



International Labour Organization

iTrack Evaluation

ILO EVALUATION

- **Evaluation Title:** Final evaluation of the project Extending access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families in selected RECs in Africa
- **ILO TC/SYMBOL:** RAF/17/16/ICM
- **Type of Evaluation :** Final Independent Evaluation
- **Country(ies) :** Africa: AUC, EAC, ECOWAS and SADC
- **P&B outcome(s):** P&B 2018 – 2019: Outcome 3 and 9; and P&B 2020-2021: Outcome 7 and 8
- **SDG(s):** SDG Targets: 8.8, 1.3, 5.4, 3.8, 5.4 and 10.4
- **Date of the evaluation:** 14 September 2020
- **Name of consultant(s):** Theo van der Loop
- **ILO Administrative Office:** ILO Regional Office for Africa
- **ILO Technical Backstopping Office:** MIGRANT and SOCPRO, ILO, Geneva
- **Other agencies involved in joint evaluation:** Not applicable
- **Date project ends:** 15 October 2020
- **Donor: country and budget US\$ ICMPSD / EU : EUR 2,326,813 (US\$ 2,645,150)**
- **Evaluation Manager:** Ricardo Furman, Senior M&E Officer, ILO Regional Programme Unit/ROAF
- **Evaluation Budget:** US\$ 13,200
- **Key Words:** Migrant workers and their families, social protection, portability of benefits, Regional Economic Communities

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

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iv
List of Abbreviations	v
Executive Summary	viii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background and Objectives of the Project.....	1
1.2 Purpose, Scope and Clients of the Final Independent Evaluation	3
2 Methodology of the Evaluation	5
2.1 Conceptual Framework.....	5
2.2 Methodology, Work Plan and Key Deliverables.....	5
3 Overall Findings	7
3.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit.....	7
3.2 Validity of design.....	11
3.3 Project effectiveness.....	12
3.4 Efficiency of resource use.....	19
3.5 Effectiveness of management arrangements	20
3.6 Impact orientation and sustainability.....	23
3.7 Visibility	26
4 Conclusions and Recommendations	28
4.1 Conclusions	28
4.2 Recommendations	31
5 Lessons Learned and Good Practices	34

List of Annexes

Annex 1	Terms of Reference (TOR).....	36
Annex 2	List of persons interviewed	37
Annex 3	List of Key Stakeholders	38
Annex 4	Data Collection Worksheet	40
Annex 5	Work plan.....	44
Annex 6	Gender Equality Strategy.....	45
Annex 7	Lessons Learned (LL) and Good practices (GP).....	46
Annex 8	List of Documents Consulted.....	51

List of Tables

Tables:

1	ECOWAS: Activities undertaken and revisions made compared to the LogFrame.	13
2	SADC: Activities undertaken and revisions made compared to the LogFrame.	13
3	EAC: Activities undertaken and revisions made compared to the LogFrame.	14
4	AUC: Activities undertaken and revisions made compared to the LogFrame.	15
5	Actual expenditures and proposed expenditures ('Forecast') for the remaining project period (as of 30 June 2020)	20

List of Abbreviations

ACTEMP	(ILO) Bureau on Employers' Activities
ACTRAV	(ILO) Bureau on Workers' Activities
AMU	Arab Maghreb Union
ARLAC	African Labour Administrative Council
AU	African Union
AUC	African Union Commission
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CEN-SAD	The Community of Sahel-Saharan States
CESS	Committee of Experts on Social Security
CIPRES	Conférence Interafricaine de la Prévoyance Sociale
CISNA	Committee of Insurance, Securities and Non-Bank Financial Authorities
CMP	Common Market Protocol
CNSS	Caisse nationale de Sécurité Sociale
CO	Country Office
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CPSC	Committee for Project Steering and Coordination
CSMEAP	EAC Council and Sectoral Council of Ministers responsible for EAC Affairs and Planning
CRADAT	Centre Régional Africain d'Administration du Travail
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DWT	ILO Decent Work Team
EAC	East African Community
EAEO	East African Employers Organisation
EATUC	East African Trade Union Confederation
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
ECASSA	East and Central African Social Security Association
ECCAS	Economic Community of Central African States
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ELS	Employment and Labour Sector
EO	Employers' Organisation
EST	Estimated
EU	European Union
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FMM West Africa	Support to Free Movement of Persons and Migration in West Africa
HLTF	High Level Task Force
ICMPD	International Centre for Migration Policy Development
IGAD	Inter-Governmental Authority on Development
ILC	International Labour Conference
ILMS	International Labour Migration Statistics
ILO	International Labour Organisation
ILOSTATS	ILO database of labour statistics
ILS	International Labour Standard
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
IPRES	Institut de Prévoyance Retraite du Sénégal
IR	Inception Report

ISSA	International Social Security Association
ITC/ILO	ILO International Training Centre (in Turin)
ITCU-Africa	International Trade Union Conference- Africa
JLMP	Joint Labour Migration Programme
JTTS	Joint Tripartite Technical Sub-Committees
LMIS	Labour Market Information System
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MIGRANT	International Migration Programme
MIGSEC project	Extending social security coverage to African migrant workers and their families
MMD	Africa EU Migration and Mobility Dialogue (funding facility)
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSMEs	Micro, small and medium enterprises
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NASSCORP	National Social Security & Welfare Cooperation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NOA/NOB	National Officer (Grade A / Grade B)
NPC	National Project Coordinator
NSITF	Nigeria Social Insurance Trust Fund
OVI	Objectively verifiable indicators
OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
PARDEV	Partnerships and Field Support
PMF	Performance Measurement Framework
PPRM	Policy, Planning & Resource Mobilisation
PRODOC	Project Document
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PSU	Project Support Unit
RECs	Regional Economic Communities
RISDP	Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan
ROAF	Regional Office for Africa
ROM	Results-Oriented Monitoring
RPU	Regional Programming Unit
RSS	Republic of South Sudan
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SAMM	Southern Africa Migration Management
SATUCC	Southern Africa Trade Union Coordinating Council
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SEP/CNPS	Secrétariat exécutif permanent de la Commission nationale de protection sociale
SOCPRO	Social Protection Department- ILO
SP4MW	Social Protection for Migrant Workers and their Families
SPSF	SADC Private Sector Forum
SSHFC	Social Security and Housing Finance Corporation
SSNIT	Social Security and National Insurance Trust
TC	Technical Cooperation
ToC	Theory of Change
TOT	Training of Trainers
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training

UMA	Arab Maghreb Union
UN	United Nations
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WS	World Solidarity

Executive Summary

Background and project description

The present Evaluation Report is mandated by the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Final Independent Evaluation of the project “Extending access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families in selected RECs in Africa” (see Annex 1). The rationale of the project is that migrant workers face huge challenges in exercising their rights to social protection and portability of benefits. The project Objective is: Strengthening the capacities of RECs to provide and drive the implementation of regional frameworks on the extension of social protection to migrant workers and their families including those in the informal economy.” The project has identified four Outputs or Results Areas, one for each of the four main partners: AUC, EAC, ECOWAS and SADC.

Objective, Scope and Methodology of the Evaluation

The overall *purpose* of the present independent final evaluation is to assess the extent to which the project has achieved its objective, promoting accountability and strengthening learning among the key project stakeholders, including the donor and ILO. The specific objectives of the evaluation are related to the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, validity of design, effectiveness, efficiency, management arrangements, impact orientation and sustainability, and visibility. The *scope* of the Evaluation includes the entire implementation period of the project until July 2020. The principal *clients* for this evaluation are the AUC, the RECs (EAC, ECOWAS, and SADC), the regional social partners, project stakeholders and partners including JLMP Partners as well as development partners (ICMPD, EU) and the ILO. The *methodology* includes a desk study, primary data collection through in-depth interviews and discussions which were all conducted online due to the COVID-19 pandemic, data analysis and reporting. Key deliverables are the inception report, the PowerPoint presentation with the preliminary findings, the draft report, the final report taking into consideration the feedback on the draft report, a Matrix including comments and explanations why comments were or were not incorporated into the report, and a stand-alone evaluation summary using the ILO standard template.

Findings

The conclusions of the final independent evaluation are below categorized according to the seven evaluation criteria used throughout this report. The ***Relevance and Strategic Fit*** of the intervention was quite high for the beneficiaries and for the countries involved, and most of the stakeholders interviewed underlined that the relevance has remained high until today and has only become more urgent due to the COVID-19 crisis. In particular the project’s objectives aligned closely to the priorities and needs of the four partners, i.e. the three RECs secretariats and the AUC. At the AU level the project supported the Joint Labour Migration Programme (JLMP) and aligned to the AU Migration Policy Framework. The project was also relevant to the interests of the migrants working in the *informal economy*, while it was less relevant to the priorities of the employers’ and workers’ organisations. The intervention was further clearly aligned to global and regional frameworks, such as SDGs, the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM), and the Africa EU Migration and Mobility Dialogue (MMD) as well as to several policy outcomes of the ILO Programme and Budget (P&B).

The intervention was partly demand-driven especially since the AUC was keen to start such a project. The project is funded by the European Union through the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD) as part of the MMD under its capacity-building component

dedicated to operationalising pan-African and euro-African migration and mobility frameworks including the political priorities of the dialogues.. In total it took about 1.5 years of negotiations between the EU and the ILO to finalize the EU Action Document. Stakeholder involvement in the project was rather mixed with the AUC as the initiator being deeply involved in the design phase while this was reduced somewhat during implementation when the attention had to be divided over the different components of JLMP. Of the three RECs, SADC was most active, while for example the EAC suffered from understaffing. Involvement of regional employers' and workers' organisations was more limited.

Internal coherence was clearly satisfactory as the project has built on a large number of other ILO projects in particular MIGSEC and FMM West Africa, while the project promoted coherence during the implementation phase with few other ILO projects (including SAMM). In terms of external coherence, the project was firmly embedded in the EU-funded MMD and in the broader JLMP; for the future, coordination will be needed with the new Swiss-funded Labour Migration project.

The *Validity of design* of the project was satisfactory but had some important drawbacks. The PRODOC's LogFrame is a clear document with four outputs or results areas and 17 activities, and with a complete set of indicators, baselines, targets and assumptions. However, the implementation approach was rather ambitious including three RECs spread all over Africa in a project of about Euro 2.3 million to be implemented in just 22 months. The project design included further a basic type of sustainability strategy but no gender strategy; after the Grant Evaluation Commission recommended to take gender equality into account more specifically throughout the Action the response of the ILO amounted to a Gender Strategy.

Overall the evaluation found that *Project effectiveness* has been satisfactory. In **ECOWAS** progress was made with the implementation of the General Convention through technical assistance and guidance from the project (see Table 1). In **SADC** most leadership was shown and most progress was made, i.e. on the Guidelines and the action plan (Table 2). In the **EAC**, activities were revived after a long interval since 2011 and the project has been supporting the revision of the draft EAC Council Directive, as well as two country studies (Table 3). With respect to the **AUC**, progress was made through a high-level capacity building workshop, the support to include a migration component in ILO's Social Security Inquiry, SSI, and the work on the dashboard of ECASSA (Table 4).

The inclusion of the *informal economy* was an additional exploratory component and two studies were undertaken which remained somewhat theoretical in particular due to lack of data (Ghana and Cabo Verde). For the coming months, the project will try to include an analysis of the impact of COVID-19 on the informal economy. The project's *gender strategy* as given in Annex 6 was not very ambitious and some elements were not implemented. The project did make an effort to include gender equality, but also faced the political processes of the RECs which are not always particularly gender sensitive.

As a result of special circumstances, the project required *two No-Cost Extensions*, one in July 2019 and the second in July 2020. The 1st one was needed because there were major challenges in delivering within the 22 months and the main change was an extension with one year until July 2020. The 2nd one was the result of the COVID-19 crisis, and it proposed an extension of two and half months of project implementation until 15 October 2020 including a virtual closing event. Both extensions were appropriate and are understandable based on the project context.

The main *contributing factors* towards project's success include the commitment within the RECs to improve social protection and portability for migrant workers, the expertise, flexibility and hard work of the project team, the support from different ILO units and the support and flexibility of ICMPD and EU to approve the crucial no-cost extensions. The *challenges* faced by the project are relatively numerous and include the stepwise political processes in the RECs/AUC each step often requiring consensus among member states, the difficulties encountered in the coordination of national social security laws, lack of knowledge on social security among the regional social partners and some government representatives, sometimes leadership at RECs in social security issues is not sufficient, lack of data especially on informal migrant workers, shortage of funds and staff to accommodate *all* of the requests made by the RECs/AUC and, of course, COVID-19.

The *Efficiency of resource use* has overall been good in the project. Almost 80% of the budget of over USD 2.6 million had actually been spent as of 30 June 2020, and the remaining 20% has been partly re-allocated to activities that are expected to be possible during the COVID-19 crisis. The actual expenditures by cost categories (Table 5) show that the largest category was for the project team with about 37%, which is relatively modest for an ILO project of this nature, also compared to the total for the four main partners which will amount to 50% at the end of the project. The AUC component substantially lagged behind until 30 June 2020 but is expected to absorb no less than one third of the no-cost extension. The expenditures are very much in line with the original budgetary plans of the PRODOC. Another element of efficiency concerns the solid synergies with other ILO initiatives, in particular with JLMP, MIGSEC and FMM.

The *Effectiveness of management arrangements* is overall satisfactory. The backstopping, guidance and support by ILO units, i.e. ROAF, SOCPRO, MIGRANT, DWT in Pretoria and Dakar and the Country office in Addis Ababa have been intense at times (e.g. in the project design phase) and have always been sufficient. In terms of project management, the project was staffed with a relatively small project team based in Ethiopia and Tanzania partly because the EU's preference was to have more funds for non-staff costs and a lean project team. Nevertheless, the stakeholders interviewed for the present evaluation have commended the project team and the ILO for its expertise, flexibility, good communication as well as good presentations.

The Project Steering Committee (PSC) chaired by AUC held only one meeting (in February 2019) which provided support for the first no-cost extension. A second PSC meeting was planned for March/April 2020 but was cancelled because of COVID-19. The updated work plans function appropriately as M&E Plan, and two complete Progress Reports were prepared as well as two comprehensive proposals for no-cost extensions.

The sixth evaluation criteria, *Impact orientation and sustainability*, was also evaluated as satisfactory despite the very difficult COVID-19 conditions since March 2020. Positive changes in the RECs have been registered in this report in the area of *policy development* as well as in the area of *administration*. The PRODOC did not include a specific 'exit strategy', but there were various sustainability considerations. Nevertheless, even as early as February 2019 the PSC noted that follow-up interventions would be required. Also, for the individual RECs a lot still needs to be done to make the interventions sustainable. *Ownership* of the project outcomes was highest in SADC showing leadership in several decisions made by the Meeting of Ministers. The AUC was important as a kind of liaison between the three RECs. Ownership was not built among the regional social partners, although in the SADC region progress was made in this respect.

Most stakeholders recognized that the work with the RECs needs to be considered in a longer-term perspective well beyond *the end of the project* and therefore interventions need to continue especially now that COVID-19 has created many more challenges for migrant workers. Possible elements to be considered for a future intervention to sustain the momentum are the inclusion of the present three RECs as well as national level interventions, continuation of the AUC involvement, inclusion of work on the informal economy, inclusion of other RECs (e.g. IGAD and/or UMA), and attention for the impact of COVID-19. Lastly, ILO can liaise with the EU and the ICMPD to monitor the possibility of a follow-up phase, and with the broader JLMP programme. In principle, a continuation of the project would have the interest of the EC, since it attaches importance both to internal mobility and to social protection.

The project's *Visibility* has been satisfactory in terms of acknowledging the contribution of EU and ICMPD, although the different websites could have been kept more up to date. In the coming months, during the 2nd no-cost extension phase, there will be more opportunities to enhance the visibility, for example through the virtual closing event and the COVID-19 relief effort.

Recommendations

Relevance and strategic fit

- 1) **Involve more pro-actively the regional employers' and workers' organisations (EO/WO) in the project**, and include specific activities directed exclusively at these regional EO/WO in order to enhance their knowledge and involvement as well as their sense of ownership.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO ROAF, Project Team, regional EO/WO, RECs/AUC, ILO workers' and employers' specialists (ACTRAV and ACT/EMP), DWTs	Medium	Remainder of the project period, and design of new projects	Part of ongoing investments, and part of new interventions

Validity of design

- 2) **Include a comprehensive and targeted Gender Equality Strategy in the PRODOC**, and in particular make sure that all stakeholders pay specific attention to the inclusion of women in each and every project activity.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO ROAF, DWT Gender Specialists, HQ Geneva, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, RECs/AUC	Medium	Design of new projects	Part of new interventions.

Project effectiveness

- 3) **Accommodate and anticipate as far as possible the stepwise political approval processes in the RECs and AUC** which often impacts on project implementation leading to delays especially since mostly consensus is required among all member/partner states for every major subsequent step.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO ROAF, RECs/AUC, DWTs, HQ Geneva, MIGRANT, SOCPRO	Medium	Design of new projects	Part of new interventions.

Efficiency of resource use

- 4) **Maintain the synergies with other Labour Migration projects and programmes in Africa**, in particular with the broader JLMP programme, with the recently launched EU funded Southern Africa Migration Management (SAMM) project working with two RECs (SADC and COMESA), as well as with the new Swiss funded Labour Migration project (2021-2024) involving six RECS: the three from the present project, i.e. EAC, ECOWAS and SADC, as well as AMU, COMESA and ECCAS.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO ROAF, Project Team, JLMP, EU, SAMM, Swiss funded project, RECs/AUC, DWTs, MIGRANT, SOCPRO	Medium to High	Remainder of the project period, and design of new projects	Part of ongoing investments, and part of new interventions

Effectiveness of management arrangements

- 5) **Make sure that the project team is large enough to deal not only with four main partners spread all over Africa, but also with the relevant regional employers' and workers' organisations.** For example, the project team could have benefitted from an earlier involvement of the National Project Officer supporting the EAC which had a shortage of human resources, and from an extended full-time presence of the project manager until the end of the project.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO ROAF, EU, Other donors, RECs/AUC, DWTs, HQ Geneva, MIGRANT, SOCPRO	Medium	Design of new projects	Part of new interventions.

- 6) **Organize the first Project Steering Committee meeting *within* the first half year of the effective start of the project.** This would not only have identified much earlier the need for human resources support for the EAC but would also have allowed for the conducting of two more PSC meetings, i.e. in the second and in the third year (face-to-face or virtual). This is the more important in view of the crucial role the PSC is expected to play in communication and in ownership and would have enhanced the opportunities for RECs and regional employers' and workers' organisations of '*learning from each other*' which was considered as an important element in the project.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO ROAF, DWTs, HQ Geneva, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, EU	Medium	Design of new projects	Part of new interventions.

Impact orientation and sustainability

- 7) **Make sure that the planned *Closing Event* is actually organised before the end of the project as a kind of 'Exit Strategy' which involves a workshop whereby sustainability issues can be discussed and agreed upon.** After COVID-19, the project team proposed in

the second no-cost extension to conduct this closing event, an EU priority, as an innovative virtual conference over two-half days in the relevant languages in partnership with Socialprotection.org.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
Project Team, ILO ROAF, RECs/AUC, EO/WO, EU, ICMPD, JLMP, ECASSA, DWTs, MIGRANT, SOCPRO	Very High	Remainder of the project period	Part of ongoing investments

8) **Explore ways to continue the current project in a second phase in order to sustain the momentum created by the present project.** ILO can liaise with the EC, the ICMPD and with JLMP to explore the available options in the coming months. Once the present project ends, social protection will no longer be covered within JLMP following the current task division between its constituent projects. Possible elements to be considered for inclusion in such a second phase are:

- The inclusion of the present three RECs as well as national level interventions,
- The continuation of the AUC involvement,
- A solid gender equality strategy,
- The inclusion of work on the informal economy as an exploratory element,
- The inclusion of other RECs (e.g. IGAD and/or UMA),
- Attention for the impact of COVID-19,
- Bring together the national social security institutions once a year and align their systems at RECs' levels and at national levels, and
- Capacity building elements for the RECs as well as for the regional social partners.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO ROAF, EU, ICMPD, JLMP, DWTs, HQ Geneva, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, Other donors	High	Design of new projects	Part of new interventions.

