace and support the activity under the PWDP. However, in turn, this has caused confusion in some quarters, e.g. some believing that the MDWT is the PWDP and issues faced in the MDWT reflect on the PWDP.
- the lengthy international travel approval process of Transnet, which thwarted sending management staff to the Container Terminal Management Programme in Antwerp, notwithstanding arrangements had been made and fares had been paid. A monetary loss was incurred, considerable embarrassment ensued and it suggests that communication lines in regard to trouble shooting were inadequate. The trip will have to be rescheduled.
- a vacuum was created by the resignation of TPT's General Manager Human Resources (a project champion) and the lengthy period of six months to secure and install a permanent replacement (who has just started in July 2012).
- Transnet recently announced plans to create four training academies in the Transnet group, including a Maritime Academy which will be formed by the merger of the School of Port Operations (of TPT) and the School of Ports (of TNPA). In addition to its internal targets, the Maritime Academy is expected to train unemployed youths (a political imperative) and to be operational by January 2013. The urgency of this task is seen as a distraction from activities under the PWDP.

Critical concerns to the Project have been found in the selection of participants for an activity and poor/partial attendance at a number of sessions, particularly within the management group. Instances have included:

- attendance at Steering Committee Meetings
- not all Study Tour participants have continued to be active in the Project
- the Social Dialogue Workshop was only attended by a few managers, and then not for the full session. The PMU is responding with a separate session for management.
- delays in naming attendees for the management training session and poor attendance at the second session.

In the interviews, management indicated that there is a buy-in and commitment to the Project; on-going operational duties are given as one reason for poor attendance. However, in reality, the instances above seem to reflect a lack of appreciation of the importance of the Project and poor attendance can be interpreted by both their own staff and other stakeholders as this project is not a priority. As a public entity, it is suggested that more should be expected of Transnet and, if the project is to succeed, the issue will have to be addressed.

### **5.3.2 Women and Men as Beneficiaries**

In so far as the participants have been a mix of men and women (with men predominant in this industry), the Project has benefitted both women and men.

While the issues of women are mainstreamed in the Project, the evaluator has not been made aware of attempts to seek to attain minimum outreach targets.

### **5.3.3 Progress toward achieving programme objectives/outcomes**

The delivery of Activities/Outcomes is summarised in the Project Implementation Plan (the May 2012 version is included as Appendix 7) and in the Strategy Maps (May/June version included as Appendix 8). Given that it is agreed to extend the Project to May/June 2013, this MTE is taking place in Month 13 or about half-way through the projected 24 month period.

Section 5.3.1 above outlines the outputs that have been delivered and, from the progress reports and interviews, the following have been achieved:

#### **Outcome 1: Promotion of Social Dialogue:**

5 of 9 activities are complete; 1 red light and 2 warning lights; consideration being given to deferring output 2.2 to Phase II.

Activities completed are:

- 1.1.1 Study Tour
- 1.1.3 Advisory Services to refine social dialogue mechanisms
- 1.1.4 Capacity Building to mediate interests through social dialogue
- 1.1.5 Facilitation of Social Dialogue around HRD initiative
- 1.1.6 Training on Social Dialogue.

An additional (repeat) social dialogue training will also be conducted for Management representatives who were unable to attend the sessions in June 2012.

The red light refers to Activity 1.1.2, which remains to be signed off by DCT.

The warning lights refer to the imminent deadlines of Activities 1.1.7 and 1.1.8, two additional social dialogue activities which are due for completion by September 2012.

Activity 1.1.9 is a monitoring and evaluation report is due by December 2012.

The PMU is proposing that Output 1.2 (a forum for social dialogue between internal and external port Stakeholders) be deferred to Phase II, as stakeholders have emphasised the importance of first and foremost paying attention to internal social dialogue at DCT before looking to strengthen social dialogue externally.

## **Outcome 2: Improving HRD Strategies and Policies:**

6 of 14 activities complete, 3 red lights.

Activities completed are:

- 2.1.1 Training senior management in balancing financial and non-financial objectives
- 2.1.2 Follow up advisory services to refine strategic plans
- 2.1.3 Coaching in productivity
- 2.1.6 Training of Trainers
- 2.1.7 Training of operational staff and management
- 2.2.1 Training of HRD line managers.

The 3 red lights refer to:

- 2.2.4 Training in Container Terminal Management was ready for implementation, but had to be cancelled at the last minute as final approval was not granted at the highest level within TPT to allow the participants to travel internationally.
- 2.2.2 Follow up advisory services and 2.2.3 support for HRD line managers, due end-July 2012 and end-August 2012 are delayed in planning and serve as alerts to the PMU.

The rest of the activities are underway and within the specified implementation deadlines.

## **Outcome 3: Strengthening of SOPO:**

1 of 8 activities complete, 3 red lights, 2 warning lights.

As per stakeholder requests, Activity 3.1.1 (review of the SOPO) was cancelled and additional activities (for example planner and curriculum development training) have been added as these are considered more relevant to the needs of the SOPO.

The completed activity is:

- 3.1.2 International Portworker Development Training

The red lights refer to:

- 3.1.4 Curriculum Development, due end of August 2012, the planning for which is behind schedule and is likely to be delayed.
- 3.2.1 Training of Trainers is the use of amended services, delayed
- 3.2.2 Coaching and support for newly trained trainers, delayed.

The amber lights refer to:

- 3.1.3 Planner Training, due end of August, implementation delayed
- 3.1.5 Adaptation of Training Products, target three training products/services, one complete (updated PDP training content), and two are outstanding. The final two products / services will be based on planner training and curriculum development. The deadline for this target is end-October 2012, though some delays are likely.

## **Outcome 4: Unlocking the Benefits**

0 of 8 activities complete, 1 red light and 1 warning light.

The red light relates to

- 4.1.1 Information campaign, delayed

Most activities under Outcome 4 are due to be implemented in the second half of the Project and it is understood that planning is on track.

In conclusion:

- at the time of this MTE, the delays and changes to the Project have resulted in only 12 of 40 activities having been completed.
- some of the remaining activities can be completed within the schedule of the current implementation plan which runs up to end-December 2012, but the challenge is to accelerate delivery.
- an extension of time is required if all the outcomes of the Project are to be realised.

## **5.4 Project Management and Resource Use**

### **5.4.1 Adequacy of technical and financial resources**

From a technical resource perspective and as indicated earlier, the PMU consists of a full-time CTA (based in Durban), supported by a PO on a 50% shared basis and a full time FAA, both of whom are based in Pretoria. The PMU reports to the SES also based in Pretoria. The project also receives the support of specialists from the ILO and the development partners: APEC and STC.

These people/technical resources are generally adequate for the Project, but the evaluator makes the following observations:

- this is the first ILO project for all members of the PMU and, in addition to dealing with the difficulties of the Project, project staff would have had to face the added difficulties of lacking experience in and having to learn ILO expectations and procedures.
- the CTA is based by himself in Durban, which environment under the circumstances can be regarded as isolated
- it is understood the SES is responsible for backstopping more than 25 projects, in addition to which he plays a major role in initiating new projects. This logically introduces the question as to whether he is able to give the PWDP adequate attention, support and mentoring, particularly in light of the challenges that have been faced by this project.
- the PO reports both to the CTA and the SES which, on paper at least, is an awkward arrangement.

