



SIDA-ILO PARTNERSHIP 2014-17
PHASE I (2014-15): ACI 2
(JOBS AND SKILLS FOR YOUTH)



International
Labour
Office

FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION

INCEPTION REPORT

▸ Rafael Muñoz Sevilla



CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. BACKGROUND ON PROJECT AND CONTEXT	1
3. INDEPENDENT FINAL EVALUATION	4
4. RESULTS FRAMEWORK	6
5. EVALUATION CRITERIA	8
6. METHODOLOGY	9
7. EVALUATION PHASES	12
8. WORKPLAN	15

1

List of Annexes:

1. Methodology Matrix
2. Documents reviewed
3. Geneva Mission Agenda
4. Uruguay Mission Agenda (draft)
5. Morocco Mission Agenda (draft)
6. Remote interviews schedule

1. INTRODUCTION

The Final Independent Evaluation is conducted by the independent evaluator, under the overall supervision of the Evaluation Manager and in close coordination with the Employment Policy Department (EMPLOYMENT) and the project management units at ILO Headquarters. The Inception Report is based on all prior discussions with ILO, the ToR, the Document Review, the evaluator's visit to ILO HQ in Geneva and an interview with a donor representative through a conference call from home.

2. BACKGROUND ON PROJECT AND CONTEXT

The Evaluator has a full understanding of the background to the project and its context.

2.1. Introduction

After the 2005 Resolution on youth employment, in 2012 the International Labour Conference adopted a new resolution ***The youth employment crisis: A call for action***. This call for action underlines the urgency of immediate and targeted action to tackle the unprecedented youth employment crisis. The call for action contains guiding principles and a comprehensive set of policy measures that can guide constituents in shaping national strategies and action on youth employment. In November 2012, the ILO's Governing Body endorsed the Office's seven-year Follow-up Plan that aims to support ILO constituents in the implementation of the resolution.

1

Subsequently, in March 2014, the Governing Body endorsed the ILO Strategy of the ***Area of Critical Importance 2 (ACI 2) on "jobs and skills for youth"*** which presents the main elements of the strategy for the biennium 2014-15 and focuses on identifying interventions that "work for youth employment" and the circumstances in which this is the case by building the capacity or "know-how" of constituents to be able to implement effective strategies in their specific context.

2.2. The Sida-ILO Partnership Programme 2014-17

Sweden has given consistent support to a number of areas within the ILO over the last years, in line with Swedish aid priorities such as employment promotion, core labour rights, gender mainstreaming, working conditions, social partners, and international labour standards.

The Sida-ILO Partnership Programme 2014-17 is fully based on the principles of aid effectiveness. In Phase I of the Partnership (2014-15), Sida provided a contribution of US\$ 15.9 million through a combination of innovative funding modalities. The Programme includes un-earmarked core contributions, lightly earmarked thematic funding at the level of Outcomes from the ILO Programme and Budget and specific project-based interventions. The actual programming of funds is derived from the ILO's results based management systems (RBM) and the priorities flowing from Decent Work Country Programmes.

2.3. The Sida supported programme on “jobs and skills for youth”

The largest allocation of funds under the Partnership (US\$ 3,861,646) for Phase I (2014-15), was allocated in support of the implementation of the ILO Call for Action on the Youth Employment Crisis. Within this strategic agenda, funds were allocated to the ILO Area of Critical Importance (ACI) 2, Jobs and skills for youth - one among eight areas that were defined for priority action in the Programme and Budget 2014-15 and ten country programme outcomes (CPOs) falling under Outcomes 1 and 2 of the Programme and Budget 2014-15.

The ***Jobs and Skills for Youth Programme*** has 11 components, one global and 10 country-level initiatives. **The global component** serves as umbrella and connects the ten country-level interventions and aims at strengthening national capacities in developing and implementing action-oriented interventions on youth employment, disseminating knowledge on what works on youth employment and strengthening knowledge on effective approaches to improve labour market outcomes of under-employed and low earners, including young people engaged in the informal economy and working poor.