Lessons Learned and Good Practices

Finally, from the experience gained by evaluating the present project three Lessons Learned (LL) and two Good Practices (GP) have been identified in this report (see Chapter 5 and Annex 7).

LL1: In every new project organize the first Project Steering Committee meeting within the first half year of the effective start of the project.

LL2: The inclusion of the informal economy in projects on social protection/portability of benefits can only be very exploratory.

LL3: Requests from one of the main project partners for human resources support should be accommodated as early as possible.

*GP1: Supporting **selected** REC's in order to extend access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families is a good practice.*

GP2: To embed the project in a broader programme, enhancing coordination and synergies.

1 Introduction

The present Evaluation Report is mandated by the Terms of Reference (ToR; see Annex 1) for the ***Final Independent Evaluation*** of the project “**Extending access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families in selected RECs in Africa**” (RECs are Regional Economic Communities). The present chapter firstly summarizes the background and the objectives of this project, followed by the purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation. In Chapter 2 the methodology of the evaluation is explained. The actual evaluation exercise consists of the analysis of the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions in Chapter 3. The findings are summarized in the Concluding Section 4.1, while the Recommendations are the subject of Section 4.2. The final Chapter 5 presents several Lessons Learned and Good Practices.

1.1 Background and Objectives of the Project

International migration poses significant challenges for migrants and their families in terms of social protection coverage. Although “everyone as a member of society has the right to social security” (Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948, art. 22), in reality, compared to nationals working their entire lives in one country, migrants face huge challenges in exercising their rights to social protection. The lack of social security coordination due to the inexistence of bilateral or multilateral agreements may prevent migrant workers from maintaining rights acquired in another State. This is particularly important in the case of long-term benefits (invalidity, old-age and survivors) where qualifying periods may be considerable. Moreover, where bilateral and multilateral social security agreements exist, they mostly cover migrant workers in formal employment, leaving migrants working in the informal economy or in an irregular situation largely unprotected.

Though the challenges are significant, many *policy options* are available to policymakers to extend social protection to migrant workers, and these are (summarized from the ToR):

- ❖ First, the conclusion of bilateral or multilateral social security agreements is one of the most effective instruments to extend social protection to migrant workers and their families.
- ❖ Second, governments can ratify and apply ILO Conventions and Recommendations (C118, C157, R167, R202 & R204) containing standards relevant to migrant workers and their social protection.
- ❖ Another option to consider is the inclusion of social security provisions in bilateral labour migration arrangements (BLMAs).
- ❖ Additionally, countries of origin or destination can adopt, on a unilateral basis, measures that will extend social protection to migrant workers and their families.
- ❖ Finally, complementary measures aimed at improving migrants effective access to social protection and health care are worth considering including communication and information campaigns, interpretation services, translation of material in relevant languages, pre-departure briefings, free-of-charge services facilitating registration and access to appeal and complaint procedures, representation of migrant workers and more.

The ILO supports its constituents and partners on various dimensions of the policy measures highlighted above to enhance decent work and social protection of migrant workers and their families. In Africa, part of ILO's support is through the project evaluated in the present report.

Project Objective

The project evaluated here aims at strengthening the capacities of RECs to provide, as well as drive the implementation of regional frameworks on the extension of social protection to migrant workers and their families including those in the informal economy. The project is funded by the European Union (EU) through the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD) under the Africa EU Migration and Mobility Dialogue (MMD) funding facility. The project is implemented by the ILO as one of the pillars of the AUC/ILO/IOM/ECA Joint Labour Migration Programme (JLMP). African Heads of State adopted the JLMP in 2015, as a comprehensive programme on labour migration governance, designed to leverage migration for development and regional integration.

The importance of regional and sub-regional actions in effective governance of migration is increasingly recognized. Recent data show that the majority of migrants continue to move mainly within their sub-region of origin – making sub-regional actions, such as initiatives supported by the project, extremely important. The project supports relevant aspects of the continental Protocol on Free Movement of Persons, the AU Migration Policy Framework and RECs' migration policy frameworks. At the level of global discussions on migration governance, the project is precursor to Objective 22 of **Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration** i.e. establish mechanisms for the portability of social security entitlements and earned benefits.

The project **Result Areas** are:

1. In **ECOWAS** - improved implementation of the ECOWAS General Convention on Social Security by ECOWAS Member States.
2. In **SADC** – strengthen capacity and policy instruments on social security provision, including portability of rights.
3. In **EAC** - enhance capacity and knowledge base to advance the regional coordination and protection framework as per Common Market Protocol (CMP) to improve migrant workers access to social protection.
4. Improve the capacity of the **AUC, RECs and regional social partners** to effectively coordinate and contribute to regional and sub-regional social protection programmes for migrant workers in both, the formal and informal sector.

Project Management/Governance Arrangement

The present project is decentralized within the ILO Regional Office for Africa (ROAF). The Project Manager was based in Addis Ababa and managed it full-time from February 2018 until April 2020; currently, he continues to work for ILO in a different capacity, but he remains involved in project activities. The project team further consists still of a Technical Officer based in ILO-CO in Dar es Salaam, a National Project Officer based at the EAC Secretariat in Arusha, Tanzania, and an Administrative and Finance Assistant based in ILO-CO in Addis Ababa. The project manager and the technical officer report to the Regional Director for Africa based in Abidjan, which authority was delegated to the Chief of the Regional Programming Unit. (RPU). The fact that the project manager was living in Addis Ababa was meant to ensure direct interactions/support to the AUC based in this city.

The project receives technical guidance and support from ILO social protection specialists based in ILO Decent Work Teams in Pretoria, Dakar and from specialists in the Regional Office for Africa (ROAF), the ILO Social Protection Department (SOCPRO) and the Labour Migration Branch

(MIGRANT) in ILO Headquarters. The project has a Project Steering Committee (PSC), established to oversee and validate the overall direction of the project and to ensure that activities are in line with the AU strategy on migration and with the RECs' frameworks and common approaches. The PSC is chaired by the AUC, and is comprised of representatives from RECs (ECOWAS, EAC, and SADC), regional workers and employers' organizations, ICMPD, EU delegation and other stakeholders. The ILO serves as the secretariat of the PSC.

1.2 Purpose, Scope and Clients of the Final Independent Evaluation

Evaluations are an integral and important part of the implementation of Development Cooperation projects within the ILO. The present evaluation will be based on ILO Policy Guidelines.¹ As per these guidelines, all projects over US\$1 million must undergo at least one independent evaluation.

So far, this project has produced two interim progress reports covering the periods 1 October 2017 to 30 September 2018, and 1 October 2018 to 30 September 2019. As per the Grant Agreement with ICMPD dated 4 October 2017, the project implementation period was originally from 1 Oct 2017 until 31 July 2019 (22 months), but this was extended (no cost) until 31 July 2020, bringing the total implementation duration to 34 months. Very recently another no-cost extension application until mid-October 2020 has been approved. As per PRODOC (2017: 33), a final independent evaluation should be carried out 3 months before the end date of the project. However, the COVID-19 crisis led to some restrictions that further affect the evaluation methodology and possibly the scope of the analysis. In this regard, the evaluation draws on internal ILO guidance, in particular the document: *Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO: An internal guide on adapting to the situation.*²

The overall **purpose** of the independent final evaluation is to assess the extent to which the project has achieved its objective, promoting accountability and strengthening learning among the key project stakeholders, including the donor and ILO. The **specific objectives** of the evaluation are:

- Assess the extent to which the project has achieved its stated objectives at outcome and impact levels, while identifying the supporting and constraining factors;
- Analyse the implementation strategies of the project with regard to their potential effectiveness in achieving the project outcomes and impacts, including unexpected results;
- Assess the project implementation efficiency;
- Assess the extent to which the project outcomes will be sustainable;
- Assess the relevance of the project design and implementation strategy in relation to the AU, ILO, RECs and global development frameworks;
- Identify lessons learned and potential good practices; and
- Provide recommendations to project stakeholders to promote sustainability and support further development of the project outcomes.

The **Scope of the Evaluation** includes the entire implementation period of the project including the first no-cost extension (1 October 2017 to 31 July 2020), assessing all the results and contributions of the project to migration governance and social protection for all. The ToR (see Annex 1) and the ILO Evaluation policies and guidance notes³ define the overall scope of this

¹ ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations 3rd edition 2017.

² Refer to: http://www.ilo.ch/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_741206.pdf

³ ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: See Footnote 1.

evaluation. Recommendations, emerging from the evaluation, are strongly linked to the findings of the evaluation and provide clear guidance to stakeholders on how they can address them in the context of new implications from the COVID-19 crisis.

The principal **clients** for this evaluation are the AUC, the RECs (EAC, ECOWAS, and SADC), the social partners, project stakeholders and partners including JLMP Partners as well as development partners (ICMPD, EU) and the ILO (Regional Office, Country Offices, SOCPRO, MIGRANT, and other relevant ILO policy departments, branches and programmes at HQ).

Limitations

The Evaluation assignment is clearly laid out in the ToR (Annex 1) and the list of stakeholders to be interviewed is comprehensive and is representative of the main stakeholders. The travel restrictions laid out by different countries as a result of the COVID-19 crisis made it impossible to undertake field missions and restricted the use of national consultants. In order to mitigate this problem use was made of online means of communication.

The four result areas discussed in Chapter 1 are widely varying in nature, almost amounting to four different projects, which makes this a broader evaluation than the usual exercise. This is compounded by the different levels of *progress* of the three RECs in the implementation of their respective and varying regional frameworks on the extension of social protection to migrant workers. It is further compounded by the varying *capacities* of RECs, regional social partners and other stakeholders to participate in the project. A case in point is the request from the EAC for staffing support from the project (cf. the PSC Minutes of 2019): EAC raised their lack of resources to support adequately project activities as the labour department at the EAC Secretariat has only one staff member. To mitigate the effect of the quite broad-ranging reach of the project, the focus will be on those issues that are underlined by the different stakeholders during the interviews, complemented by the study of the main documents.

Lastly, the assignment involved a challengingly large number of Evaluation Questions which needed to be answered: the inception report identified 32 such questions even apart from sub-questions (see Annex 4). This is quite a substantial number of questions to be answered for a one-man team in a brief assignment of just 22 working days. This problem was mitigated by focusing in principle on those activities that are underlined by the different stakeholders during the interviews and adjusted with the study of the project documents. Nevertheless, each of these questions were answered in Chapter 3.

2 Methodology of the Evaluation

2.1 Conceptual Framework

The evaluation is carried out in the context of the criteria and approaches for international development assistance as established by OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard. In order to ensure an internationally credible exercise, the evaluation adheres to the ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation of the UN System, the technical and ethical standards as well as the Code of Conduct for Evaluation. As defined in the ToR (p. 7-9; see Annex 1) the evaluation covers the following six *Evaluation Criteria* plus the criteria of Visibility:

- A. Relevance and strategic fit,
- B. Validity of design,
- C. Project effectiveness,
- D. Efficiency of resource use,
- E. Effectiveness of management arrangements,
- F. Impact orientation and sustainability, and
- G. Visibility.

The ILO template for the *Data Collection Worksheet* describes the way that the chosen data collection methods, data sources, sampling and indicators support the evaluation questions. In the Inception Report it has been discussed in detail, and for each of the seven criteria distinguished in the above, a series of evaluation questions (in total 32 questions) have been identified and they are included here in Annex 4. The *crosscutting issues*, i.e. gender equality and non-discrimination, social dialogue and tripartism, international labour standards and just transition to environmental sustainability, have been integrated throughout the different evaluation questions.

2.2 Methodology, Work Plan and Key Deliverables

Due to the COVID-19 restrictions on travel,⁴ the evaluation has been carried out through two main data collection activities:

1) Desk review: The desk review includes the following information sources: the review of the key documents (see Annex 8), and preliminary interviews with the evaluation manager, the Chief of the Regional Programming Unit (RPU) in ROAF, the project manager, the project technical officer and the donor. This desk review led to some preliminary findings that were useful in fine-tuning the evaluation questions laid down in the Inception Report dated 8 July 2020.

2) Virtual contact with stakeholders: Due to travel restrictions and no possibility of face-to-face engagements with project staff and stakeholders, the evaluation employed virtual interviews as the main source of information gathering – to replace field visits and face-to-face interviews. The organisations and individuals interviewed are listed in Annex 2. These contact persons had been identified in consultation with the evaluation manager, the RPU in ROAF, the former project manager and the technical officer of the project. The criteria used for this selection included:

⁴ For more details about adaptation to the current situation, see: www.ilo.ch/eval/WCMS_744068/lang--en/index.htm

- A distribution and balance among Partners/Beneficiaries (the 3 RECs and AUC), Donors, Regional Employers' and Workers' organisations, Experts, ILO staff, IOM and consultants (the total list of stakeholders is included in Annex 3);
- Involvement in and knowledge about the project; and
- Gender balance (see Annex 2).

The data collection phase was closed on Thursday 23 July 2020 which was later than scheduled. It had been difficult to make appointments and actually undertake the interviews. Many technical problems were encountered, such as bad connections, frequent disconnections as well as the internet shut down in Ethiopia for several weeks where crucial contact persons were located (e.g. ex-Project Team leader, AUC, ILO Country Office and project administration).

In order to discuss the preliminary findings and to complete data gaps with key stakeholders a virtual stakeholders' workshop was conducted through Zoom on Monday 10 August 2020 with 19 participants; the following stakeholders were able to attend: AUC, ECOWAS, SADC, EU, ICMPD, ROAF, JLMP, the evaluation manager, the project team and the evaluator. A PowerPoint was prepared by the evaluator and presented during this virtual meeting followed by a lively general discussion with very useful feedback. During COVID-19 times this is an important way to cross-check data and have a direct discussion with the main stakeholders.

The main **deliverables** of the present evaluation are the Inception report, the draft report and a final report in English with Executive summary in English and French (maximum 30 pages plus annexes), and the stand-alone Evaluation Summary (in English and French) in line with the ILO/EVAL template. The Evaluation Manager will circulate the draft report to key stakeholders for their review and forward the consolidated comments to the evaluator. The evaluator will finalize and submit the final report to the evaluation manager in line with EVAL Checklist 5. A matrix will be provided indicating the comments and how they have been included in the report and/or why they were not considered for inclusion. The evaluation manager will review the final version and submit to EVAL for final review. Then the evaluation report will be distributed to the key stakeholders to ensure enhanced learning and make public at the e-discovery evaluation reports web-database (i.e. ILO i-eval Discovery).

In terms of **Management Arrangements**, the Evaluation Manager is Mr. Ricardo Furman Senior M&E officer Regional Programme Unit/ROAF. He is supervising the evaluator and provide guidance on all technical and methodological matters regarding the evaluation and will subject the final approval of the evaluation report to ILO/EVAL. The project team provides or coordinates logistic and administrative support to the evaluation throughout the process, with the administrative support of the ILO Regional and Country Offices, where necessary. The evaluation is being conducted by an external independent evaluator/consultant responsible for conducting a participatory and inclusive evaluation process.

In terms of **work plan**, the evaluation is being conducted between June and August 2020. The total evaluation process is estimated to take 22 working days for the independent international consultant over a period of 2 to 3 months. The detailed work plan is included in Annex 7.

3 Overall Findings

For the Final Independent Evaluation of the project entitled '*Extending access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families in selected RECs in Africa*' seven evaluation criteria have been identified in the previous chapter which will be discussed in depth in the present chapter (Sections 3.1 – 3.7). These criteria have been investigated with the help of the 32 Evaluation Questions identified (listed in Annex 4).

3.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit

Relevance for the beneficiaries and countries involved

The relevance and strategic fit of the intervention should first and foremost be about the needs of the beneficiaries and those of the countries at which the project is directed. In this case that means that it relates to the way in which the action was aligned to the implementation of the priorities and needs of the AU, RECs, social partners and other stakeholders in migration governance and extending social protection to migrant workers and their families.

In terms of the AU continental framework the project importantly supports the realization of the AU-ILO-IOM-UNECA Joint Labour Migration Programme (JLMP), consisting of several projects:

- The present project on social protection/portability funded by the EU;
- A larger project funded by Sida and implemented by IOM, ILO and AUC; and
- Other actions, including one funded by Germany and implemented by GIZ.

JLMP has eight Activity Areas, one of which is Activity Area 2.2 - *Extension of Social Security coverage to migrants*. Only the EU-funded project works towards this Activity Area 2.2 on social security, which was also a deliberate strategy within JLMP in part to avoid duplications of interventions. The present project is thus solely responsible for the 'social protection component of the JLMP'. The project further aligns to the AU Migration Policy Framework and Action Plan especially Thematic Area 5 (ii) "*Extend social protection access and portability to migrant workers*".

With respect to the particular REC frameworks the following alignments need to be underscored:

- For ECOWAS, the ECOWAS Treaty 1975 and the Supplementary Act (A/SA.5/07/13) on the *General Convention on Social Security*.
- For SADC, the SADC Protocol on Employment and Labour (2014); the Code on Social Security in SADC (2007); the SADC Labour Migration Policy Framework (2016) and the *SADC Portability of Accrued Social Security Benefits Policy Framework* (2016).
- For EAC, the EAC Common Market Protocol (CMP) Article 10(3f) states that *Workers are entitled to enjoy the rights and benefits of social security as accorded to the workers of the host Partner State*.

The alignment to the priorities of the employers' and workers' organisations was much less clear, particularly because their involvement with social protection and portability for migrant workers has been at quite a low level, and, as many of them recognized, the same can be said of their capacity in this area. Their participation in the project made them realize the importance of it, and

some of these social partners also mentioned that the COVID-19 crisis has further showed them the importance and the urgency of dealing with this issue.

The intervention was clearly aligned to global and regional frameworks. Firstly, it contributes to a number of SDGs, in particular Targets: 8.8, 1.3, 5.4, 3.8, 5.4 and 10.4. Secondly, there are solid links to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM), especially to Objective 22: *Establish mechanisms for the portability of social security entitlements and earned benefits*. Lastly, the intervention contributes to the strategic priorities of the Africa EU Migration and Mobility Dialogue (MMD) funded by the EU through the ICMPD it includes the Migration Dialogues called the Rabat Process, the Khartoum Process as well as the Valetta Action Plan 2015; it also includes the Continental Dialogue.

An additional component of the intervention was to include in the activities as much as possible the interests of the migrants working in the *informal economy* which is, in itself, very relevant as they make up a majority in several sectors in which many migrants work. However, since social security benefits are overwhelmingly only for formal sector workers, this added an additional dimension to the intervention.

All in all, therefore, the project's relevance was quite high for the beneficiaries and for the countries involved, and most of the stakeholders interviewed underlined that the relevance has remained high until today and has only become more urgent due to the COVID-19 crisis.

Alignment to the ILO Programme and Budget

The project is also closely aligned to ILO Decent Work programmes in particular the following ILO Programme and Budget (P&B) policy outcomes:

- P&B Outcome 3: Creating and extending social protection floors (P&B 2018 – 2019),
- P&B Outcome 9: Fair and effective international labour migration/mobility (P&B 2018-2019),
- P&B Outcome 7: Adequate and effective protection at work for all (P&B 2020-2021), and
- P&B Outcome 8: Comprehensive and sustainable social protection for all (P&B 2020-2021).

Moreover, the project is linked to the following regional and sub-regional programme outcomes:

- Regional activity RAF903 on Strengthened capacity of ILO constituents and regional and sub-regional constituents and partners (AUC and RECs in particular) to develop and implement labour migration policies and programmes;
- Regional activity RAF904 on Expanded and reinforced Social Protection Floors at the policy and programmatic level as per the commitment of AU Member States;
- EAC's SAD104 on Rights-based labour migration for integration enhanced under the Common Market Protocol (CMP); the new sub-regional Decent Work Programme includes social protection as a sub-regional priority;
- ECOWAS' SDA903 on Improved governance of labour migration in ECOWAS; and
- SADC's SHA 127 on Improved governance of labour migration for the benefit of origin and destination countries and protection of migrant workers' rights.