From the interviews conducted, the PMU and the DCWP staff are considered to be approachable and responsive. It is appreciated that they have often had to put in extra time and effort. However, it is possible that some of the challenges faced by the Project (as outlined earlier and which have caused delays and changes to activities) could have been anticipated and a more proactive stance could have been taken in troubleshooting these issues at an early stage. There is a desire that the CTA spend more time at the DCT (rather than at the TPT offices in Morningside).

From a financial resource perspective and as indicated earlier, the Project only reports on the donor funds totalling about US\$ 1 270 000. For 2011, the project total allocation and expenditure both amounted to \$ 279 029.

For 2012, the project total allocation was \$ 996 685 (i.e. the balance of the \$ 1 270 000). As of 5 July 2012, expenditure amounted to only \$ 251 181 or about 25% of projected expenditure for 2012. Commitments are in place to cover the remaining 75% of the 2012 budget, or \$ 715 725.

Since the start of the Project in 2011, total expenditures amount to \$ 530 220 or about 42% of the total project budget of \$ 1 270 000. Based on the original timeframe, the Project was due to be completed in 2012 and, against this target, the Project shows a serious under-spending. However, given that some activities have yet to be agreed and scheduled, and that a project extension to May/June 2013 is being contemplated, it will be necessary to rework the budget; but, for this, it would seem there are adequate resources.

Some concern was expressed about the appropriateness of the spend and that the ILO should be more transparent in disclosing financial information; however, the evaluator has since learned that financial information was shared at the April meeting of the Steering Committee.

#### **5.4.2 Effectiveness of monitoring performance and results**

A variety of project documents were supplied to the evaluator (see Appendix 4). From these, the Project is seen to be subject to a variety of planning, monitoring and reporting arrangements, which include:

- Activity Reports and Evaluations (for each intervention such as the study tour, training sessions and workshops)
- Annual Budget (2011, 2012)
- Budget Delivery Rate
- Expenditure Summary by Commitment
- Expenditure Summary by Sub-Object (2011)
- Email Reports (informal)
- Evaluation Reports (?monthly)
- Financial Reports (2011, and 2012 up to 5 July)
- Monitoring Reports (December 2011, January/February 2012)
- Project Implementation Plans (updated periodically)
- Steering Committee Minutes (four meetings)
- Strategy Maps (updated monthly)

- Technical Indicator Description (February 2012)
- Technical Cooperation Progress Reports (January - September 2011, January 2011 – January 2012).

It may be concluded that in total these are adequate and effective in allowing the project staff, the ILO hierarchy and the various stakeholders to monitor performance and progress – some would argue too much time is spent on reporting and the paperwork to the detriment of the intervention and results.

The following comments are deemed appropriate:

- the format of the strategy maps has change and evolved monthly, which introduces difficulties in stakeholders being able to oversee progress The latest version (May/June) present a wide variety of information and is of a font size that is impossible to read on normal A4 paper (and difficult even when printed on A3 paper). Given the ILO is operating in the environment of the developing world, many readers would not have access to an A3 printer, particularly one capable of printing in colour.
- some steering Committee Members indicate that they are not kept abreast of developments (plans, progress and issues) that arise between Steering Committee Meetings (which have been spaced at between 2 and 5 months); and, hence, are not able to respond to questions that arise from their constituencies between such meetings.
- although the key performance indicators were agreed among the stakeholders, it is difficult to envisage that it will be possible to attribute and measure the Projects contribution to the suggested Key Performance and Impact Indicators (e.g. days lost to industrial action, employment opportunities retained/created and reduced accident rate) since these depend on a variety of other variables.



### **5.4.3 Accessibility of information to national partners**

The ILO periodically provides to NEDLAC ( representing the government, employers, unions and community organisations) an Implementation Update on the South Africa Decent Work Programme, the latest being on 11 July 2012.

Given this report covers a large number of interventions, it is only able to provide a brief overview of progress with the PWDP.

## **5.5 Sustainability**

### **5.5.1 Progress toward building partners' capacity and ownership**

The prime targets of the Project are the immediate beneficiaries (unions, terminal management, and the SOPO as a service provider). These, in turn, are expected to unlock the benefits to the ultimate beneficiaries: employees, as well as other employers and external stakeholders, thus creating local ownership.

All parties describe themselves as having bought into the Project and, though somewhat slower than intended, progress is being made on all fronts toward building internal capacity: e.g. from the look and learn experience of the study tour, capacity building of the stakeholder groups to mediate their respective interests, and the various training and coaching activities that have been completed. Regarding the Unions, while they may have previously not sat around the same table together, they now seem reasonably comfortable with each other, at least at the level of the shop stewards.

However, a number of concerns were raised about the MDWT programme: such as whether:

- the SATAWU members were comfortable with it, as they had not initiated any projects
- UTATU members were being allowed to fully participate
- the programme is being driven by a productivity imperative to the exclusion of other factors and benefits
- participation and up-skilling may be leading to false expectations with regard to the ability of workers to secure promotion.

Regarding management, skills are being imparted through the various interventions, but poor attendance at some of the activities is slowing progress and is interpreted negatively.

Staff of TPT has previously participated in a number of interventions and are conscious of the fact that when the facilitator/champion withdraws there is a serious risk that all the good work ceases. It will take much more than the two years of this project to secure the cultural changes being requested of stakeholders. Thought has to be given now on an exit strategy and to mechanisms that can be introduced in the next short while to ensure the activities introduced through the PWDP continue to prosper.



### **5.5.2 Integration into Local Institutions**

The PMU is proposing to the next meeting of the Steering Committee that Output 1.2 (an integration and a forum for social dialogue between internal and external port Stakeholders) be deferred to Phase II of the Project, as stakeholders have emphasised the importance of focusing on internal social dialogue at DCT before looking to strengthen social dialogue externally.

### **5.5.3 Replication into other sectors**

The learning experiences of the Project are clearly replicable to other terminals, other ports, other operations of Transnet and the port community, and other economic sectors.

It is understood that Phases II and III of the project will address some of these targets but a broad outreach will require its own plan and resources.

## **6. CONCLUSIONS**

### **6.1 Conclusions**

From the foregoing and in regard to strategic fit, it can be concluded the Project is appropriate to the objectives of the ILO, the South African DWCP, and key constituencies. In particular, the PWDP is anchored by, is in line with, and is supportive of a number of outcomes related to the promotion of sustainable enterprises creating productive and decent jobs: the ILO Programme and Budget Outcome 3, Country Outcomes ZAF 101 and 2.2, and DWCP Outcome 4 and 5; and, in particular, DWCP Output 4.5: support for increased competitiveness of large scale enterprises and Output 5.2: Improved enterprise level productivity and competitiveness through relevant skills training. .

In addition, the Project is supportive of other outcomes such as DWCP Outcomes 7 and 9 related to improved safety and health, and the capacitating of social partners to contribute to effective social dialogue and sound industrial relations.