The **ten country-level initiatives** consist of:

- i. an institutional development component that aims to assess policies and programmes, strengthen institutional capacity, reform existing policies or develop new ones, and develop strategies and/or plans of action for the implementation of policies and programmes; and
- ii. a direct support component for piloting youth employment interventions with a view to assessing results and expanding their scope and outreach.

2

These initiatives are implemented through broad-based partnerships that involve several government institutions, the social partners and other actors. In a number of countries, they are also implemented through joint support of the UN System through the UN System-wide Action Plan on Youth (Youth-SWAP). The lessons learnt from the implementation of the 10 country-level interventions are meant to inform the range of ILO’s technical assistance on youth employment.

The countries of intervention are:

- **Africa:** Burkina Faso, Morocco, Sudan, Zambia, Zimbabwe
- **Arab States:** Jordan
- **Asia and the Pacific:** Samoa, Sri Lanka
- **Latin America and the Caribbean:** Ecuador, Uruguay

2.4. Project management set-up

The evaluator took into account the project management and organisational structure of the programme in determining the need for stakeholder consultations and the design of the methodology and logistical planning. It is understood that the project's activities were designed to be implemented at the national and global levels.

The global component is jointly managed by the Country Policy Development and Coordination Unit (CEPOL) and by the Youth Employment Programme (YEP), which are both located within the ILO Employment Policy Department; providing technical backstopping and support to country projects under the programme; ensuring overall consistency of the different components of the programme, and producing the specific products under the Global product.

The management of all the ten country components is decentralized. Technical backstopping is mainly provided by CEPOL and YEP (i.e. six out of ten country projects), except for country projects (Ecuador, Jordan, Sudan and Uruguay) that are technically backstopped by the ILO Decent Work Teams (DWT) in the region. At country level, the initiatives are managed by national coordinators and CTAs, with technical support of various specialists (employment/youth employment/skills) based in Geneva and in the field.

The responsibility for the delivery of the project was designated to the Heads of CEPOL and YEP with the support of the Youth Employment Specialist. In the temporary absence of a Head of YEP, the Youth Employment Specialist is since 2015 acting as responsible of the project on behalf of YEP.

3. INDEPENDENT FINAL EVALUATION

A final independent evaluation will be conducted to examine the relevance and strategic fit; the validity of design; the Coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the programme. The evaluation report will include findings on whether the project has achieved its objectives and will also identify strengths and weaknesses in the project design, strategy, and implementation as well as lessons learned and good practices with recommendations for ILO-Sida consideration in future work related to youth employment. *The evaluation will comply with the ILO evaluation policy, which is based on the United Nations Evaluation Norms and Standards; and the UNEG ethical guidelines will be followed.*

3.1. Purpose

The purpose of the final independent evaluation is to assess the overall performance of the Sida- supported programme on “jobs and skills for youth” and its contribution the ACI 2, based on the standard evaluation criteria of relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of project outcomes.

Given the innovative funding modality introduced under the Partnership, the final independent evaluation will also look at the process that was followed in designing, managing and monitoring the different components and their relevance to the ILO’s Call for Action to tackle the youth employment crisis. Particular emphasis will be placed on lessons learnt, success factors and good practices which have a potential for replication in future programmes.

4

The evaluation will:

- a. Assess the overall progress made within the area of ACI 2 related to Sida’s contribution;
- b. Determine whether and to what extent the programme contributed to policy development and integrated actions in selected countries, identifying linkages between the global and the country components;
- c. Assess the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the process followed for the design of country level interventions in light of the programme’s objectives and timeframe;
- d. Assess the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation and management arrangements used under the programme;
- e. Assess to what extent the recommendations of previous reviews/evaluations were taken into consideration and to what extent they contributed to improve effectiveness;
- f. Identify lessons learned, especially regarding models of interventions that can be applied further and provide recommendations for the development and implementation of future programme taking into account the ILO new policy outcome framework and the Swedish priorities.

3.2. Scope

The evaluation will cover the two components under Phase I of the Sida-supported programme on jobs and skills (2014-15) and their link to the previous intervention (2012-13) under outcomes 1 and 2.