Demand-driven intervention

The demand-driven nature of the project is not without its question marks. The origins of the project lay with contacts between the AUC, the EU and the ILO (Chief of the Regional Programming Unit in ROAF). This can be considered clearly as demand-driven since the AUC

was very keen to start such a project and made it clear to the EU that this was a priority, although it turned out that they were expecting a much larger intervention (around US\$ 20 million or so). As a result, it took quite a long time for them to accept this new reality. That is also why the project became a part of the Africa EU Migration and Mobility Dialogue (MMD). As this specific funding was already allocated to ICMPD, this organisation came into the picture; they are usually more involved in the Khartoum process and the other international dialogues also under the MMD.

Subsequently, there were various reasons for delays especially because it took about 1.5 years of negotiations and discussions between the EU and the ILO before the EU Action Document was finally endorsed by all. These discussions included the following issues:

- The question whether the lead from the ILO should be in Abidjan, in Addis Ababa or in Geneva.
- Which RECs should be included?⁵ The Arab Maghreb Union (AMU) was already more or less promised to be included when, at the very last moment, they were left out reasoning that it was also involved in other EU projects, and this turn of events logically led to some disappointment on their side. IGAD was left out because it was already the main partner in another EU project (EU Trust Fund). Other RECs were judged as too diffuse (covering the major part of the continent), or not active enough at this stage.
- While the EU Mobility department was very interested to move ahead with the migrant workers element, the EU Social Protection Department had many questions and preferred to include social protection and the informal economy throughout the project, in fact, in extremis it was proposed to include the informal economy in each and every activity listed in the LogFrame; this almost led to the cancellation of the project as ILO-ROAF reasoned that this was unrealistic. However, a compromise was reached after that.

For the three RECs participating in the project the demand-driven nature differed. ECOWAS underscored that the project was very timely for them to enhance the implementation of the ECOWAS General Convention 2013 on social security. In contrast, the SADC Secretariat stated that the project was not demand-driven, because their demand was much more dealing with enhanced access to social security benefits through the SADC Protocol on Employment and Labour than to focus on portability; since this Protocol on access to benefits is not yet a binding instrument (because *all* member states need to ratify it and until now only one has done that), it was not their first priority to start working on portability guidelines. This led to some delays as the project team was under pressure to deliver results, while the secretariat pulled them back preferring to wait for ratification. However, the AUC's argument has been countered somewhat by other stakeholders that in principle one does not need to wait for that binding instrument since the portability guidelines can be developed *simultaneously* and can be considered as an incentive to move ahead with the ratification of the Protocol. For the third REC, the EAC, its Common Market Protocol (CMP) stipulates that "...the free movement of workers shall entitle a worker to enjoy the rights and benefits of social security as accorded to the workers of the host Partner State." indicating that the project responded to a clear priority of this REC.

⁵ Africa's current integration landscape contains an array of Regional Economic Communities (RECs), including eight recognized as the building blocks of the African Union. These eight are: AMU, CEN-SAD, COMESA, EAC, ECCAS, ECOWAS, IGAD and SADC.

Stakeholders involvement

ILO's usual project structure is tripartite with an important role for the government as well as for the main employers' and workers' organisations. In the present case, there is the initiator, the AUC, which recognized that after the initial phase they have been "a little bit distant from the implementation of the project". In addition, the person coordinating the activities was also the overall JLMP-coordinator who had to divide his time over the different JLMP interventions. The three RECs showed diverging levels of involvement, while SADC was quite active, ECOWAS mostly followed the lead of the project, while EAC was severely understaffed and requested the project to fund an additional staff member for them which was implemented (see Section 3.4). The project team did pay attention to the tripartite nature of activities but having to divide their attention already over four main partners spread over Africa, this was limited to inviting the regional employers' and workers' organisations to join workshops and/or committees. At the same time, it has to be said that migrant workers and social protection are not on the top of the list of priorities of these social partners, although several of them mentioned that COVID-19 has opened their eyes in this respect.

In sum, the complexity of the project with the AUC as initiator and the three RECs in different corners of Africa as the main partners, inevitably led to less attention for and involvement of other stakeholders, including for the regional social partners.

Internal coherence

The project has built on a large number of other ILO projects (described in detail in the PRODOC) of which the majority have been completed already some time ago, but two projects should be mentioned here, i.e. the MIGSEC (2008-2012, German funded) and the FMM West Africa (EU Funded 2013-2019) which was extended until the middle of 2020. The analysis in the PRODOC shows clearly that lessons were learned from previous projects (especially MIGSEC). During the implementation phase the project promoted coherence with other ILO projects/programmes in the areas of intervention, such as the coordination on migration statistics with a different EU project (i.e. on public finance management) implemented by UNICEF and ILO. In Southern Africa contacts were maintained with the new Southern Africa Migration Management (SAMM) project formally launched in January 2020 and funded by the EU (Euro 20 million) which will work with two RECs (SADC and COMESA). The implementation of SAMM is jointly undertaken by ILO, IOM, UNODC and UNHCR, and it has one pillar on portability.

External coherence

The project itself was firmly embedded in two broader frameworks, the EU-funded MMD and the JLMP. As we saw in the above, JLMP has eight Activity Areas, one of which is 'Extension of Social Security coverage to migrants' (2.2). This activity area was further subdivided into four 'Action Outputs':

1. Facilitate national unilateral measures to extend social security coverage and portability,
2. Harmonization of social security access regimes in regional integration spaces,
3. Facilitate cooperation between social security agencies, and
4. Promote implementation of ILO C-102 (social security) C-118 (portability).

It is important to note that the other projects within JLMP deal with migration per se and not with social protection. The social protection component is also not a priority for several organisations involved in JLMP, including IOM. For the future it is important to monitor the new Swiss-funded

Labour Migration project developing a strategic framework with the AUC that is scheduled for 2021-2024 and that will deal with six RECs (the three RECs of the present project, as well as AMU, ECCAS and COMESA).

ILO's comparative advantage

The project interventions were designed to maximize ILO's comparative advantage in the field of social protection and labour migration involving for example the departments in Geneva, MIGRANT and SOCPRO, the DWT teams especially in Pretoria and Dakar and several ILO Country Offices, in particular Addis Ababa and Pretoria. In addition, capacity development and knowledge products developed in other projects and programmes were used and the involvement of ITC in Turin was important for several activities (see further Section 3.3).

3.2 Validity of design

Outcomes, outputs and performance indicators with baselines and targets

The LogFrame attached to the PRODOC is a clear document with one impact and one outcome:

Impact: The overall objective of the action is to extend social protection to migrant workers and their families.

Outcome: AUC, ECOWAS, EAC, and SADC's capacities to provide, as well as drive the implementation of regional frameworks on the extension of social protection to migrant workers and their families, including those in the informal economy.

The four **Outputs** or 'Result areas' concern one for each of the four main partners (discussed in Chapter 1), while the 17 **Activities** are divided over these four main partners.

The indicators, baselines, targets as well as the means of verification and assumptions are clear and concise and together constitute a logical and complete LogFrame. The 17 activities are separately listed in the second part of the LogFrame as if it were a stand-alone component indicating in the right column only some more details of the activities.

Implementation approach

The implementation approach has been discussed in detail in the design phase between AUC, EU and ILO, and within ILO. The choice to include three RECs spread over Africa in a project of about Euro 2.3 million to be implemented originally in just 22 months seems overambitious to say the least. It was the wish of the AUC (expecting a much larger budget) which the EU intended to honour, but it would not have been a surprise that the discussions on the implementation approach then became elongated. On the other side, several stakeholders also underlined that the inclusion of three RECs was useful as it was intended to enhance peer learning in general, and more specifically by bringing staff together at joint workshops (e.g. the high-level workshop in Addis Ababa in December 2018). The implementation approach did apparently not foresee that having *four* main partners/beneficiaries would automatically limit the attention the project team was able to pay to other stakeholders including the regional social partners. The project has thus not provided for adequate tripartite involvement and consultations in project planning and implementation, but they were involved in the present final independent evaluation.

Strategy for sustainability and for gender equality and other cross-cutting issues

The project design included an extensive section on sustainability (PRODOC 2017: 29-32). This included such elements as: dialogue, ensuring ownership and political support; the involvement of all relevant parties through meetings and workshops including tripartite participation; capacity building and awareness raising; and enhancing capacities of existing training centres with support from ITC Turin. This is further detailed for the four main partners and include: consultation meetings of (technical) experts, training of staff members, sensitization and advocacy campaigns, development of roadmaps, involvement of social partners and civil society, and the (regular) collection of statistical data (related to SDG targets). The implementation hereof will be further taken up in Section 3.6.

The PRODOC (2017: 28) only summarily discussed gender equality. It was mainly indicated that women face specific vulnerabilities, and that they make up half of the migration flows and the majority of workers in the informal and unpaid care-economy. It is no wonder then that the Grant Evaluation Commission in its Award Letter dated 21 September 2017 made the following recommendation as one of the conditions for approval: *“The issue of gender should be taken into account more specifically throughout the Action;”*. This triggered a detailed response from ILO (see Annex 6) which can be considered as the project’s Gender Equality Strategy. Concerning the three other cross-cutting issues the PRODOC just listed them (2017:28).

3.3 Project effectiveness

Overall the evaluation found that Project effectiveness has been satisfactory, but it consists of multiple elements with varying results.

Achievement of objectives

The achievement of objectives, for example, differed substantially among the four components, or ‘Result Areas’ of the project.

ECOWAS

In ECOWAS, the **General Convention** on Social Security was adopted by its Member States in 2013. It is a comprehensive instrument including nine branches of social security. This region is the only REC with a *binding* social security multilateral agreement. As such, its successful implementation could serve as a model for the other RECs to follow, and good progress was made in this respect with technical assistance and guidance from the project (see Table 1, which includes the percent of completion as approximately estimated by the evaluator).

Table 1: ECOWAS: Activities undertaken and revisions made compared to the LogFrame.

Summary of Activities of PRODOC (2017)	Activities undertaken by project	Revisions (compared to LogFrame)	EST % of completion
1.1) Set up a Committee of Experts	Establish CESS and conduct two annual meetings. Set up 3 Technical Working Groups (TWGs).	Added: 3 TWGs and support to monitoring of implementation of Convention	80%
1.2) Facilitate annual technical & coordination meetings	Technical Workshop on the ECOWAS General Convention in May 2018 in Lomé, Togo with 14 Member States.		50%
1.3) Develop training modules and conduct training on the provisions of the General Convention	Developed Toolkit and conducted training on the General Convention with ITCILO, FMM West Africa and the ECOWAS Commission.	Added: More training modules (7 instead of 3) and ToT dimension. COVID-19: Change ToT into online ToT & train the 1 st cohort. Added: Develop a self-guided course on the Convention.	Ongoing
1.4) Disseminate information on the General Convention	Information materials and communication tools on the Convention were developed.	Dissemination ongoing	80%
1.5) Assess feasibility to extend to the informal economy and pilot test concrete policy proposals	Commissioned study on the informal economy in Ghana and Cabo Verde . The draft report is being reviewed for publication.	Report not yet published. Added: Include impact of COVID-19 on the informal economy.	80%

SADC

The meeting of the SADC Ministers of Employment and Labour (of 16 countries) and the regional Social Partners (hence a genuine tripartite meeting) on 2-6 March 2020 adopted the proposed **Guidelines** on Portability of Social Security Benefits in SADC and approved the SADC Labour Migration Action Plan 2020-2025. Although 'guidelines' are considered as 'soft law' (not binding), this adoption constituted a great success for the Project which supported the development of these Guidelines in the past two years through studies on access to and portability of social

Table 2: SADC: Activities undertaken and revisions made compared to the LogFrame.

Summary of Activities of PRODOC (2017)	Activities undertaken by project	Revisions (compared to LogFrame)	EST % of completion
2.1) Formal launch and validation of activities	Launched in Manzini, Swaziland, at the SADC Employment and Labour Sector (ELS) meeting on 13-14 December 2017 (Roadmap was discussed). The project and its planned activities were validated by SADC Ministers of ELS in Cape Town in March 2018.		100%
2.2) Pilot implementation of policy options for 3 SADC countries for distinct economic sectors	Three technical assessments in agriculture (7 countries) and mining (6 countries) and financial services in the SADC region. The consolidated report will be published jointly with SADC Secretariat in 2020.	SADC Ministers decided on 3 sectors (not 3 countries). Reports not yet published.	80%
2.3) Develop suitable administrative arrangements and management systems to support a regional social protection regime	SADC Ministers endorsed and adopted the proposed Guidelines on Portability in March 2020. Support to 5 Member States who volunteered to pilot the implementation of the Guidelines. Several Policy Briefs are being developed, incl. one on social protection for migrant workers in times of COVID-19.	Added: Develop a popular version of the Guidelines and start dissemination.	80%
2.4) Facilitate consultation meetings including with social partners.	10 Member States and 3 Social Partners participated in a sub-regional workshop in May 2018 on portability in the SADC region. Social security experts' meeting , and Task team of regional tripartite partners		Partly done
2.5) Support the implementation of the SADC policy framework in the three pilot countries.	SADC Ministers prefer a more systematic approach: Cancel pilot countries.	Cancelled by SADC Ministers meeting	0%

security in the mining and agriculture sectors, and on payment and financial systems related to portability. Some stakeholders involved closely found these three reports to be somewhat general offering only few new insights (whereas specific bilateral issues would have been useful). Another significant development occurred at the same meeting mentioned above notably that five Member States, i.e. Eswatini, Lesotho, Malawi, South Africa and Zimbabwe, volunteered to *pilot* the implementation of these Guidelines. The SADC Ministers' meetings are generally much more assertive than the meetings in other RECs because the SADC Ministers actively revised or cancelled activities (see Table 2).

EAC

In the EAC, activities have come from a long way as it required reviving a process that stalled since 2011 after the Common Market Protocol (CMP) was adopted in 2009. The project is primarily supporting the revision and finalization of the draft EAC **Council Directive** on coordination of social security (the 'EAC multilateral instrument') partly based on the work of the MIGSEC project. The draft was presented to Partner States in January 2020 and feedback/input was provided which is currently in the process of being incorporated in the draft. The actuarial studies of the Partner States were discussed several times, and the failure to undertake the consolidation of all these studies was caused by the various levels of finalization of the national actuarial study reports. There also seems to be a fear among the member states that it might lead to irreversible costs for them (although the PRODOC carefully scheduled only a tentative action plan). Because of the generally slow progress due to human resources shortages at the EAC secretariat, it was decided to employ consultants to undertake two country studies (Burundi and Republic of South Sudan, RSS). For further details see Table 3.

Table 3: EAC: Activities undertaken and revisions made compared to the LogFrame.

Summary of Activities of PRODOC (2017)	Activities undertaken by project	Revisions (compared to LogFrame)	EST % of completion
3.1) Conduct a baseline desk review of social protection laws and policies and suggest steps to finalise a multilateral social security instrument	ToR was developed in 2018 but delayed response by EAC. The draft of the EAC Council Directive was presented to Partner States in January 2020 and feedback/input provided, which are currently being included in the draft.	COVID-19: Change to virtual regional dialogue to finalize the (draft) Council Directive.	Ongoing virtual dialogue
3.2) Facilitate regional dialogue to agree on a roadmap	Two regional dialogues of Social Security Experts in June and in November 2018. Road map developed and agreed by EAC Partner States in June 2018 (it steered activities under 3.4).	COVID-19: Delayed.	80%
3.3) Conduct a feasibility study including on actuarial and financial issues	Mainly delayed due to lack of human resources and funds; Changed to an actuarial analysis of studies by partner states; also delayed	Cancelled.	5%
3.4) Provide technical, legal and actuarial advisory services to a selected number of Partner States.	Capacity-building workshop in Burundi to enhance its capacity to engage in regional dialogues and policy development. Assessment of the state of social protection in Republic of South Sudan (RSS) ; presented report in Juba, July 2019 which was a crucial workshop for the involvement (and opening up) of the Sudanese stakeholders.	Two country reports Not yet published. Added: Capacity building of Burundi and RSS with ITC support.	80%

In 2015 the AU Executive Council requested the AUC to develop an **AU Protocol** on rights to social protection to be added to the African Charter and to the Social Agenda of the AU Agenda 2063. This Protocol has as a first step been approved by the AU Ministers of Labour and requires three more steps (including the approval by the Heads of State which might take another 2 to 3 years). A major project intervention of the regional AUC component relates to supporting the systematic collection and analysis of statistical information on social protection for migrant workers (related to SDG Indicator 1.3). In this regard, the project has been collaborating with the ILO Social Protection Department (SOCPRO) in Geneva to include a migration component in ILO’s Social Security Inquiry (SSI). The SSI is one of the main tools used by the ILO to collect data on national social protection systems and programmes. For the first time, the revised SSI will include questions on social protection on migrant workers, as a result of the project intervention. Other activities include among others a high-level capacity building workshop and cooperation with the East and Central African Social Security Association, ECASSA (cf. Table 4).

Table 4: AUC: Activities undertaken and revisions made compared to the LogFrame.

Summary of Activities of PRODOC (2017)	Activities undertaken by project	Revisions (compared to LogFrame)	EST % of completion
4.1) Support the AUC to promote south-south cooperation providing a platform for learning	Platform did not materialize, but project activities were aligned to key High-Level events, such as ILO Centenary Celebrations, ILO Social Protection Week AU’s ministerial meetings, and International Migrants Day.	COVID-19: Cancel closing event. Re-purpose to: Organize a virtual closing event.	Ongoing
4.2) Build the capacity of the AUC, selected RECs and regional and sub-regional social partners	High-Level Capacity Building Workshop on the extension of social protection for migrant workers in Addis Ababa in December 2018: training of 23 senior officials from the 3 RECs and representatives of regional social partners	COVID-19: Cancel trainings. Re-purpose to: Support inclusion of a portability module in ILO’s Actuarial model; and direct relief support to migrant workers through social security institutions	Ongoing
4.3) Initiate the systematic collection and analysis of statistical information (related to relevant SDG targets)	Include a portability component in ILO’s Social Security Inquiry (SSI) questionnaire jointly with ILO SOCPRO. Data will feed into ILO’s World Social Protection Report, and into data collection for JLMP Africa Report on Labour Migration Statistics. Collaborate with ILO SOCPRO on training on SSI. Support incorporation of a component on social protection for migrant workers in the social security dashboard of ECASSA.	Added: Inclusion of migration component in SSI, and work with ECASSA. COVID-19: Delay of Validation.	> 100%

Achievement of objectives on the inclusion of the informal economy

The project’s aim of extending access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families was not limited to formal sector workers, but especially the EU Employment/Social Protection Section was in favour of including those in the informal economy as well. This can be considered as an additional component of the project; while guaranteeing social protection for formal, registered workers is already a giant task it becomes even more complicated when unregistered workers are included. Several partners and other stakeholders therefore commented during the interviews that it was difficult to deliver on this component and/or that it was too ambitious. However, for ICMPD and EU it was an interesting component, and while being aware that it was ambitious, they considered that it is also good to be ambitious and to explore how far the project could come with including informal workers.

Ultimately, it was only possible to undertake activities related to this component in the ECOWAS region. While the ECOWAS Convention is only for formal sector workers, the partner states agreed to undertake two studies on the legal backgrounds, one each in Ghana and Cabo Verde. The first drafts are ready now which in itself is a good accomplishment, and the ECOWAS secretariat finds it very useful ('You need such studies in order to know more about it'). Ghana is mentioned as a Good Practice with *voluntary* schemes for all informal economy workers including migrant workers. However, different stakeholders mentioned several reservations, in particular that the studies are still very theoretical, and offer not many new insights, especially because no data are available, and/or not enough funds and time were allocated. For the coming months, the project will try to include an analysis of the impact of COVID-19 on the informal economy.