With regard to the recipient organisation, TPT and in particular DCT, the Project Document acknowledges that the Port suffers from weak competitiveness which is due to both technical and people factors. In regard to human resources, a main concern is low productivity resulting from a lack of skills and confrontational workplace relations. Hence, this type of intervention - aimed at skills development and social dialogue - is critical to addressing such issues.

In regard to the design, the project is structured appropriately to meet the objectives and outcomes, particularly in regard to introducing social dialogue and strengthening the SOPO. However, it is difficult for the Project to address HRD policies as these are typically decided at a higher level in the organisation. Activities to address the objective of unlocking the benefits to port workers are mainly scheduled for the second half of the project.

Although there was extensive consultation at the outset, the Project faced issues related to staff changes within the constituent groups, and conflictive relationships and poor communication within some constituencies. As the project progressed, it was also necessary to adjust some activities to better address the needs of the recipient organisation, particularly the SOPO. Hence, in retrospect, more time should have been given in the design phase to forging and re-forging relationships, both within and between constituent groups, and a purposeful needs analysis at the outset would have assisted in a better definition of activities.

While women's concerns have been mainstreamed in the activities, the evaluator has not been made aware of any efforts to set and seek to attain minimum outreach targets for women.

In regard to progress, the Project has been subject to a number of delays but is now progressing in a reasonably satisfactory manner. Highlights of the project have included the Study Tour, the Chief Instructor Training, the implementation of the Mission Directed Work Teams Programme and the Social Dialogue Workshop, all of which are judged to have been of a high quality and beneficial. A mix of hard and soft skills is being imparted and tangible products will remain after the intervention. However, with the Project Strategy Map reporting only 12 of the 40 activities as being completed, an extension of time and an acceleration in delivery is required if the Project is to meet its goals.

In regard to management and resource use, the technical and financial resources are adequate and performance monitoring is effective. Project staff are considered approachable and responsive. Comment was received that the ILO could possibly have been more proactive in anticipating and troubleshooting issues (such as the communication “bottlenecks” described above and the TPT’s international travel policy which prevented the Project sending staff on a scheduled training session in Antwerp). And, comment was also received that, given that members of the PMU were new to the ILO and there was a need to adjust to the vagaries of working in a large, complex and dynamic organisation, the ILO could have provided the Project staff with more support to address such issues. However, taking note on the difficulties and possible repercussions of intervening in constituents’ internal processes, the ILO probably did everything it possible could in the circumstances to address the issues.

In regard to sustainability, progress is being made toward building internal capacity. It is pleasing to see representatives of the two unions participating together but trust is fragile. There is a major concern about the level of participation from management, which is interpreted as a lack of commitment. This must be addressed if the Project is not to lose its credibility with other stakeholders. From a Union perspective, this Project will not be deemed successful unless there are tangible benefits to workers before it closes.

Change is uncomfortable and the organisational changes being initiated by this project will take a long time to achieve. There are some people who have not yet “bought in” to the value of changing the way they go about their work. Essential components of the next few months will be an exit strategy and mechanisms to ensure activities introduced through the PWDP continue to prosper.

## 6.2 Lessons Learned

The lessons learned in the Project include:

1. The interventions, in particular those relating to social dialogue and skills development, are suitable to the needs of the recipient organisation and are supportive of promoting the emerging systems approach to the development of decent work
2. While it was expected that the Project would face the inherent tensions between management and labour, the Project has also illustrated the importance of addressing suspicions between labour organisations, as well as communication and conflicts *within* the structures of each of the constituencies.
3. Such issues can easily resurface with each new person introduced into the Project and with each new issue that arises; hence consensus may have to be built and rebuilt several times.
4. For this Project, the implementation deadlines were overly optimistic and it is clear that adequate time is needed at the project design and inception to cope with the various issues that can arise; and, during implementation, the Project should be ready for and able to cope with such issues and the delays that may arise.
5. Given that troubleshooting is almost inevitably needed during a project, a plan should and could be in place for a door to be open at the appropriate level within the structures of all the stakeholders to be able to address the concern at an early stage, before it escalates and causes consternation and delays..
6. It is noted that the Project does not aim to address all the issues at DCT and Transnet and TPT are evolving their own plans at various levels independently of the Project; hence, it is appropriate to ask the question as to whether there is a lesson here that the Project is (as one interviewee described it) “fixing leaks”, rather than seeking to address the needs of TPT and DCT in a holistic manner.

## 6.3 Good Practices

1. To date, the interventions most appreciated and relevant have been the Study Tour, Social Dialogue Workshop and the various training initiatives.
2. Where appropriate to needs, these are suitable to be rolled out to other ports in South and Southern Africa, as well as to other large scale enterprises. Given that the Project has been able to considerably enhance the capacity of the SOPO, the School is becoming well positioned to play a wider skills development role.
3. The open door, participatory and responsive stance of the PMU have been well appreciated by all stakeholders and should be reproduced.
4. The Project has had the flexibility to adjust activities and timeframes when issues arise, which is inherently useful during other projects.

## 6.4 Recommendations

At this mid-point of the project, and based on this Internal Mid-Term Evaluation, it is possible to make a number of recommendations with a view to addressing key issues and ensuring the PWDP remains on track.

In regard to the overall management of the Project, it is recommended that:

1. the Steering Committee at its 8 August meeting grant an extension in time to the Project (proposed as being to May/June 2013) at no extra cost, as being necessary if the objectives of the project are to be met.
2. the ILO, together with appropriate members of the Steering Committee within the month approach the key stakeholders of the Project (Transnet, TPT, SATAWU and UTATU) at the highest levels to discuss the concerns raised in this report and to seek to generate signals and, where appropriate, instructions to address the concerns, so that all parties fully participate in and secure the benefits of the remainder of the project. In the case of TPT, it is essential that the Chief Executive be seen to regard the Project as important, and the new General Manager Human Resources and DCT Terminal Executive be visible and active in its implementation. Delegation should occur only by exception and, in such a case, the delegate should be fully empowered.
3. the Steering Committee and the PMU consider forming project sub-committees to focus on key objectives such as social dialogue and training.
4. the PMU, together with the Project constituencies, within the month draw up a Communication Plan to ensure all avenues are being used to give publicity to the Project (including newsletters, internal publications such as *Portside*, e-mail news flashes) and, at the same time, manage expectations.

In regard to implementation, it is recommended that:

5. the Steering Committee consider locating the CTA at DCT for the remainder of Phase I; or, failing this, the CTA make more frequent visits to DCT so as to be more visible and approachable at the “coal face” of the intervention, and able to participate as a coach and team builder in a variety of forums.

In regard to individual activities, it is recommended that:

6. the CTA reconvene participants of the Study Tour to review the learning experience and progress since, and to then put in place a plan to ensure that appropriate interventions are implemented at DCT. One such project could be to explore “labour pools” a potentially contentious idea, but one that would enable the participants to draw on and test the social dialogue skills that they have acquired.
7. the Steering Committee, together with the CTA, explore the merger of the SOPO and the SOP as an opportunity to assist with institutional development and strategy formulation in the context of social dialogue.
8. the CTA ensure that the proposed activity regarding competency profiling and training plans fully reflects the needs for all training, including artisanal and technical training.

9. more attention could be given to gender during the remainder of the project. Selection criteria for training could explicitly recommend the inclusion of women, and the project targets could align with TPT's gender targets/policies.
10. the Steering Committee give consideration to an activity to address an issue relevant to DCT (such as employee assistance) with the intent that recommendations may flow up for consideration and possible approval at a national level; thus exploring the ability for TPT to adjust its policies to take the particular concerns of each port into consideration.

In regard to planning and monitoring, it is recommended that:

11. the PMU update the key planning and reporting documents (including the Implementation Plan) to reflect the current status of and plans for activities (as well as incorporating new activities such as planner training). It is now understood revised plans will be submitted to the next Steering Committee meeting on 8 August 2012.
12. the PMU generate a monthly progress report for Steering Committee members to ensure they are aware of, and can interact with their constituencies, on progress and issues as they may arise between meetings of the Steering Committee.

In regard to sustainability:

13. the PMU give consideration now to an exit strategy to ensure continuity of the project, aspects of which may include confirming champions in the SOPO and at DCT, the development of a team active at the coalface to address issues at an early stage, and allowing the CTA to phase out his involvement with DCT over a period a time, so as to address the concern that subsequent phases of the project will see a roll out to other ports and into Africa, before stakeholders see the needs of DCT as being fully addressed.

## **7. APPENDICES**

1. Steering Committee Members for the Port Work Development Project
2. Terms of Reference for the Mid-Term Evaluation
3. Evaluation Questions
4. List of Document provided for the Evaluation
5. List and Schedule of Persons Interviewed
6. List of Workshop Attendees
7. Project Implementation Plan (May 2012)
8. Strategy Map (May/June 2012)

**Appendix 1:**  
**Steering Committee Members for the Port Work Development Project**

Permanent Committee Members					
No	Name	Representative Organisation		Email address	Contact Number
1.	Andreas Klemmer	Enterprise Resource Specialist	ILO	<a href="mailto:Klemmer@ilo.org">Klemmer@ilo.org</a>	012-818-8000
2.	Neeran Ramjuthan	Chief Technical Advisor	ILO	<a href="mailto:Ramjuthan@ilo.org">Ramjuthan@ilo.org</a>	078-019-1969
3.	Hector Danisa	Terminal Executive Manager: DCT	DCT	<a href="mailto:Hector.Danisa@transnet.net">Hector.Danisa@transnet.net</a>	031-361- 6690
4.	Moshe Motlohi	Head People Transformation Project	TPT	<a href="mailto:Moshe.Motlohi@transnet.net">Moshe.Motlohi@transnet.net</a>	031- 361- 8103
5.	Willie Coetsee	Manager Strategic Projects	TPT	<a href="mailto:Willie.Coetsee@transnet.net">Willie.Coetsee@transnet.net</a>	031-308-8304
6.	Bhekithemba Gumede	Full time Shop steward	SATAWU	<a href="mailto:Bhekithemba.gumede@transnet.net">Bhekithemba.gumede@transnet.net</a>	078-276-9660
7.	Steven Marais	Full time Shop steward	UTATU	<a href="mailto:Steven.Marais@transnet.net">Steven.Marais@transnet.net</a>	083-382-2083
8.	Deidre Batchelor	Policy Officer	Dutch Embassy	<a href="mailto:deidre.batchelor@minbuza.nl">deidre.batchelor@minbuza.nl</a>	084-387-7964
9.	David Maenaut	Counsellor / Representative	Flemish Embassy	<a href="mailto:david.maenaut@flanders.org.za">david.maenaut@flanders.org.za</a>	012-460-0781
10.	Raymond Nazar	CONSUL	Flemish Embassy	<a href="mailto:raynazar@worldonline.co.za">raynazar@worldonline.co.za</a>	031-303-2840
11.	Sibusiso Ngcobo	HR / ER Manager	TPT	<a href="mailto:Sibusiso.Ngcobo@transnet.net">Sibusiso.Ngcobo@transnet.net</a>	031 308-8016
Ad hoc Committee Members					
12.	Vic Van Vuuren	Director ILO SA Office	ILO	<a href="mailto:vanvuuren@ilo.org">vanvuuren@ilo.org</a>	012-818-8000
13.	Sue Albertyn	Transnet Group IR Manager	Transnet	<a href="mailto:Sue.Albertyn@transnet.net">Sue.Albertyn@transnet.net</a>	011-308-3851
14.	BhekuyiseNgwane	Full time Shop steward NRB	SATAWU	<a href="mailto:Bhekuyise.ngwane@transnet.net">Bhekuyise.ngwane@transnet.net</a>	073-855-6664
15.	Lorraine Wentzell	Full time Shop steward	SATAWU	<a href="mailto:Wentzel.Lorraine@transnet.net">Wentzel.Lorraine@transnet.net</a>	083-303-6103
16.	Joseph Dube	SATAWU KZN Provincial Secretary	SATAWU	<a href="mailto:joseph@cinet.co.za">joseph@cinet.co.za</a>	



**Appendix 2:**  
**Terms of Reference for the Mid-Term Evaluation**



---

International Labour Organization

TERMS OF REFERENCE:  
PROJECT MID-TERM EVALUATION

of

Promotion of Decent Work in the South African Transport Sector (Phase 1)

*Port Work Development Project*

Project Code	SAF/10/03/MUL
Budget	1,27 million US\$
Donor	Dutch and Flemish Governments
Time scale	December 2010 – December 2012
Geographical Coverage	Durban, Kwa Zulu Natal Province
Evaluation Period	9 – 28 July 2012

## **1. Introduction and Background on the Project**

This term of reference (TOR) is designed to support a consultant to conduct an internal mid-term evaluation (MTE) of the Port Work Development project. The evaluation will assess project performance in relation to stated objectives, outcomes and outputs. An assessment of the effectiveness of management arrangements and project design, as well the efficient use of resources, and impacts. Identified and opportunities for learning will also form part of the evaluation. The evaluation will provide an opportunity for mid-term course corrections to improve upon expected project deliverables and results.

The evaluation is an activity in the project cycle which attempts to determine, as systematically and objectively as possible, the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project. The evaluation is expected to lead to recommendations and lessons learned for future use.

## **2. Brief Background on the Project and Context**

The overall project objective is the creation of decent employment for women and men. The overall project outcome is sustainable Port businesses that create decent and productive jobs, including for Youth, women and people living with disabilities. The immediate objectives of the project are:

- (1) To promote a more dialogue-driven mediation of stakeholder interests in the Port of Durban – Durban Container Terminal (DCT),
- (2) To create a more conducive policy and regulatory framework for 'doing business' in the Port (DCT) with emphasis on Human Resource Development (HRD),
- (3) To strengthen the capacity of local Business Development Services (BDS) providers, among them predominantly the School of Port Operations in Durban to in turn provide Port stakeholder groups with a range of workforce-centered training and advisory services, and
- (4) To boost the capacity of all Port stakeholders to fully unlock the benefits of the HRD effort.

The design of the Port Work Development Project (Appendix 1) as a pilot project is to demonstrate the emerging systematic approach to the promotion of Decent Work. The project is aimed at boosting the competitiveness in the transport sector of a key industry player namely Transnet, by focusing on Transnet Port Terminals and more specifically at Durban Container Terminal during phase 1. It is anticipated that over the duration of the project and through a combination of interventions, determined by way of social dialogue and ranging from workplace improvement measures to functional and technical/vocational skills training, the aims of the project shall be achieved.