Achievement of objectives on gender equality and non-discrimination

The gender strategy of the project and its objectives are indicated in Annex 6. These are in part not specifically ambitious and mention such elements as encouraging maternity as one of the social security benefits, sex-disaggregated statistics, participation of women in meetings and committees, gender perspectives in training, etc. Some elements of this strategy were not touched upon and/or not implemented, such as the gender impact assessments and the work on minimum standards. To be sure, the social security laws in the RECs do usually include gender equity and maternity protection, and the recently approved SADC Guidelines explicitly refer to gender issues. While gender equality is also always an integral part of how ILO operates, several stakeholders realized during the interviews that more needs to be done on it and that men are mostly a large majority during meetings and workshops. The political processes of the RECs are not always gender sensitive, and the project cannot instruct the RECs whom to nominate (male or female) for meetings, workshops and committees. Therefore, it can be concluded that the project did make some efforts to include gender equality but that not all of its objectives were achieved in this respect, while non-discrimination was mainly left out.

No-Cost Extensions

As a result of special circumstances, the project required *two* no-cost extensions whereby outputs were revised, cancelled and added. The first one was approved by ICMPD in July 2019, and the second one in July 2020. The 1st extension was needed because there were major challenges in delivering within the timeframe of the Grant Agreement experienced in *all* RECs/AUC in particular for outputs relying on political processes and decisions. This was extensively discussed in the first Interim Report on the period 1 October 2017 to 30 September 2018, as well as during the Project Steering Committee meeting in early 2019. The original project period was set in the Agreement at 22 months of which almost half a year was lost for several reasons including recruiting the necessary staff; as a result, the project actually started in February 2018. The main change was an extension of the implementation period with one year (from July 2019 to July 2020). The proposed timeframe of the work plan was expected to have no implications on the delivery and quality of the core activities as per Grant Agreement.

The 2nd no-cost extension was the result of the COVID-19 crisis and proposed an extension of two and half months of project implementation until 15 October 2020. As COVID- 19 has resulted in severe disruptions in implementation of project activities due to restrictions in movements, public gathering, face-to-face interactions and international travel, key activities in the work plan were affected such as capacity building activities, south-south cooperation initiatives, the international closing event and some technical studies. Some activities and resources were

revised and/or re-purposed. The details of the revisions in the activities have been included in Tables 1 to 4 in the above.

The evaluation found that both the 1st and the 2nd no-cost extensions were very effective to deal with the realities as they had developed over time. Both extensions are assessed by the evaluation to be necessary as well as appropriate.

Unintended results

The project has seen relatively many changes in the course of its implementation since the Grant Contract was agreed on 4 October 2017. Firstly, the project was quite ambitious with 17 activities to be implemented by a relatively small project team in a period of just 22 months which was reduced to only 17 months due to a belated start. The two no-cost extensions were discussed in the previous section, while the revisions were included in Tables 1 to 4. No other unintended results of the project have been identified by the evaluation.

Main contributing and challenging factors

The main **contributing factors** towards project's success in attaining the targets as indicated in Tables 1 to 4 are:

- ❖ The commitment within the RECs to improve social protection and portability for migrant workers;
- ❖ The expertise, flexibility and hard work of the project team;
- ❖ The support from different ILO units: ROAF, HQ in Geneva, DWT in Pretoria and Dakar and the CO in Addis Ababa; and
- ❖ The support and flexibility of ICMPD and EU to approve the crucial no-cost extensions.

Mutual inspiration and learning between the four partners could be another contributing factor but it is difficult to find solid prove of such processes. For example, the AUC secretariat indicated that the three RECs should have been more inspired by the AU Protocol which is resulting in harmonization.

The **challenging factors** towards project's success are either for the project as a whole, or specific for the four partners. The *overall* challenging factors are:

- RECs need political approval to go to a next procedural step which often slows the process down substantially and leads to delays in project implementation especially since mostly consensus is required among all member/partner states for every major step.
- Although few stakeholders mentioned the harmonization of the national laws of the partner states as a challenge for the project, some others argued that harmonization of laws is, in itself, *not* a pre-requisite for access to social security and portability for migrant workers. Such harmonization of national laws would theoretically be possible, but it has enormous practical and political challenges because it may not be practically achievable for all countries within RECs to have the same social security laws and/or systems. Therefore, the tried and tested approach in different countries around the world is to pursue *coordination*: Coordination establishes mechanisms through which social security systems can work together to achieve mutually agreed objectives while maintaining and respecting the separate rules, laws and definitions of each system and/or country. This is in itself also a challenge, but one that is more manageable than harmonisation of laws/systems, and this is precisely what makes the approach through the RECs all the more important.

- On some topics (e.g. actuarial studies), the political will is not sufficiently present.
- Social partners and some government representatives do not have sufficient knowledge of social security issues, and capacity building is urgently needed.
- Leadership, technical or otherwise, is sometimes not sufficient concerning social protection issues at the level of the REC secretariats.
- Shortage of funds and staff to accommodate *all* of the requests made by the RECs/AUC and social partners.
- The COVID-19 crisis.

Specific challenges for the four partners are identified as follows:

ECOWAS: The General Convention existed but was not known at all among the Member States, nor among the social security institutions. In addition, at the start of the project, ECOWAS had a Convention its implementation had not yet started.

SADC: Although SADC Meeting of Ministers showed clear commitment and leadership, the internal processes are not smooth as meetings at the ministerial and other levels are often postponed (e.g. because of Statutory difficulties). A different challenge is that the SADC secretariat tends to consider migrant workers more as a security issue than as an employment issue.

EAC: Like in SADC, the internal processes in EAC are not smooth (or even less smooth) and are less dynamic. This was among others caused by a lack of budget allocation at the EAC to support social security activities and the delayed convening of the Forum of Ministers responsible for Labour and Employment to provide further guidance. The EAC secretariat has further consistently cited their lack of human resources to deal with social protection of migrant workers as a major factor for delays in responding to requests from the project. In addition, people in the newest member state, the RSS, are reluctant to discuss social protection issues as there is very little knowledge on such issues, as peace processes are taking up most of the work, and as their websites are not up to date.

AUC: The big challenge for the AU is how to bring all 54 member states together at the continental level. Another challenge is that capacity building for the AUC has been lagging behind. Lastly, there is a technical challenge related to statistics: many countries do not register migrant workers at all, and they are often even excluded from the law.

Thematic areas of more and least success of the project

The thematic areas in which the project operates is social protection and portability, and within that there was more or less success of certain activities or sub-topics. Those relatively successful activities can be mentioned for each of the four partners:

- ❖ ECOWAS: CESS and TWGs, Toolkit, and two country studies on informal economy (Ghana and Cabo Verde).
- ❖ SADC: The adoption of the Guidelines as well as of the Labour Migration Action Plan, and the three technical assessments (agriculture, mining and financial services).
- ❖ EAC: The discussion on the draft of the EAC Council Directive, the regional dialogues, the road map and the two country reports (Burundi and RSS).
- ❖ AUC: High-Level Capacity Building Workshop in Addis Ababa, the work on statistics of migrant workers (SSI) and the work on the dashboard of ECASSA.

The thematic areas of least success are already discussed in the previous section on the challenges. On the whole, the *pace itself* of the progress made in the three RECs and the AUC

should be considered as least successful, whereby the main factor was the stepwise political processes and decisions each step often requiring consensus.

COVID-19 Pandemic and its Replicability

The COVID-19 Pandemic has clearly influenced project results and implementation since March of this year. It has resulted in severe disruptions in implementation of project activities due to restrictions in movements, public gathering, face-to-face interactions and international travel. Key activities in the work plan were affected such as capacity building activities, south-south cooperation initiatives, the international closing event and some technical studies. The project has addressed this very adequately and timely through the request for a no-cost extension of two and half months. We have already seen in the above that some activities and resources were revised and/or re-purposed such as the closing event, the training seminars and direct relief support to migrant workers.

An interesting unexpected result or finding was further that during the interviews many stakeholders indicated that the pandemic made them realize (even more urgently) the importance of working towards social protection and its portability of migrant workers. The above-mentioned adapted intervention models developed under COVID-19 have a high degree of replicability as the no-cost extension and the re-purposing can easily be applicable for similar crisis responses in other projects.

3.4 Efficiency of resource use

The Efficiency of resource use has overall been good in the project.

Allocation and use of resources

The allocation of resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) has been efficient and, in addition, was flexible enough to cope with the changes needed for the two no-cost extensions discussed in the above; this has been appreciated very much by several stakeholders. Table 5 below shows that almost 80% of the budget of over USD 2.6 million had actually been spent as of 30 June 2020, and the remaining 20% has been partly re-allocated and re-purposed to activities that are expected to be possible during the COVID-19 crisis. The actual expenditures by cost categories show that the largest category was human resources, in other words, the project team, with almost 43%; as the project manager has left in March 2020 the *percentage* of funds required for the extension period is much less, and overall this category will absorb almost 37% of the total budget, which is relatively modest for a project of this nature, also compared to the total for the four main partners which will amount to 50% at the end of the project.

The four main partners are *each* expected to account for about 10 to 15% of the *total* budget as indicated in Table 5. The AUC component substantially lagged behind until 30 June 2020 but is expected to absorb no less than one third of the forecast. This concerns in particular re-purposed funds, especially to conduct an online virtual conference, to support returning migrants to integrate social health protection schemes and national social protection response to COVID Pandemic (including cash transfers), and to develop and integrate a migrant component into the new ILO actuarial modelling for social protection systems (see also Table 4 above). The EAC's share in the forecast is zero but the national project officer stationed in Arusha where EAC's Secretariat is

established is dedicated to work with EAC only, while the budget for that is part of the human resources cost category.

Table 5: Actual expenditures and proposed expenditures ('Forecast') for the remaining project period (as of 30 June 2020).

Cost Categories	% Actuals USD as of 30 June	% of Forecast USD 1 July -15 Oct 2020	% of TOTAL	TOTAL in USD
Human Resources	42,8%	13,8%	36,9%	976.496
Travel & Office	4,4%	2,7%	4,0%	106.105
ECOWAS	14,8%	18,7%	15,6%	413.337
SADC	14,6%	15,8%	14,8%	392.435
EAC	11,9%	0,0%	9,5%	251.283
AUC	4,0%	33,8%	10,1%	266.720
Other costs *)	1,4%	8,7%	2,9%	77.154
Program Support Costs	6,0%	6,5%	6,1%	161.619
TOTAL in %	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
TOTAL in USD	2.106.381	538.769	--	2.645.150
TOTAL in % (row)	79,6%	20,4%	100,0%	

*) Publication, Evaluation, Translation, Visibility.

Source: Adapted from the Budget Revision Forecast dated 30 June 2020 of the Request for No-Cost Extension.

Project expenditures compared to budgetary plans

The project expenditures as indicated in Table 5 are very much in line with the expected budgetary plans as laid down in the PRODOC. For example, overall 40% of the original (2017) project budget was planned to go to human resources, and the four main partners are each allotted between about 8 to 15% of the total budget, the main difference being that SADC's percentage is expected to become substantially higher than planned (14.8% versus 10.9%) maybe because leadership was highest here. The other categories show expenditures which are close to the originally planned budget.

Synergies with other ILO initiatives/projects

The project has clearly built on other ILO initiatives and projects as was discussed in the above. In particular being part of the JLMP programme created synergies through networks and through the JLMP Coordinator in AUC who was also the main contact person for the present project. Furthermore, the ILO projects MIGSEC and FMM were very important, respectively for ECOWAS and EAC and for ECOWAS only, in enhancing attention to social protection and in preparing the grounds for the present project. The project has also built on other actors e.g. AU and RECs, but that was part and parcel of the project itself. The efficiency in the use of resources was not so much directly impacted by such synergies; the indirect impact lies in the fact that the implementation of the current project was supported by the achievements of those previous and ongoing ILO projects and programmes.

3.5 Effectiveness of management arrangements

Backstopping, guidance and support from ILO units

The project was developed with intensive involvement of the Regional Office for Africa (ROAF) in Abidjan and of SOCPRO and MIGRANT in Geneva connecting with EU and ICMPD to arrive at the EU Action Document and the PRODOC in 2017. For its implementation the project is decentralized within ROAF, and once the project team was in place from February 2018 SOCPRO

and MIGRANT were mainly involved in selected activities, in particular also the work on labour migration statistics. The project has also received effective technical guidance and support from ILO social protection specialists based in the ILO Decent Work Teams in Pretoria and Dakar. The Administrative and Finance Assistant of the project was based in ILO-CO in Addis Ababa for broader support when needed.

Project management and governance structure

The project effectively commenced operation in February 2018 upon recruitment of project staff. Considering that activities were spread throughout Africa the project was staffed with a relatively small project team itself based in Ethiopia and Tanzania with one project manager in Addis Ababa, one technical officer in Dar es Salaam and one administrative/finance staff in Addis Ababa, while the national project officer in Arusha had started much later, i.e. from October 2019. It is a pity that the latter appointment was delayed substantially as the EAC has requested for human resource support already in the first PSC (see below) and the draft ToR had already been developed in November 2018. The problem was that it amounted to a new budget line which had to be approved by ICMPD and EU, and then recruitment itself also took some time. Part of the decisions on the composition of the team can be traced back to the original discussions in 2016-2017 with the EU which preferred a lean project team and for example also a P4 position for the project manager instead of a CTA (P5). Of course, this resulted in more funds for the non-staff costs, but it might have been more efficient in the end to have a somewhat larger team as, for example, now progress had been slow in the EAC component in the first half or so of the project. Lastly, the decision to base the project manager in Addis Ababa was logical because it was related to the proximity to the AUC which was, and still is, a pivotal partner in the project.

The stakeholders interviewed for the present evaluation have in different ways commended the project team and the ILO for its expertise, its flexibility and solid re-design, the swift and appropriate framing of solutions to challenges, willingness to learn, good cooperation and communication, as well as good presentations.

The project's Project Steering Committee (PSC) discussed in Chapter 1 held ultimately only one meeting, i.e. in February 2019. This meeting was important to assess progress and challenges, and, significantly, supported the proposal from the project team to apply for a one year no-cost extension. One of the conclusions of the meeting was to invite the regional social partners to the next PSC which seems a bit odd because these partners were mentioned specifically as members already in the PRODOC (2017: 16) and because in any ILO project the PSC is expected to have a tripartite structure.

A second PSC meeting was planned for March/April 2020 but had to be cancelled because of the COVID-19 crisis. Perhaps it would have been better if it would not have been cancelled but instead conducted virtually; however, as experienced by this evaluation during the interviews the online facilities are not always sufficient to be able to conduct interviews let alone full-fledged meetings. To bridge this gap, ICMPD organised two coordination meetings (March 2020, May 2020) with JLMP Project Manager and Project Officer to monitor the implementation of the activities and discuss possible compensatory strategies. As a result, the no-cost extension was finalised in July 2020. In view of the connectivity problems, the project has also wisely decided to conduct the Closing Event, one of EU's main priorities, through an innovative virtual set up: An online conference over two-half days in three languages (FR/EN/PR) in partnership with

Socialprotection.org (this is an online member-based knowledge sharing and capacity-building platform, open to social protection practitioners, policymakers, and experts, as well as academics and students). The innovative set up includes also an approach for participants to interact with each other through virtual marketplaces to exchange good practices of extending social protection to migrant workers.

Regarding monitoring and evaluation, the PRODOC (2017: 17) states:

*“The AUC, regional and national partners, together with the EU Delegation and ICMPD will review the project interim and final reports as well as the evaluation reports, (one final independent evaluation three months before the end of the project, in line with the ILO’s evaluation policy rules). **The mid-term internal evaluation** will allow all stakeholders to review progress and jointly decide on any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of project activities.” (emphasis in bold added)*

This mid-term evaluation was not undertaken most likely because the implementation period was originally only 22 months while also the actual start was substantially delayed; however, no decisions on this could be found in writing. It could have eased the burden on the project team to get the first no-cost extension approved.

The project has further set up a detailed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan through the regularly updated workplans which were again adjusted at the time of the two no-cost extension requests. Two complete Technical Progress Reports were prepared, one on the period October 2017 to September 2018, and the other on October 2018 to September 2019. In addition, two very detailed proposals were submitted to ICMPD and EU for two no-cost extensions which provided important updated details on project progress, re-allocations and re-purposing, including detailed financial budgets. Lastly, the present report is the result of the final independent evaluation.

Cooperation with relevant stakeholders

The project established and maintained relationships and cooperation with all the relevant stakeholders, in particular with AUC as the project manager was based in Addis Ababa as well, with SADC also through the ILO-DWT in Pretoria, with EAC also through the project officers based in Dar es Salaam and Arusha, and with ECOWAS also through the ILO-DWT in Dakar. Meetings with multiple stakeholders were also important in this respect, such as the one PSC meeting and the high-level capacity building workshop in Addis Ababa. Contacts were also maintained with the JLMP partners, e.g. with the AU through the JLMP coordinator in AUC, and with IOM, through the Chief of the Regional Programming Unit in ILO-ROAF and through the project team.

The interviews with regional employers’ (SPSF) and workers’ organisations (EATUC, ITUC Africa and SATUCC) indicated that cooperation has been at a relatively low level, and one of the regional workers’ organisations even indicated during the interviews that they were not aware of this project and were not involved apart from incidental contacts with members of the project team. The others were somewhat more involved and indicated that they attended three of four workshops and that they also received slots in meetings to present their views. Specifically, the regional employers and workers’ organisations in the SADC region mentioned that the project brought them together and that now they started to work together more often! The SADC secretariat is now also operating in a genuinely tripartite manner bringing in regional social partners in the Meetings of Ministers of Labour, and in the SADC ad hoc Task Team for the

Guidelines. The SADC Troika on Social Security (the three outgoing, current and incoming Chairs) also includes SATUCC and SPSF in their meetings.

Cooperation with ICMPD and EU

ICMPD is a Vienna based international organisation with a mission in Brussels, a regional office in Malta and project offices in several countries, which is specialized in migration policy. Founded in 1993 and consists of 18 Member States of which Germany is the newest member joining in May 2020. The project established and maintained regular cooperation with ICMPD, especially in the framework of the Migration and Mobility Dialogues. Nevertheless, the project maintained close relations with ICMPD, and they have very much appreciated the cooperation and the flexibility of the project team. More specifically cooperation with both the ICMPD and the EU was relatively close in the project involving among others participation in the PSC meeting, periodic updates by the project manager to the focal persons for the project in both organisations including much appreciated presentations, two complete progress reports and incidental participation at events.

3.6 Impact orientation and sustainability

Positive impact on the RECs due to project contribution

Positive changes in the RECs have been registered in this report both in the area of policy development, as well as in that of administration of social protection/portability for migrant workers. On *policy development*, two changes stand out: the SADC Ministers endorsed and adopted the proposed Guidelines on Portability in March 2020, and the draft of the EAC Council Directive was presented to Partner States in January 2020 and feedback/input was provided which is currently being included in the draft. While ECOWAS was the only REC with a legally binding instrument, the General Convention, in the area of policy development per se not much further changes took place, although the knowledge of this convention among the member states was enhanced through ToT and a Toolkit. A last positive and lasting change applies to all three RECs and that is, as was underscored by one of the Secretariats, the fact that the project influenced policy makers and/or top management to give more prominence to social protection.

The second area considered here is the *administration* of social protection/portability for migrant workers. There were two effects that applied to all three RECs: Firstly, the capacity building of the staff of all three secretariats through the tripartite High-Level Capacity Building Workshop on extending social protection to migrant workers and their families in December 2018 in Addis Ababa; and Secondly, the inclusion of a portability component in ILO's Social Security Inquiry (SSI) questionnaire jointly undertaken by AUC and ILO SOCPRO which will enhance knowledge on administration of portability in all three RECs. With respect to the individual RECs, in ECOWAS the main development was the capacity building and awareness raising on the already existing General Convention and the establishment of CESS. In SADC, a Roadmap was developed, and three technical assessments were undertaken (one each on agriculture, mining and financial services) informing the SADC Secretariat on issues of administration in social protection and portability. In EAC, two regional dialogues of social security experts were held, a road map was agreed by Partner States, while targeted activities supported two specific member states (Burundi and RSS).