Two sets of target group beneficiaries for the project have been identified namely; immediate and ultimate beneficiaries. The immediate beneficiaries are the institutions capacitated by the project to in turn capacitate the ultimate beneficiaries. The main immediate beneficiary groups to be reached through the project are the unions representing port employees, the port management authorities and selected BDS providers providing any of the above stakeholders with workforce-centered training and advisory services, among them predominantly the School of Port Operations. The ultimate beneficiaries are the intended beneficiaries of the initiative, among them prominently employees and employers in the Port of Durban, but also external stakeholders with a vested interest in the Port, like members of the local community

Identified in the project are two developmental partners the project aims at forging strategic partnerships with (i) Antwerp/Flanders Port Training Center (APEC) and (ii) STC. Both APEC and STC are recognised international centers of excellence in the provision of port specific training and advisory services. In the past both these training centers have collaborated with the School of Port Operations in the provision of training courses.

The project intervention strategy is inspired by the system enterprise development approach of the ILO.

Four system levels of interaction of stakeholders are distinguished:

- i. Meta-level: Norms, values and perceptions held by stakeholders across system levels towards port work development,
- ii. Macro Level: The regulatory framework defining the 'rules of doing business' at Durban Container Terminal,

- iii. Meso-level: interventions that aim at boosting the capacity of local BDS organisations to in turn boost the delivery capacity of business stakeholder groups, and
- iv. Micro-level: The 'market place' where interventions that aim at stimulating demand among these business stakeholders groups for capacity building support from the meso level providers, and to maximise the benefits derived from these services.

The Port Work Development Project has duration of 24 months and a budget of USD 1.27 million. Effective implementation started late in the project cycle due to unavoidable delays. The project is scheduled for completion in March 2013 (however a no cost extension is anticipated).

A number of changes, not reflected in the project document, have been made to date, and these should be taken into account during the evaluation:

- The project document makes reference to the "first phase is on piloting the new approach in the Ports of Durban and Richards Bay" however the project is currently only been piloted at the Port of Durban and specifically at Durban Container Terminal.
- In the project document output 1.2 makes reference to a forum for social dialogue between internal and external port stakeholders building on the existing Container Terminal Forum and the Maritime Cluster, in this regard the Project has had limited interaction with only the EThekweni Maritime Cluster (EMC).
- In the project document reference is made to immediate beneficiaries, referring to unions representing port employees, the port management authorities and selected BDS providers, in this regards through focusing on Durban Container Terminal the project has not engaged with Port Management Authorities further the project has not focused on BDS providers but limited to the School of Port Operations.
- In the project document reference is made to the ultimate beneficiaries are the intended beneficiaries of the initiative, among them prominently workers and employers in the Port of Durban, but also external stakeholders with a vested interest in the Port, like members of the local community. In this regard through focusing on Durban Container Terminal the project has only extended benefits to employees and employers at Durban Container Terminal. Further, the project has not dealt with external stakeholders, for example such as the local community.

### **Project management arrangements**

The project management unit (PMU) comprises three individuals and is run on a full-time basis by an ILO Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), namely Neeran Ramjuthan. The CTA is supported on a 50% basis by a Programme Officer, Luzelle Lestrade, who assists with quality control, monitoring and evaluation, and implementation of activities. The CTA is further supported by a full-time Finance and Administration Assistant, Likomang Moeketsi. The PMU is under the overall supervision of the Office Director. The CTA is technically backstopped directly by the Senior Enterprise Specialist in Pretoria, Andreas Klemmer. The CTA is based at the Transnet offices in Durban, and the rest of the unit is based at the ILO offices in Pretoria.

The CTA is guided by a project steering committee comprising the ILO Area Office Director for South Africa, the Senior Enterprise Specialist, the Flemish and Dutch donors, and Transnet Management and Labour representatives. The Steering Committee meets at least every quarter.

### **3. Purpose, Scope and Clients of the Mid-Term Evaluation**

The purpose of the internal midterm evaluation is to enable project staff, constituents and other relevant stakeholders to assess the progress in delivery of project outcomes and based on this assessment, to take decisions regarding the intervention logic and emphasis of the project during its remaining time. The clients of the evaluation include: the overall project manager (Chief Technical Advisor); technical backstopping staff (Senior Technical Specialist and Programme Officer at the Decent Work Support Team for Eastern and Southern Africa Office in South Africa); ILO Field Directors (South Africa); the donors; and constituents, in particular the project steering committee. The scope of the evaluation in terms of time is 9<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> July 2012. The scope of the evaluation in terms of operational area is Transnet Ports Terminals Durban, particularly the Durban Container Terminal and Transnet People Transformation Unit.

The MTE will assess five evaluation criteria as outlined below. Related to each of these criteria are a number of key evaluation questions as outlined in part 4 of this TOR.

- a. Relevance and strategic fit,

- b. Validity of design,
- c. Project progress and effectiveness,
- d. Effectiveness of management arrangements and efficiency of resource use, and
- e. Sustainability

The MTE will be carried out in Durban, Durban Container Terminal from in the week of 9<sup>th</sup> – 13<sup>th</sup> July 2012

#### 4. Key Evaluation Questions

As mentioned in the previous section and in line with ILO evaluation guidelines (Appendix 2), the project should be assessed against five evaluation criteria. A number of questions have been developed for each set of criteria, as set out in the table below. The following key evaluation questions (second column) are expected to be answered through the MTE:

Evaluation criteria	Related key evaluation questions
a. Relevant and strategic fit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the programme directly supporting the national development priorities and the Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP)?</li> <li>▪ How well does it complement other relevant ILO projects in South Africa?</li> <li>▪ What links are established/being established with other similar activities of the UN or non-UN international development organizations at country level?</li> <li>▪ Does the project align with ILO's mainstreamed strategy on gender equality?</li> </ul>
b. Validity of design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Was the design process adequate?</li> <li>▪ Do outputs causally link to the intended outcomes/objectives?</li> <li>▪ Did the project adequately consider the gender dimension of the planned interventions?</li> <li>▪ Do the project objectives and outcomes adequately address gender concerns?</li> </ul>
c. Project progress and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What outputs have been produced and delivered so far, and</li> </ul>



effectiveness	<p>has the quality of these outputs been satisfactory?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Are women and men likely to benefit from project activities?</li><li>▪ What progress has been made towards achieving the programme objectives/outcomes?</li></ul>
d. Effectiveness of management arrangements and efficiency of resource use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Are the available technical and financial resources adequate to fulfill the project plans?</li><li>▪ How effectively does the project management monitor programme performance and results?</li><li>▪ Is information being shared and readily accessible to national partners?</li></ul>
e. Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Is there any progress in local partners' capacity to carry forward the project and is there a growing sense of ownership?</li><li>▪ Does the project succeed in integrating its approach into local institutions?</li><li>▪ Does the project succeed in developing a replicable approach that can be applied with modifications to other sectors?</li></ul>

#### **Methodology to be followed**

The evaluation will employ three methodologies: document reviews, key informant interviews and a review workshop.

##### **i) Document review**

The evaluator shall familiarize him/herself with the project through a review of relevant documents. These documents include inter alia: Project Document, minutes of meetings (steering committee meetings), workshop reports, work plans, strategy maps, progress report and monitoring reports. Selected documents will also be made available to the evaluator via e-mail.



ii) Key Informant Interviews

- a. The evaluator will be available at Durban Container Terminal to carry out ten key informant interviews.
- b. Interviews will use a simple questionnaire designed to solicit feedback on opportunities and constraints to the delivery of project outcomes.
- c. The questionnaire will be developed by the evaluator in consultation with project staff and tested with two interviewees nominated by project staff before use.
- d. Interviews will be conducted face-to-face or by telephone. Project staff will arrange the interviews and where necessary provide a venue.
- e. Interview categories include project staff (CTA, NPCs, technical backstoppers in Pretoria), other stakeholders (donors), beneficiaries, and selected other ILO staff. A list of interview categories will be given to the evaluator for selection.

iii) Stakeholder Review workshops

- a. One stakeholder review workshop will be held at Durban Container Terminal. The workshop will be attended by key stakeholders who did not form part of the interview process.
- b. The evaluator will develop a workshop programme in consultation with project staff. The workshop will be designed in such a way as to solicit feedback from attendees on the opportunities and constraints to the delivery of project outcomes.
- c. The evaluator will consult with the Programme Officer on the group to attend the workshop. Project staff will arrange the workshop and provide venue and workshop facilities as requested by the evaluator.

Port Work Development project staff in Durban and Pretoria (South Africa) will be available to facilitate the MTE as required.

## 5. Main Outputs

The evaluator will provide the following main outputs:

- A draft report for comment
- One stakeholders' workshop
- A final report

The evaluator will produce a concise final report according to the ILO evaluation guidelines and reflecting the key evaluation questions. The quality of the report will be determined by conformance with Checklist 4 Formatting Requirements for Evaluation Reports (appendix 3), and Checklist 5 Rating for Quality of Evaluation Reports (appendix 4). The maximum length of the final report is 30 pages long.

The expected structure of the final report is outlined below:

- Title page
- Table of contents and lists
- List of acronyms or abbreviations [as appropriate]
- Executive summary
- Body of the report

### Introduction

1. Brief background on the project and its logic
2. Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation
3. Methodology
4. Review of implementation
5. Main findings

#### 5.1. Relevance of strategic fit

- 5.1.1. Is the programme directly supporting the national development priorities and the DWCP?
- 5.1.2. How well does it complement other relevant ILO project in South Africa
- 5.1.3. What links are established/being established with other similar activities of the UN or non-UN international development organizations at country level?
- 5.1.4. Does the project align with ILO's mainstreamed strategy on gender equality?

#### 5.2. Validity of design

- 5.2.1. Was the design process adequate?
- 5.2.2. Do outputs causally link to the intended outcomes/objectives?
- 5.2.3. Did the project adequately consider the gender dimension of the planned interventions?

5.2.4 Do the project objectives and outcomes adequately address gender concerns?

5.3. Project progress and effectiveness

5.3.1. What outputs have been produced and delivered so far, and has the quality of these outputs been satisfactory?

5.3.2. What progress has been made towards achieving the programme objectives/outcomes?

5.3.3. Are women and men likely to benefit from project activities?

5.3.4. What progress has been made towards achieving the programme objectives/outcomes?

5.4. Effectiveness of management arrangements and efficiency of resource use

5.4.1. Are the available technical and financial resources adequate to fulfill the project plans?

5.4.2. How effectively does the project management monitor programme performance and results?

5.4.3. Is information being shared and readily accessible to national partners?

5.5. Sustainability

5.5.1. Is there any progress in local partners' capacity to carry forward the project and is there a growing sense of ownership?

5.5.2. Does the project succeed in integrating its approach into local institutions?

5.5.3. Does the project succeed in developing a replicable approach that can be applied with modifications to other sectors?

6. Conclusions

6.1. Conclusions

6.2. Lessons learned

6.3. Good practices

6.4. Recommendations

7. Appendices

The evaluator is required to append the following items:

- Terms of Reference
- Data collection instruments
- List of meetings attended

- List of persons or organisations interviewed
- Attendance registers of stakeholders' workshops
- List of documents / publications cited
- Any further information the evaluator deems appropriate can also be added.

The evaluator is responsible for reflecting any factual corrections brought to his/her attention prior to the finalization of the final report. Therefore, in order to ensure that the report considers the views of all parties concerned, is properly understood and factually correct, the evaluator shall submit a draft report to the CTA no later than two weeks after completion of the evaluation mission. The CTA will solicit and revert promptly with collective feedback from project staff and partners in order for the evaluator to finalize the report. The quality of the report will be assessed against the ILO evaluation checklists 4 and 5 (see annex). Adherence to these checklists should be considered a contractual requirement when submitting evaluations to ensure full remuneration of the contract. All evaluation report submissions must include a MS Word and a PDF version.

The final report shall be shared with the Project Steering Committee.

## **6. Management Arrangement and Work Plan**

The evaluation process is expected to be concluded within three weeks. The field evaluation will take place in Durban during the week of 9<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> July 2012 as set out in the work plan below. The CTA and Programme Officer will be the direct focal points for support during this time. Following the field evaluation, five (5) working days are allocated for development of the draft report, i.e. 16<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> July 2012.

The draft report should be submitted for comment by latest 20<sup>th</sup> July 2012 to the Evaluation Manager, Ms. Chantel Bellerose at [bellerose@ilo.org](mailto:bellerose@ilo.org). One week will be allocated to concerned parties to provide inputs, where after the Evaluation Manager will return the draft report to the evaluator by latest 27<sup>th</sup> July 2012. The final report will be submitted to the Evaluation Manager and CTA ([ramjuthan@ilo.org](mailto:ramjuthan@ilo.org)), copying the Senior Technical Specialist ([klemmer@ilo.org](mailto:klemmer@ilo.org)) and Programme Officer ([lestrade@ilo.org](mailto:lestrade@ilo.org)), by latest 31<sup>st</sup> July 2012.

The Programme Officer will be the focal point for all general, logistical and programme queries related to the evaluation. Said official can be contacted on email: [lestrade@ilo.org](mailto:lestrade@ilo.org), office tel. 0027-12-818 8075 or cell no. 0027-725812082.

The table below gives an indication of the planned activities in the MTE process with the corresponding timelines

Activities	1	2	3	4
Weeks & Month (2012)				
<b>EVALUATION MISSION: Durban Container Terminal – Durban South Africa</b>				
Document Review				
Key informant interviews				
Review workshop with selected stakeholders				
<b>REPORTING</b>				
Draft Report				
Comments on Draft Report				
Submission of Final Report				

The evaluation will comply with UN Norms and Standards and UNEG ethical guidelines will be followed. This TOR is accompanied by the code of conduct for carrying out the evaluation (appendix 5).