Sustainability considerations and exit strategy

The PRODOC did not include a specific 'exit strategy', but there was an extensive section on sustainability (PRODOC 2017: 29-32) which included a number of elements as discussed in Section 3.2. It also included efforts by the project to incorporate dimensions on social protection of migrant workers in each new migration project in Africa. For the four main partners sustainability was further detailed and included: consultation meetings, training of staff members, sensitization and advocacy campaigns, development of roadmaps, involvement of social partners and civil society, and the (regular) collection of statistical data (related to SDG targets). These were all indeed undertaken to certain degrees as was explained in detail in Section 3.3, and for the four partners in Tables 1 to 4. However, even at such an early stage as February 2019 it was noted at the PSC meeting "... that even if current project deliverables are met, follow-up interventions would be required to consolidate gains and give effect to enhancing social protection for migrant workers in Africa."

Furthermore, for the individual RECs a lot still needs to be done as well. For example, after the finalization of the draft Council Directive in the EAC continued support will be required for the partner states for policy development and implementation of the Council Directive. In ECOWAS, continued and effective functioning of the Committee of Experts and its Technical Working Groups would be required as well as awareness raising and capacity building of member states. SADC has come furthest with the adoption of the Guidelines on portability but will need further support for piloting the implementation of these guidelines.

COVID-19 and sustainability

Due to COVID-19 several for sustainability important activities could not be undertaken, such as workshops, regional dialogues and the closing event which significantly was to discuss the way forward. The project has shown great flexibility and adaptability skills by developing the second No-Cost Extension which included for example the already mentioned online virtual conference in partnership with Socialprotection.org, and a COVID Relief Effort to support national or regional mechanisms for returning migrants to integrate social health protection schemes and national social protection response to the COVID Pandemic. Lastly, it needs to be noted that the COVID-19 crisis made a number of stakeholders realize the severity of the situation for migrant workers in both the formal and the informal sectors. COVID-19 has created many more challenges for the migrant workers, not only is their mobility affected but their very employment is increasingly affected as well. One stakeholder underscored the desperation among the large number of stranded migrant workers in South Africa.

Ownership

The RECs and AUC build varying degrees of ownership of the project outcomes. It was highest in SADC showing leadership in several decisions made by the Meeting of Ministers of Labour and Employment (see Table 2) and in adopting the Guidelines on Portability and developing a detailed SADC Labour Migration Action Plan 2020-2025. Significantly, five SADC Member States took decisive action and *volunteered* to pilot the implementation of these Guidelines. Ownership was relatively lower among EAC and ECOWAS than in the case of SADC, with less direction provided by ECOWAS as to priority activities, while the EAC had from the beginning indicated the inadequacy of staffing at its Secretariat department responsible for labour matters and it underlined that there is a need for continuous technical support from ILO to the Secretariat even after the project ends. The AUC was important as a kind of liaison between the three RECs and

by hosting the high-level capacity building workshop; their first priority lies, however, in implementing the broader JLMP programme.

Ownership of the project outcomes was not built with any other stakeholders. The workers' and employers' organisations were involved mainly in several workshops, but as mentioned before migrant workers are not their prime target with respect to membership. It is interesting to note, however, that the eyes of several of these organisations were opened by the COVID-19 crisis as to the vulnerability of migrant workers with respect to social protection and portability.

Strengthen project achievements after the end of the project

After the end of the project, there are several ways in which the project stakeholders -including ILO- could strengthen project achievements. The project's relevance for ICMPD has been taken into consideration also for a possible follow up phase. They do recognize that there is value added to have such a project as part of JLMP and that the work with the RECs needs to be considered in a longer-term perspective and therefore needs to continue.

In terms of funding agency, the first question would be whether the EU would consider funding a follow-up phase. In principle, a continuation of the project would have the interest of the EC, since it attaches importance both to internal mobility and to social protection, but financial programming is currently in process.

In order to sustain the momentum of the present project, an intervention in the future will be needed, and possible elements to be considered are:

- The focus needs to be on what can realistically be done as a continuation of the current project, whereby more focus on the implementation at *national* level could be one option. For example: A pilot project in one or two volunteering countries ('cooperation of the willing') exploring intervention mechanisms.
- AUC involvement and the involvement of the present three RECs remain important.
- Importance of Fair Recruitment and of corridors.
- A solid gender equality strategy.
- Informal economy could still be a part of it although it is recognized that intervention mechanisms are still in its infancy.
- Possibly include also IGAD as they now have the Free-Movement Protocol (and the EU Trust Fund project with IGAD has been closed).
- Investigate also the impact of COVID-19.

According to the AUC, it is needed to strengthen the project achievements after the end of the project by bringing together the national social security institutions once a year and by enhancing and aligning their systems at RECs' levels and at national levels. In addition, more coordination and reporting are needed, as well as human resources support (i.e. a social security expert) for AUC. In terms of RECs, the AUC proposes to involve the Arab Maghreb Union (UMA) because of their strong cooperation with the EU; while some stakeholders indicated this REC is dormant as a result of the conflict between Morocco and Algeria on the Western Sahara, while this applies according to AUC only to the level of the heads of state and does not affect the Meetings of the Ministers of Labour/Employment.

In ECOWAS there is a perceived need for the continuity of CESS (and its TWGs) as well as for ECOWAS-wide training and capacity building activities on social protection of migrant workers and the General Convention but there are no clear plans how to continue and the secretariat does not have the means to support such activities after the project ends. Therefore, the Secretariat called on ILO to explore avenues for additional resources to continue the support to implement the General Convention on portability. In addition, it would be important to establish an association of social security institutions in ECOWAS (similar to ECASSA in East and Central Africa).

SADC has developed a very clear path through the Decisions of the Ministers of Employment and Labour and the Social Partners in March 2020; the Implementation Status Matrix dated 6 April 2020 indicates two decisions that are of particular relevance here:

- ❖ Decision 3: Portability of social security benefits in the SADC region: Focus future activities on the five countries that volunteered!
- ❖ Decision 6: Development of SADC Labour Migration Action Plan (2020-2025). Output 3.2 of this action plan is: *Promote access to and portability of social security benefits.*

In the case of the EAC, the project achievements are advised to be strengthened by extending the project for another period of 2 years allowing for continuous engagement of the Secretariat and ILO experts to plan and implement the coordination of social security activities in the EAC, as well as for further capacity building programs to the secretariat staff and at national levels (especially for RSS). It would also allow for the review and finalization of the study on Social Protection laws and policies in the EAC in order to arrive at an effective instrument for Coordination of Social Security.

Lastly, ILO can liaise with the EU and the ICMPD after the end of the project to monitor the possibility of a follow-up phase. ILO can also strengthen project achievements in particular through their involvement in the broader JLMP programme, and also through the other related ILO projects (e.g. SAMM).

3.7 Visibility

The visibility of the contribution of EU/ICMPD to the project has been enhanced through the following means:

- 1) The project's website, which can be accessed here: https://www.ilo.org/africa/technical-cooperation/WCMS_646607/lang--en/index.htm. However, the website has not been updated since the middle of 2019 and still has the original end-date (August 2019). The workspace is at: <https://www.social-protection.org/gimi/ShowProject.action?id=3083>, but it has not been updated since early 2018.
- 2) A few project leaflets were developed upon inception see: <http://www.social-protection.org/gimi/gess/ShowProjectWiki.action?id=3300&pid=2657> (updated until the end of 2018), and these leaflets have been disseminated to inform partners, stakeholders and local press. The project also developed posters and banners for display at project activities, activities of partners, national and regional workshops, knowledge sharing forums, side events and conferences which included logos and references to the EU and ICMPD. In addition, the Africa EU Migration and Mobility Dialogue (MMD) supported the mainstreaming of the JLMP project in high level meetings.

- 3) Project staff made well-received presentations at key events related to the project such as the ICMPD expert panel at the 2019 European Development Days - Inequalities along the migration journey, 19 June 2019, and the Khartoum Process Thematic Meeting on Legal Frameworks and Policy Development: Optimising the Benefits of Organised Labour Migration. 24th-25th of September 2019, Egypt.⁶
- 4) The project implements a key component of the Joint Labour Migration Programme (JLMP), and its structure and activities provided for regular dissemination of project results, for example through the JLMP Technical Committee meetings and the UN Migration Working Group Meeting (UN-MWG), a platform of UN agencies with migration related mandates.

Overall, the project's visibility in terms of acknowledging the contribution of EU/ICMPD has been satisfactory, although the different websites could have been kept more up to date. In the coming months, during the 2nd no-cost extension phase, there will be more opportunities to enhance the visibility, in particular through the proposed innovative virtual international conference and the COVID-19 relief effort.

⁶ See the following two websites: <https://www.icmpd.org/news-centre/news-detail/project-news-icmpd-expert-panel-at-the-2019-european-development-days/>, and <https://www.khartoumprocess.net/news-and-events/news/85-thematic-meeting-on-legal-frameworks-and-policy-development-optimising-the-benefits-of-organised-labour-migration-24-25-september-cairo-egypt>

4 Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

The conclusions of the final independent evaluation are below categorized according to the seven evaluation criteria used throughout this report. The *Relevance and Strategic Fit* of the intervention was quite high for the beneficiaries and for the countries involved, and most of the stakeholders interviewed underlined that the relevance has remained high until today and has only become more urgent due to the COVID-19 crisis. In particular the project's objectives aligned closely to the priorities and needs of the four partners, i.e. the three RECs secretariats and the AUC. For ECOWAS this applied especially to the General Convention on Social Security, for SADC to the Protocol on Employment and Labour and the Labour Migration Policy Framework, and for EAC to the Common Market Protocol (CMP). At the AU level the project supported the Joint Labour Migration Programme (JLMP) and aligned to the AU Migration Policy Framework.

The project was also relevant to the interests of the migrants working in the *informal economy*, while it was less relevant to the priorities of the employers' and workers' organisations. The intervention was further clearly aligned to global and regional frameworks, such as SDGs, the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM), and the Africa EU Migration and Mobility Dialogue (MMD) as well as to several policy outcomes of the ILO Programme and Budget (P&B).

The intervention was partly demand-driven especially since the AUC was keen to start such a project. It became a part of the Africa EU Migration and Mobility Dialogue (MMD) which included Flagship Initiatives for large-scale actions with a multi-country, regional or continental scope. In total it took about 1.5 years of negotiations between the EU and the ILO to finalize the EU Action Document. The project clearly responded to the priorities of both ECOWAS and EAC, but in the case of SADC it was less demand-driven: their first priority was on support for access to benefits instead of for portability, although these can be done simultaneously as well.

Stakeholder involvement in the project was rather mixed with the AUC as the initiator being deeply involved in the design phase while this was reduced somewhat during implementation when the attention had to be divided over the different components of JLMP. Of the three RECs, SADC was most active, while for example the EAC suffered from understaffing. Involvement of regional employers' and workers' organisations was more limited.

Internal coherence was clearly satisfactory as the project has built on a large number of other ILO projects in particular MIGSEC and FMM West Africa, while the project promoted coherence during the implementation phase with few other ILO projects (including SAMM). In terms of external coherence, the project was firmly embedded in the EU-funded Africa EU Migration and Mobility Dialogue (MMD) and in the broader JLMP; for the future, coordination will be needed with the new Swiss-funded Labour Migration project.

The *Validity of design* of the project was satisfactory but had some important drawbacks. The PRODOC's LogFrame is a clear document with four outputs or results areas and 17 activities, and with a complete set of indicators, baselines, targets and assumptions. However, the

implementation approach was rather ambitious including three RECs spread all over Africa in a project of about Euro 2.3 million to be implemented in just 22 months. The project design included further a basic type of sustainability strategy but no gender strategy; after the Grant Evaluation Commission recommended to take gender equality into account more specifically throughout the Action the response of the ILO amounted to a Gender Strategy.

Overall the evaluation found that *Project effectiveness* has been satisfactory. In **ECOWAS** progress was made with the implementation of the General Convention through technical assistance and guidance from the project (see Table 1). In **SADC** most leadership was shown and most progress was made, i.e. on the Guidelines and the action plan (Table 2). In the **EAC**, activities were revived after a long interval since 2011 and the project has been supporting the revision of the draft EAC Council Directive, as well as two country studies (Table 3). With respect to the **AUC**, progress was made through a high-level capacity building workshop, the support to include a migration component in ILO's Social Security Inquiry, SSI, and the work on the dashboard of ECASSA (Table 4).

The inclusion of the informal economy was an additional exploratory component and two studies were undertaken which remained somewhat theoretical in particular due to lack of data (Ghana and Cabo Verde). For the coming months, the project will try to include an analysis of the impact of COVID-19 on the informal economy. The project's gender strategy as given in Annex 6 was not very ambitious and some elements were not implemented. The project did make an effort to include gender equality, but also faced the political processes of the RECs which are not always particularly gender sensitive.

As a result of special circumstances, the project required *two No-Cost Extensions*, one in July 2019 and the second in July 2020. The 1st one was needed because there were major challenges in delivering within the 22 months and the main change was an extension with one year until July 2020. The 2nd one was the result of the COVID-19 crisis, and it proposed an extension of two and half months of project implementation until 15 October 2020 including a virtual closing event. Both extensions were appropriate.

The main *contributing factors* towards project's success include the commitment within the RECs to improve social protection and portability for migrant workers, the expertise, flexibility and hard work of the project team, the support from different ILO units and the support and flexibility of ICMPD and EU to approve the crucial no-cost extensions. The *challenges* faced by the project are relatively numerous and include the stepwise political processes in the RECs/AUC each step often requiring consensus, the difficulties encountered in the coordination of national social security laws and/or systems, lack of knowledge on social security among the regional social partners and some government representatives, sometimes leadership at RECs is not sufficient, lack of data especially on informal migrant workers, shortage of funds and staff to accommodate *all* of the requests made by the RECs/AUC and, of course, COVID-19.

The *Efficiency of resource use* has overall been good in the project. Almost 80% of the budget of over USD 2.6 million had actually been spent as of 30 June 2020, and the remaining 20% has been partly re-allocated and re-purposed to activities that are expected to be possible during the COVID-19 crisis. The actual expenditures by cost categories (Table 5) show that the largest category was for the project team with about 37%, which is relatively modest for an ILO project

of this nature, also compared to the total for the four main partners which will amount to 50% at the end of the project. These four main partners are *each* expected to account for about 10 to 15% of the ultimate *total* budget. The AUC component substantially lagged behind until 30 June 2020 but is expected to absorb no less than one third of the no-cost extension. The expenditures are very much in line with the original budgetary plans of the PRODOC. Another element of efficiency concerns the solid synergies with other ILO initiatives, in particular with JLMP, MIGSEC and FMM.

The *Effectiveness of management arrangements* is overall satisfactory. The backstopping, guidance and support by ILO units, i.e. ROAF, SOCPRO, MIGRANT, DWT in Pretoria and Dakar and the Country office in Addis Ababa have been intense at times (e.g. in the project design phase) and have always been sufficient. In terms of project management, the project was staffed with a relatively small project team based in Ethiopia and Tanzania partly because the EU's preference was to have more funds for non-staff costs and a lean project team. Nevertheless, the stakeholders interviewed for the present evaluation have commended the project team and the ILO for its expertise, flexibility, good communication as well as good presentations.

The Project Steering Committee (PSC) chaired by AUC held only one meeting (in February 2019) which provided support for the first no-cost extension. A second PSC meeting was planned for March/April 2020 but was cancelled because of COVID-19. The updated work plans function appropriately as M&E Plan, and two complete Technical Progress Reports were prepared, while the two proposals for no-cost extensions also provided details on progress, re-allocations, and financial budgets. Lastly, the present report is the result of the final independent evaluation.

The sixth evaluation criteria, *Impact orientation and sustainability*, was also evaluated as satisfactory despite the very difficult COVID-19 conditions since March 2020. Positive changes in the RECs have been registered in this report in the area of *policy development*, in particular the adoption of the SADC Guidelines, the presentation of the draft of the EAC Council Directive, and the influence the project had on policy makers and top management to give more prominence to social protection. Positive changes have also been registered in the RECs in the area of *administration*, in particular the capacity building of the staff, the inclusion of a portability component in ILO's Social Security Inquiry (SSI) questionnaire, and the capacity building and awareness raising in ECOWAS on the General Convention.

The PRODOC did not include a specific 'exit strategy', but there were various sustainability considerations. It also included efforts by the project to incorporate dimensions on social protection of migrant workers in each new migration project in Africa. Nevertheless, even as early as February 2019 the PSC noted that follow-up interventions would be required. Also, for the individual RECs a lot still needs to be done to make the interventions sustainable.

Ownership of the project outcomes was highest in SADC showing leadership in several decisions made by the Meeting of Ministers, in adopting the Guidelines and in developing the Action Plan, while five SADC Member States volunteered to pilot the implementation of these Guidelines. Ownership was relatively lower among EAC and ECOWAS than in the case of SADC, with less direction provided by ECOWAS as to priorities, while the EAC suffered from the inadequacy of staffing. The AUC was important as a kind of liaison between the three RECs and their first priority lies in the broader JLMP programme. Ownership was not built among the regional workers' and

employers' organisations, although in the SADC region the secretariat operates increasingly in a tripartite manner, and the project also brought the employers and workers of this region closer together.

Most stakeholders recognized that the work with the RECs needs to be considered in a longer-term perspective well beyond *the end of the project* and therefore interventions need to continue especially now that COVID-19 has created many more challenges for migrant workers. In principle, a continuation of the project would have the interest of the EC, since it attaches importance both to internal mobility and to social protection. Possible elements to be considered for a future intervention to sustain the momentum are the inclusion of the present three RECs as well as national level interventions, continuation of the AUC involvement, inclusion of work on the informal economy, inclusion of other RECs (e.g. IGAD and/or UMA), and attention for the impact of COVID-19. Bringing together the national social security institutions once a year and by enhancing and aligning their systems at RECs' levels and at national levels is another important element. In addition, more coordination and reporting are needed, as well as human resources support. Lastly, ILO can liaise with the EU and the ICMPD to monitor the possibility of a follow-up phase, and with the broader JLMP programme.

The project's **Visibility** has been satisfactory in terms of acknowledging the contribution of EU and ICMPD, although the different websites could have been kept more up to date. In the coming months, during the 2nd no-cost extension phase, there will be more opportunities to enhance the visibility, for example through the virtual closing event and the COVID-19 relief effort.

4.2 Recommendations

The recommendations will be presented in this section according to the six OECD/DAC Evaluation Criteria distinguished in this report.

Relevance and strategic fit

- 1) **Involve more pro-actively the regional employers' and workers' organisations (EO/WO) in the project**, and include specific activities directed exclusively at these regional EO/WO in order to enhance their knowledge and involvement as well as their sense of ownership.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO ROAF, Project Team, regional EO/WO, RECs/AUC, ILO workers' and employers' specialists (ACTRAV and ACT/EMP), DWTs	Medium	Remainder of the project period, and design of new projects	Part of ongoing investments, and part of new interventions

Validity of design

- 2) **Include a comprehensive and targeted Gender Equality Strategy in the PRODOC**, and in particular make sure that all stakeholders pay specific attention to the inclusion of women in each and every project activity.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO ROAF, DWT Gender Specialists, HQ Geneva, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, RECs/AUC	Medium	Design of new projects	Part of new interventions.

Project effectiveness

- 3) **Accommodate and anticipate as far as possible the stepwise political approval processes in the RECs and AUC** which often impacts on project implementation leading to delays especially since mostly consensus is required among all member/partner states for every major subsequent step.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO ROAF, RECs/AUC, DWTs, HQ Geneva, MIGRANT, SOCPRO	Medium	Design of new projects	Part of new interventions.

Efficiency of resource use

- 4) **Maintain the synergies with other Labour Migration projects and programmes in Africa**, in particular with the broader JLMP programme, with the recently started EU funded Southern Africa Migration Management (SAMM) project working with two RECs (SADC and COMESA), as well as with the new Swiss funded Labour Migration project (2021-2024) involving six RECS: the three from the present project, i.e. EAC, ECOWAS and SADC, as well as AMU, COMESA and ECCAS.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO ROAF, Project Team, JLMP, EU, SAMM, Swiss funded project, RECs/AUC, DWTs, MIGRANT, SOCPRO	Medium to High	Remainder of the project period, and design of new projects	Part of ongoing investments, and part of new interventions

Effectiveness of management arrangements

- 5) **Make sure that the project team is large enough to deal not only with four main partners spread all over Africa, but also with the relevant regional employers' and workers' organisations.** For example, the project team could have benefitted from an earlier involvement of the National Project Officer supporting the EAC which had a shortage of human resources, and from an extended full-time presence of the project manager until the end of the project.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO ROAF, EU, Other donors, RECs/AUC, DWTs, HQ Geneva, MIGRANT, SOCPRO	Medium	Design of new projects	Part of new interventions.

- 6) **Organize the first Project Steering Committee meeting within the first half year of the effective start of the project.** This would not only have identified much earlier the need for human resources support for the EAC but would also have allowed for the conducting of two more PSC meetings, i.e. in the second and in the third year (face-to-face or virtual). This is the more important in view of the crucial role the PSC is expected to play in communication

and in ownership and would have enhanced the opportunities for RECs and regional employers' and workers' organisations of 'learning from each other' which was considered as an important element in the project.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO ROAF, DWTs, HQ Geneva, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, EU	Medium	Design of new projects	Part of new interventions.

Impact orientation and sustainability

- 7) **Make sure that the planned *Closing Event* is actually organised before the end of the project as a kind of 'Exit Strategy' which involves a workshop whereby sustainability issues can be discussed and agreed upon.** After COVID-19, the project team proposed in the second no-cost extension to conduct this closing event, an EU priority, as an innovative virtual conference over two-half days in the relevant languages in partnership with Socialprotection.org.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
Project Team, ILO ROAF, RECs/AUC, EO/WO, EU, ICMPD, JLMP, ECASSA, DWTs, MIGRANT, SOCPRO	Very High	Remainder of the project period	Part of ongoing investments

- 8) **Explore ways to continue the current project in a second phase in order to sustain the momentum created by the present project.** ILO can liaise with the EC, the ICMPD and with JLMP to explore the available options in the coming months. Once the present project ends, social protection will no longer be covered within JLMP following the current task division between its constituent projects. Possible elements to be considered for inclusion in such a second phase are:

- The inclusion of the present three RECs as well as national level interventions,
- The continuation of the AUC involvement,
- A solid gender equality strategy,
- The inclusion of work on the informal economy as an exploratory element,
- The inclusion of other RECs (e.g. IGAD and/or UMA),
- Attention for the impact of COVID-19,
- Bring together the national social security institutions once a year and align their systems at RECs' levels and at national levels, and
- Capacity building elements for the RECs as well as for the regional social partners.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO ROAF, EU, ICMPD, JLMP, DWTs, HQ Geneva, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, Other donors	High	Design of new projects	Part of new interventions.

5 Lessons Learned and Good Practices

This chapter introduces three lessons learned (LL) and two good practices (GP) from the experience gained by the evaluation in the present report.

Lessons Learned

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

LL1: In every new project organize the first Project Steering Committee meeting within the first half year of the effective start of the project.

If this would have been done in the present project, it would not only have been possible to identify much earlier the need for human resources support for the EAC, but would also have allowed for the conducting of two more PSC meetings, i.e. in the second and in the third year (face-to-face or virtual). This is the more important in view of the crucial role the PSC is expected to play in communication and in ownership and would have enhanced the opportunities for RECs and regional employers' and workers' organisations of 'learning from each other' which was considered as an important element in the project.

LL2: The inclusion of the informal economy in projects on social protection/portability of benefits can only be very exploratory.

The project's aim of extending access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families was not limited to formal sector workers, but especially the EU Employment/Social Protection Section was in favour of including those in the informal economy as well. This can be considered as an additional component of the project; while guaranteeing social protection for formal, registered workers is already a giant task it becomes even more complicated when unregistered workers are included.

LL3: Requests from one of the main project partners for human resources support should be accommodated as early as possible.

During the project implementation it was learned that not accommodating requests from one of the main project partners for human resources support in an early stage resulted in serious delays. Specifically, in this project it took a long time to accommodate the request from EAC for direct human resources support. While the draft ToR for a National Project Officer to be located in the EAC Secretariat in Arusha was ready in late 2018, the NPO started almost one year later in October 2019. Delays occurred in getting the approval from the donor for an additional budget (including a new budget line) for human resources support for the EAC Secretariat, and in the recruitment procedure. In the meantime, EAC was suffering from severe understaffing and as a result progress was much slower in the first half of the project than in the other RECs.

Good Practices

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

*GP1: Supporting **selected** REC's in order to extend access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families is a good practice.*

The project approach of supporting selected REC's in order to extend access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families is a good practice. This approach focuses on enhancing the coordination of national social security laws and/or systems in the partner states of the RECs, and on learning from each other (at the level of the RECs).

The harmonization of the national laws of the partner states would be an enormous task, but important is that, in itself, it is not a pre-requisite for access to social security and portability for migrant workers. Therefore, the tried and tested approach in different countries around the world is to pursue coordination: Coordination establishes mechanisms through which social security systems can work together to achieve mutually agreed objectives while maintaining and respecting the separate rules, laws and definitions of each system and/or country. This is in itself also a challenge, but one that is more manageable than harmonisation of laws/systems, and this is precisely what makes the work through the RECs all the more important.

GP2: To embed the project in a broader programme, enhancing coordination and synergies.

It is a Good Practice to embed the project in a broader programme enhancing coordination and synergies. The project is implemented by the ILO as one of the pillars of the AUC/ILO/IOM/ECA Joint Labour Migration Programme (JLMP). African Heads of State adopted the JLMP in 2015, as a comprehensive programme on labour migration governance, designed to leverage migration for development and regional integration.

In terms of the AU continental framework the project importantly supports the realization of the AU-ILO-IOM-UNECA Joint Labour Migration Programme (JLMP), which consists of several projects:

- The present project on social protection/portability funded by the EU;
- A larger project funded by Sida and implemented by IOM, ILO and AUC; and
- Other actions, including one funded by Germany and implemented by GIZ.

JLMP has eight Activity Areas, one of which is Activity Area 2.2 - Extension of Social Security coverage to migrants. Only the EU-funded project works towards this Activity Area 2.2 on social security, which was also a deliberate strategy within JLMP in part to avoid duplications of interventions. It is important to note that the other projects within JLMP deal with migration per se and not with social protection. The social protection component is also not a priority for several organisations involved in JLMP, including IOM. The present project is thus solely responsible for the 'social protection component of the JLMP'.

The ILO Templates for these Lessons Learned and Good Practices are provided in Annex 7.

Annex 1 Terms of Reference (TOR)

Terms of Reference for the Final Evaluation

Project Title	Extending access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families in selected RECs in Africa.
Project Code	RAF/17/16/ICM
Implementer	International Labour Organization – Regional Office for Africa
Partners/Beneficiaries	AUC, EAC, ECOWAS and SADC
Backstopping units	MIGRANT and SOCPRO
Development partners	ICMPD/EU
Project budget	EUR 2,326,813
Duration	October 2017 – July 2020
Type of Evaluation	Final independent
Timeline	June-July 2020

I. Background of the Project

International migration poses significant challenges for migrants and their families in terms of social protection coverage. Although “everyone as a member of society has the right to social security” (Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), art. 22), in reality, compared to nationals working their entire lives in one country, migrants face huge challenges in exercising their rights to social protection. This is partially due to legal restrictions pertaining to their particular circumstances (e.g. the length of their period of employment and residence, their nationality, migrant status etc.) but also to more practical obstacles including the lack of information or contributory capacity and the complexity of administrative procedures to access social protection. Certain categories of workers may face additional obstacles in accessing social security, if they work in a sector or occupation not or insufficiently covered by national social security legislation. Temporary workers, such as seasonal workers (e.g. agricultural workers, fishermen, etc.) may face particular obstacles in accessing and fulfilling the requirements for eligibility to social security benefits (e.g. minimum qualifying periods and minimum residence periods).

The lack of social security coordination due to the inexistence of bilateral or multilateral agreements may prevent migrant workers from maintaining rights acquired in another State. This is particularly important in the case of long-term benefits (invalidity, old-age and survivors) where qualifying periods may be considerable. Moreover, where bilateral and multilateral social security agreements exist, they mostly cover migrant workers in formal employment, leaving migrants working in the informal economy or in an irregular situation largely unprotected.

Though the challenges are significant, many policy options are available to policy-makers to extend social protection to migrant workers. First, the conclusion of bilateral or multilateral social security agreements is one of the most effective instruments to extend social protection to migrant workers and their families. It can ensure the portability of social security rights and provide equality of treatment of non-nationals and national workers in respect of social security. Second, governments can ratify and apply ILO Conventions and Recommendations (e.g. C118, C157, R167, R202) containing standards relevant to migrant workers and their social protection. This will imply that social security laws, regulating both social insurance and social assistance schemes, cover migrant workers.

Another option to consider is the inclusion of social security provisions in bilateral labour migration arrangements (BLMAs). This can be particularly relevant in the absence of social security agreements and can help ensure that at least some provisions such as the access to health care or work injury benefits are provided to migrant workers. Additionally, countries of origin or destination can adopt, on a unilateral basis, measures that will extend social protection to migrant workers and their families. These unilateral measures comprise the inclusion of migrant workers in national social protection floors, the application of the equality of treatment principle and the exports of benefits, the establishment of voluntary or mandatory insurance mechanisms as well as welfare funds. Finally, complementary measures aimed at improving migrants effective access to social protection and health care are worth considering including communication and

information campaigns, interpretation services, translation of material in relevant languages, pre-departure briefings, free-of-charge services facilitating registration and access to appeal and complaint procedures, representation of migrant workers and more.

The ILO supports its constituents and partners on various dimensions of the policy measures highlighted above to enhance decent work and social protection of migrant workers and their families. In Africa, part of the ILO's support is through the ICMPD/EU funded project: *Extending social protection access and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families in selected RECs⁷ in Africa*. The project aims at strengthening the RECs' capacities to provide, as well as drive the implementation of regional frameworks on the extension of social protection to migrant workers and their families including those in the informal economy.

The project builds on and revitalizes existing regional processes. It is critical to migration governance in Africa and constitutes an important component of the **AU-ILO-IOM-UNECA Joint Labour Migration Programme (JLMP)**. African Heads of State and Government adopted the JLMP in 2015, as a comprehensive programme on labour migration governance, designed to leverage migration for development and regional integration. The importance of regional and sub-regional actions in effective governance of migration is increasingly recognized. Recent data show that the majority of migrants continue to move mainly within their sub-region of origin – making sub-regional actions, such as initiatives supported by the project, extremely important. The project supports relevant aspects of the continental Protocol on Free Movement of Persons, the AU Migration Policy Framework and RECs' migration policy frameworks. At the level of global discussions on migration governance, the project is precursor and directly pertinent to Objective 22 of Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration i.e. *establish mechanisms for the portability of social security entitlements and earned benefits*.

The project result areas are:

1. In **ECOWAS** - improved implementation of the ECOWAS General Convention on Social Security by ECOWAS Member States
2. In **SADC** – strengthen capacity and policy instruments on social security provision, including portability of rights.
3. In **EAC** - enhance capacity and knowledge base to advance the regional coordination and protection framework as per Common Market Protocol to improve migrant workers access to social protection
4. Improve the capacity of the **AUC, RECs and regional social partners** to effectively coordinate and contribute to regional and sub-regional social protection programmes for migrant workers in both, the formal and informal sector.

⁷ Regional Economic Communities' The RECs covered by the project are East African Community (EAC), Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and continental level interventions through support to the African Union Commission (AUC).

Some links/contributions to migration and social protection frameworks

Global frameworks

- *Contributions to the SDGs* – Targets: 8.8, 1.3, 5.4, 3.8, 5.4, 10.4
- *Links to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM)* - Objective 22: establish mechanisms for the portability of social security entitlements and earned benefits.

AU continental framework

The project supports the realization of **Pillar 2** of the AU-ILO-IOM-UNECA Joint Labour Migration Programme (JLMP), “Promote decent work for regional integration and inclusive development”, 2.2 - *Social Security extended to migrants through access and portability regimes compatible with international standards and good practice*. AU Migration Policy Framework and Action Plan – thematic Area 5 (ii) “*Extend social protection access and portability to migrant workers*”

REC frameworks

- EAC: EAC Common Market Protocol, Article 10 (3) (f) of the, workers are entitled to enjoy the rights and benefits of social security as accorded to the workers of the host Partner State
- ECOWAS: ECOWAS Treaty 1975, Supplementary Act A/SA.5/07/13 – ECOWAS General Convention on Social Security
- SADC: SADC Protocol on Employment and Labour (2014), Article 19(f); Code on Social Security in SADC (2007); SADC Labour Migration Policy Framework (2016) and Action Plan, SADC Portability of Accrued Social Security Benefits Policy Framework (2016)

Links to ILO Decent Work programmes

The project is contributing to the following ILO Programme and Budget policy outcomes:

P&B Outcome 3: Creating and extending social protection floors (2018 – 2019)

P&B Outcome 9: Fair and effective international labour migration and mobility (2018-2019)

P&B Outcome 7: Adequate and effective protection at work for all (2020-2021)

P&B Outcome 8: Comprehensive and sustainable social protection for all (2020-2021)

The project is linked to the following regional and sub-regional programme outcomes:

- Regional activities:

- RAF903- Strengthened capacity of ILO constituents and regional and sub-regional constituents and partners (AUC and RECs in particular) to develop and implement labour migration policies and programmes
- RAF904 - Expanded and reinforced Social Protection Floors at the policy and programmatic level as per the commitment of AU Member States
- EAC : SAD104- Rights-based labour migration for integration enhanced under Common Market Protocol
- ECOWAS :SDA903- Improved governance of labour migration in ECOWAS
- SADC :SHA 127. Improved governance of labour migration for the benefit of origin and destination countries and protection of migrant workers' rights.

Project Management/Governance Arrangement

RAF/17/16/ICM is decentralized within the ILO Regional Office for Africa organization unit. A Project Manager based in Addis Ababa manages it and reports to the Regional Director for Africa based in Abidjan, which authority was delegated to the Chief of regional Programming Unit. Administrative and financial services support to the project is provided by an Administrative and Finance Assistant based in Addis Ababa. This arrangement is meant to ensure direct interactions and support to the AUC. The project team also includes a Technical Officer and a National Project Officer based in Dar es Salaam and Arusha, Tanzania, respectively. The Project Manager provides direct supervision of all project staff.

The project receives technical guidance and support from ILO social protection specialists based in ILO Decent Work Team in Pretoria, Dakar and from specialists in the Regional Office for Africa, the ILO Social Protection Department (SOCPRO) and the Labour Migration Branch (MIGRANT) in ILO Headquarters.

The project has a Programme Steering Committee (PSC), established to ensure multi-stakeholder participation and effective ownership of processes, activities and outcomes. The PSC oversees and validates the overall direction of the project and ensures that activities of all components are in line with the AU strategy on migration and the RECs' frameworks and common approaches. The PSC is chaired by the AUC. It is comprised of representatives from RECs (ECOWAS, EAC, and SADC), RECs workers and employers' organizations, EU delegation, ICMPD and other stakeholders. The ILO serves as secretariat to the PSC.

Evaluation background

Evaluations are an integral and important part of the implementation of Development Cooperation projects within the ILO. Evaluation exercises provide crucial information for planning, accountability, knowledge building and learning. In particular, project evaluations provide an opportunity for the Office and its funding partners to assess the

appropriateness of project design as it relates to the ILO's strategic and relevant policy frameworks, and consider the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of project outcomes. Project evaluations also test underlying assumptions about contributions to broader development goals.

This evaluation will be based on ILO Policy Guidelines⁸. As per ILO policy guidelines, all projects over US\$1 million must undergo at least one independent final evaluation⁹. External evaluators-consultants, who have no previous links to the project, carry out independent evaluations for the ILO. An ILO Evaluation Manager, with oversight by EVAL, manages the independent evaluation.

This project¹⁰ has undertaken two annual reviews. As per PRODOC, a final independent evaluation should be carried out 3 months before the end date of the project¹¹. However, the COVID-19 crisis led to some restrictions that further affect the evaluation methodology and possibly the scope of the analysis. In this regards, the evaluation will draw on internal ILO guidance, in particular the document: *Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO: An internal guide on adapting to the situation*¹².

II. Purpose of the Evaluation

The overall purpose of the independent final evaluation is to assess the extent to which the project has achieved its objective, promoting accountability and strengthen learning among the key project stakeholders, including the donor, and ILO.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are:

- Assess the extent to which the project has achieved its stated objectives at outcome and impact levels, while identifying the supporting and constraining factors;
- Analyze the implementation strategies of the project with regard to their potential effectiveness in achieving the project outcomes and impacts; including unexpected results.
- Assess the project implementation efficiency
- Assess the extent to which the project outcomes will be sustainable;
- Assess the relevance of the project design and implementation strategy in relation to the AU, ILO, RECs and global development frameworks;
- Identify lessons learned and potential good practices;

⁸ ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations 3rd edition 2017

⁹ Final evaluations focus on the outcomes of projects, programmes, strategies or policies and the likelihood that they will achieve impact. Evaluations provide an opportunity for in-depth reflection on the strategy and assumptions guiding the intervention.

¹⁰ As per Grant Agreement, the project implementation period was 1 Oct 2017 - 31 July 2019 (22 months), but extended (no cost) until 31 July 2020, bringing the total implementation duration to 34 months.

¹¹ See PRODOC page 33.

¹² http://www.ilo.ch/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_741206.pdf

- Provide recommendations to project stakeholders to promote sustainability and support further development of the project outcomes

III Scope of the Evaluation

This final evaluation will focus on the entire implementation period of the project (1 October 2017 to 31 July 2020), assessing all the results and contributions of the project to migration governance and social protection for all.

This ToR and the ILO Evaluation policies and guidance notes¹³ define the overall scope of this evaluation. Recommendations, emerging from the evaluation, should be strongly linked to the findings of the evaluation and should provide clear guidance to stakeholders on how they can address them in the context of new implications from the COVID19. The evaluation will pay due attention to crosscutting issues, gender and non-discrimination, social dialogue and tripartism, international labour standards and just transition to environmental sustainability.

IV. Clients

The principal clients for this evaluation are the RECs (EAC, ECOWAS, and SADC), the social partners, project stakeholders and partners including AUC and JLMP Partners as well as development partners (ICMPD, EU), and the ILO (Regional Office, Country Offices, SOCPRO, MIGRANT, as well as other relevant ILO policy departments, branches and programmes at HQ).

V. Evaluation criteria and questions

The evaluation will cover the following criteria

- i) relevance and strategic fit,
- ii) validity of design,
- iii) project effectiveness,
- iv) efficiency,
- v) impact orientation and sustainability (as defined in ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation¹⁴)

The evaluation should address the questions below. The questions are guide to the evaluator for information gathering and analysis and related conclusions, recommendations and identify lessons learnt and good practices. The evaluator can

¹³ ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations 3rd edition 2017 and all related Guidance Notes

¹⁴ ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations 3rd edition , 2017

modify questions in agreement with the evaluation manager, and reflecting such changes in the inception report.

The crosscutting issues, gender and non-discrimination, social dialogue and tripartism, international labour standards and just transition to environmental sustainability should be integrated throughout the different evaluation criteria as relevant.