### **Appendix 3: Evaluation Questions**

#### **Relevance and Fit**

- Is the programme directly supporting the national development priorities and the Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP)?
- How well does it complement other relevant ILO projects in South Africa?
- What links are established/being established with other similar activities of the UN or non-UN international development organizations at country level?
- Does the project align with ILO's mainstreamed strategy on gender equality?

#### **Validity of Design**

- Was the design process adequate?
- Do outputs causally link to the intended outcomes/objectives?
- Did the project adequately consider the gender dimension of the planned interventions?
- Do the project objectives and outcomes adequately address gender concerns?

#### **Progress and Effectiveness of Project**

- What outputs have been produced and delivered so far, and has the quality of these outputs been satisfactory?
- Are women and men likely to benefit from project activities?
- What progress has been made towards achieving the programme objectives/outcomes?

#### **Effectiveness of management and efficiency of resource use**

- Are the available technical and financial resources adequate to fulfil the project plans?
- How effectively does the project management monitor programme performance and results?
- Is information being shared and readily accessible to national partners?

#### **Sustainability.**

- Is there any progress in local partners' capacity to carry forward the project and is there a growing sense of ownership?
- Does the project succeed in integrating its approach into local institutions?
- Does the project succeed in developing a replicable approach that can be applied with modifications to other sectors?

## **Appendix 4**

### **List of Documents Provided for the Evaluation**

#### **General UN and ILO Documents**

International Labour Organisation (July 2012): *Implementation Update of the South Africa Decent Work Country Programme*.

International Labour Organization (2010): *Decent Work Country Programme for South Africa (2010 – 2014)*.

International Labour Organization (2010): *Checklist 4: Formatting Requirements for Evaluation Reports*.

United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)(2008): *UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System*.

#### **General Project Documents**

International Labour Organisation (June 2012): *Presentation to the Ambassador Dinner*

International Labour Organisation (March 2012): *Presentation to the EMC-MOU Management Committee*.

International Labour Organisation (2011) *Port Work Development Project*, 2 pps

International Labour Organisation (2010): *Promotion of Decent Work in the South African Transport Sector (Phase 1)* 33 pps

**Project Reporting Documents (authored by the PMU)**

Budget (2011, 2012)

Budget Delivery Rate (as of 5 July 2012)

Container Terminal Management Training (July 2012)

Desktop Evaluation of Existing Social Dialogue Mechanisms in the Port of Durban (Durban Container Terminal)

Expenditure Summary by Commitment (2011)

Expenditure Summary by Sub-Object (2011)

Email Reports/M&E Feedback (February/March 2012, April 2012, June 2012)

Financial Reports (2011, and 2012 up to 5 July)

Missions/Study Tours (Antwerp/Rotterdam November 2011; Turin March 2012)

Mission Directed Work Teams (various reports)

Monitoring Reports (December 2011, January/February 2012)

Outline for Phase II (2 pps)

Project Implementation Plans (as at November 2011, and as of May 2012)

School of Port Operations: Overview (February 2012)

Steering Committee Minutes (2011: August, September; 2012: February, April)

Strategy Maps (2011: October, November, December; 2012: January, January/February, February/March, March/April, May/June).

Technical Indicator Description (February 2012)

Technical Cooperation Progress Reports (January - September 2011, January 2011 – January 2012)

Workshop on Strengthening Social Dialogue in the Ports Sector (June 2012).



**Appendix 5:**  
**List and Schedule of Persons Interviewed**

Port Work Development Programme: Mid-Term Evaluation						
List and Schedule of Persons Interviewed						
No	Name	Organisation & Designation	Date and Time	Venue	Contact	Status
1	Andreas Klemmer	ILO, Sr. Enterprise Development Specialist	3 Aug 2012, 12h00 - 13h00	Telephonic interview	klemmer@ilo.org	Completed
2	Neeran Ramjuthan	ILO, CTA	10 July 2012, 10h00 - 13h00	TPT, Morningside	780191969	Completed
3	Raymond Nazar	Belgian Consulate, Consul	11 July 2012, 09h00 - 10h00	TPT, Morningside	313032840	Completed
4	Linda Chonco	SOPO, Training Manager	11 July 2012, 10h00 - 11h00	TPT, Morningside		Completed
5	Willie Coetsee	Transnet, Manager (Strategy)	11 July 2012, 12h15 - 13h00	TPT, Morningside	842082796	Completed
6	Sibongile Sithebe	Head School of Port Operations	11 July 2012, 14h30 - 15h30	TPT, Morningside		Completed
7	Bhekithemba Gumede	SATAWU, Full-time Shop Steward		TPT, Morningside	782769660	No Response
8	Steven Marais	UTATU, Full-time Shop Steward	11 July 2012, 15h30 - 16h30	TPT, Morningside	833822083	Completed
9	Hector Danisa	DCT, Terminal Executive	11 July 2012, 17h00 - 18h00	DCT	832624220	Completed
10	Sibusiso Gwala	SATAWU Shop Steward		DCT	785751034	Included in Workshop
11	Leon Fourie	UTATU, Shop Steward	12 July 2012, 09h00 - 10h00	DCT	846222277	Completed
12	Sybrand Fourie	Consultant	13 July 2012, 10h15 - 11h00	Telephonic interview	832615864	Completed
13	Erik Litver	Dutch Embassy	13 July 2012, 11h15 - 12h15	Telephonic interview	124254553	Completed
14	Thamsanqa Makhathini	SOPO, Training Facilitator	16 July 2012, 09h00 - 10h00	Telephonic interview	834887352	Completed
15	David Maenaut	Flemish Office, Representative	16 July 2012, 10h00 - 11h00	Telephonic interview	124600781	Completed
16	Irin Smith	SATAWU, Shop Steward	17 July 2012, 08h30 - 09h30	TPT, Morningside	728780568	Completed
17	Luzelle Lestrade	ILO, Programme Officer	17 July 2012, 14h00 - 15h00	TPT, Morningside		Completed
18	Moshe Motlohi	TPT, Executive	16 July 2012, 15h00 - 16h00	DUT	832888908	Completed
19	Limpho Mandoro	ILO, Social Dialogue Specialist	18 July 2012, 10h30 - 11h00	Telephonic interview	739109063	Completed

## Appendix 6: List of Workshop Attendees



Internal Mid-term Evaluation of the Port Work Development Project Workshop			
Date	17 <sup>th</sup> July 2012	Venue	199/203 North Ridge Road (Peter Mokaba Road) Name of Boardroom: Umkhumbi 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor
Time	10h00 to 14h00	Facilitator	Prof. Dan Archer

No	Name	Surname	Representation	email Address	Signature
1.	Noeran	Ramjuthan	ILO	ramjuthan@ilo.org	
2.	Luzelle	Lestrade	ILO	lestrade@ilo.org	
3.	Raymond	Nazar	Belgian Consulate, Durban	raynazar@worldonline.co.za	
4.	Bhekithemba	Gumede	SATAWU Full time Shop Steward	bhekithemba.gumede@transnet.net	
5.	Irin	Smith	SATAWU Shop Steward	irin.smith@transnet.net	
6.	Sandy	Landers	SATAWU Shop Steward	Sandy.Landers@transnet.net	
7.	Sibusiso	Gwala	SATAWU Shop Steward	Sibusiso.gwala@transnet.net	
8.	Lorraine	Wentzel	SATAWU Full time Shop Steward	Wentzel.lorraine@transnet.net	
9.	Steven	Marais	UTATU Full time Shop Steward	Steven.marais@transnet.net	
10.	Fourie	Fourie	UTATU Shop Steward	Leon.fourie@transnet.net	
11.	Norman	Krauspe	UTATU Shop Steward	Krauspe.Norman@transnet.net	
12.	Mpumi	Ngobese	UTATU Shop Steward	Mpumi.ncube@transnet.net	
13.	Moshe	Motlohi	People Transformation Unit	Moshe.motlohi@transnet.net	
14.	Siyabonga	Mdladla	People Transformation Unit	Siyabonga.mdladla@transnet.net	
15.					
16.					
17.					
18.					