Key Evaluation Questions

The evaluator shall examine the following key issues:

1. Relevance and strategic fit,

- How did the action align and support the implementation of the ILO Programme and Budget 2018-19 and 2020-21 outcomes, with special focus on International Labour Standards and the ILO's approach to the extension of social protection to migrant workers?
- How did the action align, support/contribute to the implementation of the priorities and needs of the AU, RECs, social partners and other stakeholders in migration governance and extending social protection to migrant workers and their families?
- Has the project addressed stakeholder and constituents' needs? Were the interventions demand-driven?
- Did project target the relevant stakeholders for the project objectives? Were these stakeholders involved in project design and implementation?
- How well has the project promoted coherence with, and complemented and fitted in with other ILO projects/programmes in the regions of intervention?
- How well has the project promoted coherence with, and complemented and fitted in with other projects/programmes being implemented by the RECs
- Were project interventions, including capacity development and knowledge products, designed to maximize ILO's comparative advantage in the field of social protection and labour migration?

2. Validity of project design

- Has the project design clearly defined outcomes, outputs and performance indicators with baselines and targets? Were these realistic?
- Was the implementation approach valid and realistic?
- Has the project provided for adequate tripartite involvement and consultations in project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?
- Did the project design include a strategy for sustainability?
- Were any lessons learned from previous projects (e.g. MIGSEC) or policy interventions considered in the design and implementation of the project?

3. Project results and effectiveness

- To what extent the project has achieved its objectives in terms of stated targets?
- Has this been done through the planned outputs or new ones have been included, why and how effective have been?
- What, if any, unintended results of the project have been identified or perceived?
- Which have been the main contributing and challenging factors towards project's success in attaining its targets?
- Which are the project thematic areas of more and least success? What factors have contributed to it and why?
- To what extent has the COVID-19 Pandemic influenced project results and implementation and how has the project addressed it ?
- Can the adapted intervention models developed under COVID 19 be applicable for similar crisis response?

4. *Efficiency of resource use*

- How efficiently have resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) been allocated and used to provide the necessary support to achieve broader project objectives?
- To what extent were the disbursements and project expenditures in line with expected budgetary plans?
- To what extent was the project able to build on other ILO initiatives/project and other actors (e.g. AU and RECs) and create synergies? How did this affect the efficiency in use of resources?

5. *Effectiveness of management arrangements*

- Assess the backstopping, guidance and support on technical, programmatic, administrative and financial services from relevant ILO units (HQ, CO Addis and ROAF).
- Assess the project management and governance structure role on facilitating results and efficient delivery?
- Did the project establish and maintain relationship and cooperation with relevant stakeholders (e.g. AUC, JLMP partners, REC Secretariats, and development partners) to achieve the project results more effectively?
- Did the project establish and maintain cooperation with ICMPD?

6. *Impact orientation and sustainability*

- To what extent there is evidence of positive changes due to project contribution in areas such as policy development and administration of social protection for migrant workers and portability of social security benefits in any of the project RECs?
- To what extent were sustainability considerations taken into account in the project interventions? Has the project developed and integrated an exit strategy in its work?
- How has the sustainability approach of the project been affected/could be affected by the Covid19 situation in context of the national regional responses?
- Have the RECs and other stakeholders build ownership of the project outcomes?
- How can the project stakeholders -including ILO- strengthen project achievements after the end of the project?

7. *Other*

- Has the project team establish fluid communication channels with the project key stakeholders including such as AU, RECs and ICMP
- How visible has the project been in the social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families field in Africa in terms of acknowledging its contribution

VI. Methodology

Due to the COVID-19 restrictions on travel¹⁵, the evaluation will be carried out through two main data collection activities:

Desk review, including the following information sources:

a. Review of documents

- Project documents (logframe, budget, implementation plan, etc.)
- Progress reports and outputs
- Research and studies conducted by the Project
- Missions reports

¹⁵ For more details about adaptation to the current situation see:

www.ilo.ch/eval/WCMS_744068/lang--en/index.htm

- Financial information
- Others as required

All documents will be made available by the Project manager, in coordination with the evaluation manger, in a drop-box (or similar) at the start of the evaluation.

b. Preliminary interviews with the evaluation manger, the project manager and the donor

The desk review may suggest a number of preliminary findings that could be useful in reviewing or fine-tuning the evaluation questions.

Virtual contact with stakeholders and target groups individuals (Online/email questionnaires and telephone and video interviews)

Due to travel restrictions and no possibility of face-to-face engagements with project staff and stakeholders, the evaluation will employ email/online questionnaires and virtual interviews as the main sources for information gathering – to replace field visits and face-to-face interviews. An indicative list of persons to be interviewed will be prepared by the Project in consultation with the Evaluation Manager. This list will include:

- Partners/Beneficiaries (EAC, ECOWAS, SADC) - Secretariat officials and related bodies such as for example the Committee of Experts and the Social Dialogue Forum
- AUC, AU organs and JLMP Partners
- Project Steering Committee
- Direct beneficiaries of the project – selected government officials and social partners
- REC employers’ and workers’ organizations and beneficiary institutions e.g. ECASSA
- Development partners: EU and ICMPD
- Project staff
- Consultants on the project, where necessary
- ILO - ILO projects, ILO staff responsible for financial, administrative and technical backstopping of the project (ILO HQ, ROAF, DWCT Pretoria, DWT Dakar, CO-Addis, CO-Abuja, CO-Dar-es-Salaam)

The Evaluator will undertake group and/or individual discussions listed above. The project will provide all its support in organization these virtual interviews.

A virtual stakeholders' workshop (of key stakeholders in one group or in stages)¹⁶ will be organized to discuss initial findings and complete data gaps with key stakeholders, ILO staff and representatives of the development partners. The workshop will be logistically supported by the project and programmatically managed by the evaluator. Its details should be stated clearly in the Inception report for further preparation during the data collection phase.

After the workshop, debriefing to the ILO Director of CO Addis and the project team will take place.

The evaluator is encouraged to propose alternative mechanism or techniques for the data collection phase. These will be discussed with the project and the evaluation manager at the Inception phase. Any alternative should be reflected in the Inception report.

VII. Deliverables

1. **Inception report** (with detailed work plan and data collection instruments) following *ILO EVAL Checklist 3*, the report should include:
 - Description of the evaluation methodology and instruments to be used in sampling, data collection and analysis and the data collection plan mentioned above.
 - Evaluation matrix (questions and indicators and data collection matrix)
 - Guide questions for questionnaires and interviews;
 - Detailed work plan (including virtual interview schedules) should be developed in consultation with the Evaluation Manager and project team;
 - The proposed report outline structure.
 - Stakeholders' workshop agenda and logistics organization

2. Draft report and a Final reports in English with Executive summary in English and French (maximum 30 pages plus annexes) as per the following proposed structure:
 - Cover page as per ILO /EVAL template
 - Executive Summary (in English and French)
 - Acronyms
 - Description of the project
 - Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation
 - Methodology, data and limitations
 - Findings (this section's content should be organized around evaluation criterion and questions)
 - Conclusions

¹⁶ This will depend on the logistical possibilities in light of COVID-19 challenges

- Recommendations and possible future directions towards the sustainability of the project achievements (i.e. for the different key stakeholders)
- Lessons learned and good practices
- Annexes:
 - TOR
 - Evaluation matrix
 - List of people interviewed
 - Detail schedule of work
 - Documents examined
 - Lessons learned and Good practices (ILO/EVAL templates)
 - Others (optional)

3. Executive summary (English and French), in line with ILO/EVAL template.

The draft and final evaluation report must be in line with ILO EVAL Checklists 5 and 6. The total length of the reports should be a maximum of 30 pages for the main report, excluding annexes. The Evaluation Manager will circulate the draft report to key stakeholders, the project staff and the development partners for their review and forward the consolidated comments to the evaluator.

The evaluator will finalize and submit the final report to the evaluation manager in line with EVAL Checklist 5. The report should address all comments and/or provide explanations for comments not taken into account. An Executive summary (ILO/EVAL template must be submitted as well. The quality of the report will be assessed against ILO/EVAL's Checklist 617.

The evaluation manager will review the final version and submit to EVAL for final review. Then the evaluation report will be distributed to the key stakeholders to ensure enhance learning and make public at the e-discovery evaluation reports web-database¹⁸.

VIII. Management arrangements, work plan & timeline

Management arrangements

Evaluation Manager

Mr. Ricardo Furman (furman@ilo.org) Senior M&E officer Regional Programme Unit/ROAF. The Evaluation manager will supervise the evaluator and provide guidance on all technical and methodological matters regarding the evaluation and will subject the final approval of the evaluation report to ILO/EVAL.

Project team: The project team will provide or coordinate logistic and administrative

¹⁷ [EVAL Checklist 6: Rating the quality of evaluation reports.](#)

¹⁸ [ILO i-eval Discovery.](#)

support to the evaluation throughout the process, with the administrative support of the ILO Regional and Country Offices, where necessary.

- Ensuring project documentations are up to date and easily accessible;
- Provide support to the Evaluator during the data collection phase.

Evaluator/Consultant: The evaluation will be conducted by an external independent evaluator responsible for conducting a participatory and inclusive evaluation process. The external evaluator will produce the evaluation deliverables listed above based on the methodology outlined above.

Responsibilities and profile of the Evaluator

Responsibilities	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review of programme documents • Briefing with ILO/ Evaluation Manager • Development of the evaluation instrument • Telephone interviews with ILO and development partners • Undertake Interviews with stakeholders and key informants • Undertake field visits in projects areas (if possible) • Facilitate the stakeholders workshop • Draft evaluation report • Finalise evaluation report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not have been involved in the project. • Relevant background in social and/or economic development or other related field. • 7 years’ experience in the design, management and evaluation of development projects, in particular with policy development, regional consultative processes and institutional capacity building. • 7 years of experience in evaluations in the UN system or other international context as team leader, including Africa. • Relevant experience in the area of social protection and labour migration sector will be an asset. • Demonstrated ability to deliver quality results within strict deadlines. • Fluency in English is essential. • Working knowledge of French strongly desirable. • Experience facilitating stakeholder workshops for evaluation findings.

Work plan & timeline

The evaluation will be conducted between May and June 2020, in accordance with the tentative timeline below:

Phase	Tasks	Responsible Person	Days cons.	Tentative dates (to be updated)
I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process of selection and contract of the evaluator 	Evaluation manager	0	27 April – 12 June
II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Telephone briefing with evaluation manager Desk review of project related documents and interviews with the project and the donor Evaluation instrument designed based on desk review Inception report 	Evaluator	5	22-26 June
III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultations with ILO staff, REC officials and other stakeholders Presentation of preliminary findings to the stakeholders and debriefing with the project team 	Evaluator with logistical support by the Project team	10	29-June – 10 July
IV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft evaluation report based on desk review and virtual consultations submitted for approval and circulation 	Evaluator	5	13-17 July
V	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Circulation of the draft evaluation report to key stakeholders Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to the evaluator 	Evaluation manager	0	27-28 July
VI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate comments and inputs including explanations if comments were not integrated 	Evaluator	2	29-30 July
VII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of report by EVAL and dissemination to donor, stakeholders and upload at e-discovery 	Regional Senior Evaluation Officer, EVAL and the Project Manager/Chief Regional Programming	0	31 July
	Total number of consultant working days		22	

IX. RESOURCES

Estimated resource requirement:

- Evaluator: 22 days honorarium.
- Project team: logistic support for communications and organizing the preliminary findings presentation workshop.

Annex I: relevant ILO evaluation guidelines and standard templates

1. Code of conduct form (To be signed by the evaluator)

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206205/lang--en/index.htm

2. Checklist No. 3 Writing the inception report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165972/lang--en/index.htm

3. Checklist 5 Preparing the evaluation report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang--en/index.htm

4. Checklist 6 Rating the quality of evaluation report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang--en/index.htm

5. Template for lessons learned and Emerging Good Practices

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206158/lang--en/index.htm

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206159/lang--en/index.htm

6. Guidance note 7 Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165982/lang--en/index.htm

7. Guidance note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E of projects

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm

8. Template for evaluation title page

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166357/lang--en/index.htm

9. Template for evaluation summary: <http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/edmas/eval/template-summary-en.doc>

Annex 2 List of persons interviewed

Nr.	Type of Partner	Institution	Name	Position	Interviews held (2020)	Female
1	Beneficiary / partner	EAC-Secretariat	Mr. Stephen Niyonzima	Principal Labour and Employment Officer	July 10: 11.00	
2		SADC Secretariat	Mr. Maxwell Parakokwa	Senior Programme Officer	July 8: 10.30	
3		ECOWAS-Commission	Dr. Alves d'Almada Fernando Jorge	Head of Division of Humanitarian and Social Affairs	July 20 15.30	
4		AUC	Mr. Oumar Diop	AUC - JLMP Coordinator	July 17: 15.00	
5	Donor	ICMPD	Ms. Fagotto Giulia	MMD associate Project officer	July 8: 14.30	1
6		EU Delegate	Mr. Ron Hendrix	Program manager Migration	July 17: 10.00	
8	Regional Employers Org.	SPSF	Ms. Zoe Isaacs	Coordinator, SPSF (via VC)	July 16: 10.00	1
9	Regional Workers Org	EATUC	Mr. Davids Etyang	Coordinator, EATUC	July 23 11.00	
10		SATUCC	Mr. Nyasha Muchichwa	Southern Africa Trade Union Confederation	July 20: 17.15	
11		ITUC-Africa	Ms. Saizonou Epse Broohm Ghislaine & Mr. Joel Odigie	Program Officers	July 21: 16.10	1
13	Experts Org.	CESS	Mr. Peter Kofi Hayibor	Vice Chair, ECOWAS, and Vice president CESS	July 14: 15.00	
14	Internat. Org's	IOM	Mr. Jason Theede	IOM / JLMP, Pretoria	July 15; 10.00	
15	ILO	ILO	Mr. Joseph Momo	Chief Regional program ILO	July 3: 17.00	
16		ILO	Mr. Ricardo Furman Wolf	Senior M&E officer Regional Programme Unit/ROAF	June 22: 11.15	
17		ILO	Mr. Andrew Allieu	Project Manager, ILO	July 8: 16.30	
18		ILO	Ms. Victoire Umuhire	Technical Officer, ILO	June 22: 15.00	1
19		ILO	Ms. Van Panhuys, Clara	MIGRANT / SOCPRO	July 15: 11.00	1
20		ILO	Ms. Nesterenko, Valeria	SOCPRO	July 10: 14.00	1
21		ILO	Mr. Ndlovu, Siphon	DWT-Pretoria	July 15: 15.00 and July 16: 11.00	
23	Consultants	Consultant	Mr. Cisse Aly	Concerning ECOWAS	July 17: 11.30	
24		Consultant	Ms. Osure, Margaret	Concerning EAC	July 17: 13.00	1
25		Consultant	Mr. Mpedi, Letlhokwa George	Concerning SADC	July 17: 17.00	
	Total					7

Annex 3 List of Key Stakeholders

EAC- Secretariat	
Director of social Sectors	Mary Makoffu
Principal Labour and Employment Officer	Stephen Niyonzima
Principal Legal Officer	Florence Ochago
SADC Secretariat	
Senior Programme Officer	Maxwell Parakokwa
Troika 2018/2019	Ms. Milka Mungunda
ECOWAS-Commission	
Director, Social Affairs and Gender	Dr. Sintiki Tarfa UGBE
Head of Division Social Affairs	Alves d'Almada Fernando Jorge
Programme Officer	Abimbola Cecilia OYELOHUNNU
AUC	
Director of Social Affairs	Dr. Jane Mary Ong'olo
Head of Division of Labour, Employment and Migration, Department of Social Affairs	Sabelo Mbokazi
JLMP Coordinator	Oumar Diop

AUC	Mr. Tayeb Khaldi-M	AUC
	Mr. Oumar Diop	AUC
ICMPD	Zanette Monica	MMD Senior Coordinator
	Ms. Pauline Dunoyer	MMD Project Manager (2017 - 2019)
	Muterko Alexander	MMD Project manager (current)
	Fagotto Giulia	MMD associate Project officer
EU Delegate	Ms. Sebastiano Germano	EU to AU
RECs	Mr. Stephen Niyonzima	Head of Labor & Immigration Dep, EAC Secretariat
	Mr. DAN OKANYA	Coordinator, East Africa Employers' Organization
	Mr. Davids Etyang	Coordinator, EATUC
	Dr. Frederic Ntimarubusa	Secretary General, ECASSA
	Dr. Fernando Jorge Alves D'Almada	Head of Division, Social Affairs, ECOWAS
	Ms. Oyelohunnu Abimbola Cecilia	Program Officer, ECOWAS
	Mr. Peter Kofi Hayibor	Vice Chair, ECOWAS Committee of Experts in Social Security CESS
	Ms .Zoe Isaacs	Coordinator, SPSF (via VC)
ILO and JLMP	Ms. Catherine Matasha	IOM
	Mr. Admasseged ALEMAYEHU	IOM
	Mr. Emmanuel MADUIKE	IOM
	Mr. Alexio Musindo	Director, ILO
	Mr. Joseph Momo	Chief Regional program ILO
	Mr. Andrew Allieu	Project Manager, ILO
	Ms. Victoire Umuhire	Technical Officer, ILO
	Ms. Serkalem Abebe	Admin. Assistant, ILO

Employers' and Workers' Organisations		
SADC		
SPSF-	Zoe Angela Isaacs	Coordinator, SADC Private Sector Forum
	Valentino M. Daudi	Advocate
SATUC	Mr. Nyasha Muchichwa	
	Mr. Mohongora .A.R Kavihuha	Representative SATUCC

	Mr. Jones Kyaruzi Majura	Trade Union Congress of Tanzania (TUCTA)
EAC		
	EATUC David Etyang	Economist
	EAEO Dan Okanya	EAEO Coordinator
ECOWAS		
ECASSA	Frederic Ntimarubusa	Secretary General
	Saizonou Epse Broohm Ghislaine	Program Officer

ILO	
MIGRANT	Kazi Aoul, Samia Van Panhuys, Clara Dimechkie, Kenza
SOCPRO	Behrendt, Christina Markov, Kroum Stern-Plaza, Maya Urban Stefan Nesterenko, Valeria Yu, Zhiming
ROAF	Cynthia Samuel-Olonjuwon Joseph Momo Moreno-Fontes, Gloria
DWT-Pretoria	Joni Musabayana Allieu, Andrew Ndlovu, Siphon
DWT-Dakar	Peyron Bista, Celine
DWT- Cairo	Annycke, Pascal
Dar- Office	Cressida Mwamboma Pendo Lema
Project Staff	Andrew Allieu (11 Feb 2018 - 31 Mar 2020) Umuhire, Victoire Rutechura, Diana Abebe, Serkalem

Consultants: Name	Region/country and area of work
Mr. Henry Chikova	SADC
Mr. David Keendjele	SADC
DELAUGERRE Jean-Baptiste	Communication
MICHELO, STANFIELD HAMAKONA	Trainer
CISSE Aly	ECOWAS
OSURE, MARGARET	EAC
KAMWENUBUSA Theodore	Burundi
RUVAKUBUSA Chantal	Burundi
CROSSMAN Darry	SADC/ECASSA Dashboard
NKANAGU Tharcisse	Burundi
MPEDI, LETLHOKWA GEORGE	SADC
TOUNKARS CHEIKH TIDIANE	ECOWAS
HAYIBOR Peter Kofi	Ghana
Rodriguz Neira Carolina Delpilar	Communication
MINNEY, THOMAS	Editor
LANGIS Georges	EAC Actuary
PANNETON FRANCE Marie Claudie	EAC Actuary
KEBEDE, KALKIDAN ASSEFA (ETB)	Statistics AUC
BARYA, JOHN JEAN	EAC

Annex 4 Data Collection Worksheet

Below is the Data Collection Worksheet specifying the Evaluation Criteria and Questions, as well as the sources of data, stakeholder interviews and specific methods used in the present final independent evaluation.