**Appendix 7:  
Project Implementation Plan (May 2012)**

Activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
	July 11	Aug 11	Sept 11	Oct 11	Nov 11	Dec 11	Jan 12	Feb 12	Mar 12	Apr 12	May 12	Jun 12	July 12	Aug 12	Sep 12	Oct 12	Nov 12	Dec 12	Jan 13	Feb 13	Mar 13	April 13	May 13	Jun 13
<b>Inception Phase: Objective 0 – Establishment of the Programme Management Unit and the Programme Steering Committee</b>																								
The project management unit is operational																								
The project steering committee is established																								
The project strategy has been validated																								
<b>Immediate Objective 1: To promote a more dialogue-driven mediation of stakeholder interests in the Port of Durban (Durban Container Terminal)</b>																								
<b>Output 1.1 A firmly institutionalized social dialogue mechanism linking internal Port stakeholders that is reflective of international best practice</b>																								
A 1.1.1 Study tours for stakeholder representatives to assess international best practice of social dialogue and HRD strategies in Port																								
A 1.1.2 A review of the existing mechanisms for both internal and external social dialogue in the Port of Durban (DCT)																								
A 1.1.3 Where applicable, advisory services to refine the existing mechanisms																								
A 1.1.4 Capacity building support for each stakeholder group to mediate their respective interest through the refined system																								
A 1.1.5 Facilitation of social dialogue around the planned HRD initiative																								
A1.1.6 Training on general principles and practices of social dialogue for Management and Labour representatives.																								
A1.1.7 Collective bargaining training for Management and Labour representatives.																								
A.1.1.8 International Capacity building Social Dialogue study tour for Labour																								
A1.1.9 Monitoring and evaluation of the outcomes and impact of the interventions above																								

Output 1.2 A forum for social dialogue between internal and external Port stakeholders building on the current																								
A 1.2.1 Review of the existing mechanisms of communication with external stakeholders																								
A 1.2.2 Stakeholders validates the research findings on external social dialogue mechanisms.																								
A 1.2.3 Monitoring and evaluation of outcomes and impact of the interventions above																								
Immediate Objective 2: To create a more conducive policy and regulatory framework for “doing business” in the Ports (DCT) with emphasis on HRD																								
Output 2.1 Increased knowledge amongst Port stakeholders about international best practice in HRD strategies and policies																								
A 2.1.1 Training senior management representatives in how to better balance financial and non-financial objectives in the long-term business strategy for Ports (DCT)																								
A 2.1.2 Follow-up advisory services to refine the existing strategic plans of the Ports (DCT)																								
A 2.1.3 Coaching session in productivity strategy (MDW)																								
A 2.1.4 Training for senior managers in Container Terminal Management on international best practice (target 6)																								
A 2.1.5 Training for operational staff in Container Terminal Management on international best practice... (target 55)																								
A 2.1.6 Training of Trainers in on the new HRD initiative.																								
A 2.1.7 Operational staff and management are trained in the new HRD initiative.																								
A 2.1.8 Monitoring and evaluation of outcomes and impacts of the interventions above																								
Output 2.2 Refined HRD policies and regulations in the Port of Durban (DCT)																								
A 2.2.1 Training of HRD line managers and HRD operational staff in latest thinking on Port-centered HRD policies and regulations (re-think – a repetition of 2.1.?)																								
A 2.2.2 Follow up advisory services for HRD line managers and their operational staff to fine tune existing HRD policies and regulations – (DCT)																								
A 2.2.3 Follow up support for HRD line managers and their operational staff to																								

## Report of the Mid-Term Evaluation of the ILO Port Work Development Project

communicate the refined HRD policies and regulations – (DCT)																								
A2.2.4 The new HRD initiative is launched to all workers.																								
A2.2.5 Mini-business units on the new HRD initiative are set up.																								
A 2.2.4 Monitoring and evaluation of outcomes and impacts of the interventions above																								
<b>Immediate Objective 3: To strengthen the capacity of local Business Development Service (BDS) providers, among them predominantly the School of Port Operations to in turn provide Port stakeholder groups with a range of workforce centered training and advisory services</b>																								
<b>Output 3.1 Training and advisory service products tailored to the needs of Port workers</b>																								
A 3.1.1 Review of existing staff development training packages in the local and international market place (including the materials already used by Port Schools of Operations, APEC and STC																								
A3.1.2 International Portworker Development training for PDP Facilitators at the School of Port Operations																								
A3.1.3 Planner training for facilitators at the School of Port Operations																								
A3.1.4 Training School of Port Operations in curriculum development for port operations.																								
A 3.1.5 Adaptation of training products/services used by the Port School of Operation in line with international best practice and aligned to the new occupational profiles drafted by the QCTO																								
A 3.1.6 Monitoring and evaluation of outcomes and impact of above interventions																								

## Report of the Mid-Term Evaluation of the ILO Port Work Development Project

<b>Output 3.2 Local BDS providers (School of Port Operations) competent in the delivery of these services</b>																								
A 3.2.1 Training of trainers from the School of Port Operations in the use of amended training services/products (refer to output 3.1)																								
A 3.2.2 Coaching and support for newly trained trainers to in turn train Port workers (DCT)																								
A 3.2.3 Monitoring and evaluation of outcomes and impact of above interventions																								
<b>Immediate Objective 4: To boost the capacity of all Port stakeholders to fully unlock the benefits of the HRD effort.</b>																								
<b>Output 4.1 Port workers have the awareness level and information base required to make informed career and livelihood choices</b>																								
A 4.1.1 A Port worker (DCT) information campaign to raise customer awareness about the new service offerings																								
A4.1.2 Competency profiles are developed for all job titles.																								
A4.1.3 A career matrix is developed for all employees.																								
A4.1.4 A training gap analysis is developed for all employees.																								
A 4.1.5 Follow-up counselling support for Port workers (DCT) to enable them to make informed career and livelihood choices and to draw up individual staff development plans																								
A 4.1.6 Monitoring and evaluation of the outcome and impact of the campaign																								
<b>Output 4.2 Port workers take up the staff development services offered by BDS providers</b>																								
A 4.2.1 Facilitation of access for Port workers (DCT) to skills training as per their staff development plans and through local trainer consultants from the Port School of Operations and where applicable other service providers (see above outputs 3.1 and 3.2)																								
A 4.2.2 Monitoring and evaluation of the outcome and impact of these interventions																								

## Appendix 8: Strategy Map (May/June 2012)