Evaluation Criteria and Questions	Sources of Data	Stakeholder Interviews	Specific Methods
A. Relevance and strategic fit			
1) How did the action align and support the implementation of the ILO Programme and Budget 2018-19 and 2020-21 outcomes, with special focus on International Labour Standards and the ILO's approach to the extension of social protection to migrant workers?	ILO P&B 2018-19 and 2020-21, PRODOC, Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension, selected DWCPs	Project Team, DWT-Pretoria, ROAF, SOCPRO, MIGRANT	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
2) How did the action align, support/contribute to the implementation of the priorities and needs of the AU, RECs, social partners and other stakeholders in migration governance and extending social protection to migrant workers and their families?	Policies of RECs & AUC, PRODOC, Annual Progress Reports, Grant Contract, SDGs, Grant Evaluation Commission remarks	RECs & AUC, Social Partners, Project Team, ROAF, ICMPD, EU, JLMP, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
3) Has the project addressed stakeholder and constituents' needs? Were the interventions demand-driven?	PRODOC, Policies of RECs, AUC and of Social Partners	Project Team, RECs & AUC, Social Partners, ICMPD, SOCPRO MIGRANT, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
4) Did the project target the relevant stakeholders for the project objectives? Were these stakeholders involved in project design and implementation?	PRODOC, Policies of RECs, AUC and of Social Partners	Project Team, ROAF, SOCPRO, MIGRANT, RECs & AUC, Social Partners, ICMPD, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
5) How well has the project promoted (internal) coherence with, and complemented and fitted in with other ILO projects/programmes in the regions of intervention?	PRODOC, Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, DWT, ROAF, ICMPD, SOCPRO MIGRANT, RECs, AUC	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
6) How well has the project promoted (external) coherence with, and complemented and fitted in with other projects/programmes being implemented by the RECs	PRODOC, Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, DWT, ROAF, ICMPD, SOCPRO MIGRANT, RECs, AUC, JLMP, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
7) Were project interventions, including capacity development and knowledge products, designed to maximize ILO's comparative advantage in the field of social protection and labour migration?	PRODOC, ILO P&B, Grant contract	Project Team, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, ICMPD	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews

B. Validity of design			
8) Has the project design clearly defined outcomes, outputs and performance indicators with baselines and targets? Were these realistic?	PRODOC, LogFrame and Work Plans, Grant Evaluation Commission remarks	Project Team, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
9) Was the implementation approach valid and realistic?	PRODOC, M&E Plan, LogFrame and Work Plans	Project Team, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
10) Has the project provided for adequate tripartite involvement and consultations in project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?	PRODOC, M&E Plan, LogFrame and Work Plans, Plans of Social Partners	Project Team, Social partners, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, ICMPD, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
11) Did the project design include a strategy for sustainability? And a strategy for gender equality and other cross-cutting issues?	PRODOC, Grant Evaluation Commission remarks	Project Team, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, ICMPD	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
12) Were any lessons learned from previous projects (e.g. MIGSEC) or policy interventions considered in the design and implementation of the project?	PRODOC	Project Team, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, ICMPD	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
C. Effectiveness			
13) To what extent the project has achieved its objectives in terms of stated targets, including in the area of gender equality and non-discrimination?	Annual Progress Reports, PRODOC, Work Plans, Requests for no-cost extension, Reports produced	Project Team, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, Social Partners, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
14) Has this been done through the planned outputs or new ones have been included, why and how effective have been?	Annual Progress Reports, PRODOC, Work Plans, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, Social Partners, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
15) What, if any, unintended results of the project have been identified or perceived?	Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, Social Partners, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
16) Which have been the main contributing and challenging factors towards project's success in attaining its targets?	Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension, Reports produced	Project Team, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, Social Partners, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
17) Which are the project thematic areas of more and least success? What factors have contributed to it and why?	Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, Social Partners, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews

18) To what extent has the COVID-19 Pandemic influenced project results and implementation and how has the project addressed it?	Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, ROAF, ICMPD, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, RECs, AU	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
19) Can the adapted intervention models developed under COVID 19 be applicable for similar crisis response (replicability)?	Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, ROAF, ICMPD, MIGRANT, SOCPRO	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
D. Efficiency of resource use			
20) How efficiently have resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) been allocated and used to achieve broader project objectives?	PRODOC, Annual and Financial Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, Social Partners, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, Experts	Review of Financial Reports; Stakeholder Interviews
21) To what extent were the disbursements and project expenditures in line with expected budgetary plans?	PRODOC, Annual and Financial Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, ICMPD, ROAF	Review of Financial Reports; Stakeholder Interviews
22) To what extent was the project able to build on other ILO initiatives/project and other actors (e.g. AU and RECs) and create synergies? How did this affect the efficiency in use of resources?	PRODOC, Annual and Financial Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO	Review of Financial Reports; Stakeholder Interviews
E. Effectiveness of management arrangements			
23) Assess the backstopping, guidance and support on technical, programmatic, administrative and financial services from relevant ILO units (HQ, CO Addis, DWT and ROAF).	Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, DWT, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, Social Partners, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
24) Assess the project management and governance structure role on facilitating results and efficient delivery?	Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, DWT, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, Social Partners, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
25) Did the project establish and maintain relationship and cooperation with relevant stakeholders (e.g. AUC, JLMP partners, REC Secretariats, and development partners) to achieve the project results more effectively?	Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension, Communication materials	Project Team, DWT, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, JLMP	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
26) Did the project establish and maintain cooperation with ICMPD?	Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	ICMPD, Project Team, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
F. Impact orientation & sustainability			

27) To what extent there is evidence of positive changes due to project contribution in areas such as policy development and administration of social protection for migrant workers and portability of social security benefits in any of the project RECs?	Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, Social Partners, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
28) To what extent were sustainability considerations taken into account in the project interventions? Has the project developed and integrated an exit strategy in its work?	PRODOC, Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, Social Partners, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
29) How has the sustainability approach of the project been affected/could be affected by the COVID-19 situation in context of the national regional responses?	Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, Social Partners, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
30) Have the RECs and other stakeholders build ownership of the project outcomes?	Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, Social Partners, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
31) How can the project stakeholders - including ILO- strengthen project achievements after the end of the project?	Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension	Project Team, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, Social Partners, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
G. Visibility			
32) How visible has the project been in the social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families in Africa in terms of acknowledging its contribution?	Annual Progress Reports, Requests for no-cost extension, Communication materials	Project Team, RECs, AUC, ICMPD, Social Partners, ROAF, MIGRANT, SOCPRO, Experts	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews

Annex 5 Work Plan

Phase	Tasks	Responsible Person	Days cons.	Tentative dates (to be updated)
I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process of selection and contract of the evaluator 	Evaluation manager	0	27 April – Mid-June
II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Telephone briefing with evaluation manager Desk review of project related documents and interviews with the project and the donor Evaluation instrument designed based on desk review Inception report 	Evaluator	5	28 June – 6 July
III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultations with ILO staff, REC officials and other stakeholders Presentation of preliminary findings to the stakeholders and debriefing with the project team 	Evaluator with logistical support by the Project team	10	7 - 19 July
IV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft evaluation report based on desk review and virtual consultations submitted for approval and circulation 	Evaluator	5	20 - 26 July
V	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Circulation of the draft evaluation report to key stakeholders Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to the evaluator 	Evaluation manager	0	27 July- 7 August
VI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate comments and inputs including explanations if comments were not integrated 	Evaluator	2	12-13 August
VII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of report by EVAL and dissemination to donor, stakeholders and upload at e-discovery 	Regional Senior Evaluation Officer, EVAL and the Project Manager/Chief Regional Programming	0	14-21 August
	Total number of consultant's working days		22	

Annex 6 Gender Equality Strategy

Response from ILO on the third Recommendation of the Grant Evaluation Commission in its Award letter dated 21 September 2017: “The issue of gender should take into account more specifically throughout the Action.”

The issue of gender is cross-cutting throughout the implementation of this project. As women make up more than half the migrant workers in Africa, it is important to develop social protection and portability of benefits mechanisms that are gender sensitive. Hence the proposed intervention will pay particular attention to the specific vulnerabilities faced by women migrant workers and will raise awareness and build capacities among staff of the targeted RECs on their particular needs and how to address them. In particular:

- The project aims to support the development and/or implementation of multilateral social security agreements and policy frameworks covering all social security branches including maternity. This will allow migrants to be able to benefit from the payment of benefits abroad and the maintenance of acquired rights with respect to amongst others maternity benefits, family benefits and health protection when available and relevant.
- The project will engage in activities or support technical assessments, analytical reports, review of laws and policies, data generation, data collection and analysis to inform project interventions and policy making of project beneficiaries. In these, the project will promote or ensure that gender considerations, including the use of sex-disaggregated statistics.
- Promote the participation of women in engagements with project beneficiaries and stakeholders to ensure that they contribute to policy decisions emanating from the project interventions.
- To the extent possible, the project will pay specific attention to the informal Economy – migrants predominately work in the informal economy, majority of them are women.
- Incorporate gender perspectives and dimensions in training, capacity building and awareness raising /advocacy activities throughout the project.
- The Action will principally engage in activities supporting processes to inform the conclusion of bilateral and/or multilateral labour agreements or frameworks including instruments for enhancing accesses and portability of social security benefits. In this regard, the project interventions will, among others:
 - Promote gender impact assessments as an integral procedural component in information sharing and negotiations.
 - Acknowledge female-specific vulnerabilities and seek to ensure gender sensitive protection measures, for example incorporate measures concerning violence against women in the workplace and complaint mechanisms for harassment or discrimination.
 - Include gender-specific, non-discrimination and rights-based clauses in language and content of agreements to enhance policy coherence and compliance with international standards.
 - Include the participation of women and gender advisers with expertise in social protection, labour migration and labour laws.
 - Promote the establishment of provisions or introduction of minimum standards to protect migrants in the informal sector or sectors such as agriculture and domestic services – sectors often dominated by female migrants and not adequately covered by national labour laws.

Annex 7 Lessons Learned (LL) and Good Practices (GP)

LL1: In every new project organize the first Project Steering Committee meeting within the first half year of the effective start of the project.

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Extending access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families in selected RECs in Africa

Project TC/SYMBOL: RAF/17/16/ICM

Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop

Date: 13 August 2020

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<i>In every new project organize the first Project Steering Committee meeting within the first half year of the effective start of the project.. If this would have been done in the present project, it would not only have been possible to identify much earlier the need for human resources support for the EAC, but would also have allowed for the conducting of two more PSC meetings, i.e. in the second and in the third year (face-to-face or virtual). This is the more important in view of the crucial role the PSC is expected to play in communication and in ownership and would have enhanced the opportunities for RECs and regional employers' and workers' organisations of 'learning from each other' which was considered as an important element in the project..</i>
Context and any related preconditions	<i>The project has a Project Steering Committee (PSC), established to oversee and validate the overall direction of the project and to ensure that activities are in line with the AU strategy on migration and with the RECs' frameworks and common approaches. The PSC is chaired by the AUC, and is comprised of representatives from RECs (ECOWAS, EAC, and SADC), regional workers and employers' organizations, ICMPD, EU delegation and other stakeholders. The ILO serves as the secretariat of the PSC.</i>
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	<i>AUC, RECs (ECOWAS, EAC, and SADC), regional workers and employers' organizations, ICMPD, EU delegation and ILO. .</i>
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	<i>See above. .</i>
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	<i>The project's Project Steering Committee (PSC) discussed in Chapter 1 held ultimately only one meeting, i.e. in February 2019. A second PSC meeting was planned for March/April 2020 but had to be cancelled because of the COVID-19 crisis. .</i>
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	<i>ILO as the Secretariat of the PSC should take the lead in this.</i>

LL2: The inclusion of the informal economy in projects on social protection/portability of benefits can only be very exploratory.

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Extending access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families in selected RECs in Africa

Project TC/SYMBOL: RAF/17/16/ICM

Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop

Date: 13 August 2020

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<i>The inclusion of the informal economy in projects on social protection/portability of benefits can only be very exploratory.</i>
Context and any related preconditions	<i>The project's aim of extending access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families was not limited to formal sector workers, but especially the EU Employment/Social Protection Section was in favour of including those in the informal economy as well. This can be considered as an additional component of the project; while guaranteeing social protection for formal, registered workers is already a giant task it becomes even more complicated when unregistered workers are included.</i>
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	<i>Project team, ILO-ROAF, relevant ILO-DWT and Country Offices, EC.</i>
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	<i>While the activity planned in the project document was "1.5) Assess feasibility to extend to the informal economy and pilot test concrete policy proposals.", it turned out to be quite difficult to undertake especially due to a lack of data.</i>
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	<i>Activities on the informal economy were in the end only undertaken in the ECOWAS region. While the ECOWAS Convention is only for formal sector workers, the partner states agreed to undertake two studies on the legal backgrounds of informal migrant workers, one each in Ghana and Cabo Verde. The first drafts are ready now which in itself is a good accomplishment, and Ghana is mentioned as a Good Practice with voluntary schemes for all informal economy workers including migrant workers. However, the studies remained rather theoretical, and offered not many new insights, especially because no data are available. For the coming months, the project will try to include an analysis of the impact of COVID-19 on the informal economy.</i>
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	<i>ILO Recommendation 204 - Transition from the Informal to the Formal Economy.</i>

LL3: Requests from one of the main project partners for human resources support should be accommodated as early as possible.

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Extending access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families in selected RECs in Africa

Project TC/SYMBOL: RAF/17/16/ICM

Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop

Date: 13 August 2020

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<i>Requests from one of the main project partners for human resources support should be accommodated as early as possible, if not the project might run into serious delays.</i>
Context and any related preconditions	<i>In this project it took a long time to accommodate the request from EAC for direct human resources support. While the draft ToR for a National Project Officer to be located in the EAC Secretariat in Arusha was ready in late 2018, the NPO started almost one year later in October 2019. Delays occurred in getting the approval from the donor for an additional budget (including a new budget line) for human resources support for the EAC Secretariat, and in the recruitment procedure. In the meantime, EAC was suffering from severe understaffing and as a result progress was much slower in the first half of the project than in the other RECs.</i>
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	<i>Project team, ILO-ROAF, relevant ILO-DWT and Country Offices, EC.</i>
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	<i>The challenge is to accommodate such fundamental issues as human resources shortages on the side of one of the main partners/beneficiaries as early as possible during the project, or preferably at the design phase.</i>
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	<i>The positive effect is that in the end the human resources support could be delivered and as a result several activities were undertaken.</i>
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	<i>N.a.</i>

GP1: Supporting selected REC's in order to extend access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families is a good practice.

ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

Project Title: Extending access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families in selected RECs in Africa

Project TC/SYMBOL: RAF/17/16/ICM

Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop

Date: 13 August 2020

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

GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	<i>Supporting selected REC's in order to extend access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families is a good practice. This approach focuses on enhancing the coordination of national social security laws and/or systems in the partner states of the RECs, and on learning from each other (at the level of the RECs).</i>
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	<i>A limitation is that focusing on four different main partners (3 RECs and the AUC) almost amounts to four different projects. This is compounded by the different levels of progress (starting points, if you like) of the three RECs in the implementation of their respective and varying regional frameworks on the extension of social protection to migrant workers. It is further compounded by the varying capacities of RECs, of regional social partners and of other key stakeholders participating in the project.</i>
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	<i>The harmonization of the national laws of the partner states would be an enormous task, but important is that, in itself, it is not a pre-requisite for access to social security and portability for migrant workers. Therefore, the tried and tested approach in different countries around the world is to pursue coordination: Coordination establishes mechanisms through which social security systems can work together to achieve mutually agreed objectives while maintaining and respecting the separate rules, laws and definitions of each system and/or country. This is in itself also a challenge, but one that is more manageable than harmonisation of laws/systems, and this is precisely what makes the work through the RECs all the more important.</i>
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	<i>See above.</i>
Potential for replication and by whom	<i>This Good Practice can be replicated in similar types of interventions focusing on social protection/portability in RECs.</i>
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Program Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Program Framework)	<i>Programme and Budget (P&B) outcomes 2018-2019 and 2020-2021 and ILO's Centenary Initiatives.</i>
Other documents or relevant comments	<i>N.a.</i>

GP2: To embed the project in a broader programme, enhancing coordination and synergies.

ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

Project Title: Extending access to social protection and portability of benefits to migrant workers and their families in selected RECs in Africa

Project TC/SYMBOL: RAF/17/16/ICM

Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop

Date: 13 August 2020

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

GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	<i>It is a Good Practice to embed the project in a broader programme enhancing coordination and synergies. The project is implemented by the ILO as one of the pillars of the AUC/ILO/IOM/ECA Joint Labour Migration Programme (JLMP). African Heads of State adopted the JLMP in 2015, as a comprehensive programme on labour migration governance, designed to leverage migration for development and regional integration.</i>
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	<i>In terms of the AU continental framework the project importantly supports the realization of the AU-ILO-IOM-UNECA Joint Labour Migration Programme (JLMP), which consists of several projects:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The present project on social protection/portability funded by the EU;</i> • <i>A larger project funded by Sida and implemented by IOM, ILO and AUC; and</i> • <i>Other actions, including one funded by Germany and implemented by GIZ.</i> <i>JLMP has eight Activity Areas, one of which is Activity Area 2.2 - Extension of Social Security coverage to migrants. Only the EU-funded project works towards this Activity Area 2.2 on social security, which was also a deliberate strategy within JLMP in part to avoid duplications of interventions. It is important to note that the other projects within JLMP deal with migration per se and not with social protection. The social protection component is also not a priority for several organisations involved in JLMP, including IOM. The present project is thus solely responsible for the 'social protection component of the JLMP'.</i>
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	<i>Being part of the broader JLMP programme created synergies for the present project through networks and through the JLMP Coordinator in AUC who was also the main contact person for the present project.</i>
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	<i>See above.</i>
Potential for replication and by whom	<i>This Good Practice can be replicated in similar types of interventions focusing on social protection/portability in RECs.</i>
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Program Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Program Framework)	<i>Programme and Budget (P&B) outcomes 2018-2019 and 2020-2021 and ILO's Centenary Initiatives.</i>
Other documents or relevant comments	<i>N.a.</i>

Annex 8 List of Documents Consulted

- Terms of Reference (ToR) for the present Final Independent Evaluation dated 8 July 2020 (see Annex 1).
- Project Document (PRODOC) 2017, including Logframe, budget, work plan, etc.
- Grant Contract of October 2017.
- Grant Evaluation Commission: Award letter dated 21 September 2017, and Responses by ILO (July 2018)
- 1st Annual Progress Report: 1 October 2017 to 30 September 2018.
- 2nd Annual Progress Report: 1 October 2018 to 30 September 2019.
- PSC Minutes dated 1 February 2019.
- Request for no-cost extension (July 2020).
- Relevant ILO's DWCP's and P&B's, and Centenary Initiatives.
- ILO EVAL: Evaluation Policy Guidelines, including ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations 3rd edition 2017.
- Research and studies conducted by the Project
- Missions reports
- Financial information
- Websites, including those of the project, of ICMPD and of ILO.
- The project website: https://www.ilo.org/africa/technical-cooperation/WCMS_646607/lang--en/index.htm and the project workspace: <https://www.social-protection.org/gimi/ShowProject.action?id=3083>
- Project leaflets: <http://www.social-protection.org/gimi/gess/ShowProjectWiki.action?id=3300&pid=2657>
- Project presentations:
 - <https://www.icmpd.org/news-centre/news-detail/project-news-icmpd-expert-panel-at-the-2019-european-development-days/>
 - <https://www.khartoumprocess.net/news-and-events/news/85-thematic-meeting-on-legal-frameworks-and-policy-development-optimising-the-benefits-of-organised-labour-migration-24-25-september-cairo-egypt>
- EVAL (2020): Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO: An internal guide on adapting to the situation. Geneva:
 - http://www.ilo.ch/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_741206.pdf and
 - www.ilo.ch/eval/WCMS_744068/lang--en/index.htm
- OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation (2019): Better Criteria for Better Evaluation; Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use. December 2019.
- JLMP (undated): Programme brief: Labour Migration Governance for Development and Integration in Africa; A bold new Initiative. AU, ILO, IOM and UNECA.
- ILO PARDEV Minute Sheets.
- Relevant UNDAF (if any).
- Other documents/materials/publications that were produced through the project or by relevant stakeholders.