The scope of the independent final evaluation includes the Global Product and all project activities from the start of the project in all of the project countries. The evaluation will look at the programme as a whole and will also focus on the interventions within the broader context, globally, nationally and institutionally.

3.3. Countries

Two countries, Morocco and Uruguay were selected for in-depth analysis and meetings with project stakeholders and beneficiaries through country visits. In addition, ILO staff (HQ, ROs and COs) and national stakeholders in three additional countries (Zambia, Jordan and Samoa) will be interviewed remotely using telephone/Skype.

In the instance of project countries that were not selected for country visits or remote interviews with national stakeholders (Sri Lanka, Ecuador, Zimbabwe, Burkina Faso and Sudan) the evaluation will conduct in-depth document review and arrangements will be made to interview and gauge feedback from ILO-HQ staff (i.e. one-to-one interviews in Geneva; and Skype interviews, emails, and the like). Also, in the case of Ecuador, the (RO-Lima) Youth Employment Specialist will be interviewed (skype).

Evaluation's approach to assessing all target countries of the project					
Countries	Doc. Review	Interviews with ILO HQ staff	Remote interviews with ILO CO/RO staff	Remote interviews with National stakeholders	Country visits
Morocco	✓	✓	✓		✓
Uruguay	✓	✓	✓		✓
Zambia	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Jordan	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Samoa	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Ecuador	✓	✓	✓		
Sri Lanka	✓	✓	✓		
Zimbabwe	✓	✓			
Burkina Faso	✓	✓			
Sudan	✓	✓			

The evaluation approach to assessing the target countries was defined in order to obtain an optimal representation of experiences, taking into account the following criteria:

- Coherence between youth employment and employment policy: (i) Development of a national employment policy which prioritize youth (i.e. Morocco) (ii) Development of a national action plan on YE and coherence and inter-linkages with the NEP (i.e. Zambia, Samoa, Sri Lanka)
- Focused/specific interventions: Public Employment Services, apprenticeships/skills or entrepreneurship (i.e. Uruguay, Ecuador, Zimbabwe)
- The funding modalities: some interventions were more "projects per se" oriented (i.e. Samoa, Zambia, Sri Lanka); other interventions followed an outcome-based modality (i.e. Morocco, Jordan).
- Political situation-enabling environment: i.e. Burkina Faso and Sudan

4. RESULTS FRAMEWORK

The SIDA-ILO Partnership Programme 2014-17-Phase I (2014-15): ACI 2 consists of one global product and ten country-level interventions. For both the Global product and each of the ten country-level interventions a project document and a log-frame were formulated. However, given the (P&B) *outcome-based* orientation of the partnership, a comprehensive-programme level log-frame wasn't developed.

6

The overall logic of the ILO's **programme on "jobs and skills for youth"** is illustrated below. This *results framework* was developed by the evaluator to better bring the programme-level logic, objectives, outcomes and outputs into focus and articulate a model against for the evaluation. Also, this framework helps to visualize the linkages between the programme and: the ILO Call for Action on the Youth Employment Crisis; the Programme and Budget (P&B) 2014-15 Outcomes 1 and 2 and the Area of Critical Importance 2 (ACI 2); and the Country Programme Outcomes (CPOs)

Programme-level Results Framework:

<p>Global Objective: ILO member states develop and implement evidence-based policies; time-bound action plans and programmes that meet the youth employment challenge (Call for action/P&B ACI 2)</p>
<p>Specific Objective 1: More women and men have access to productive employment, decent work and income opportunities (P&B outcome 1)</p> <p>Outcome 1.1: Member States, with ILO support, integrate national, sectorial or local employment policies and programmes in their development frameworks (P&B Indicator 1.1.)</p> <p>Output 1.1.1: Support to Burkina Faso in integrating jobs into policies, national and sectorial plans, in particular, the Strategy for Accelerated Growth and Sustainable Development –SCADD- (CPO: BFA 101)</p> <p>Output 1.1.2: Decent Work principles are integrated in Sudan's national development framework through better capacities of stakeholders in the areas of labour market and employment policies (CPO: SDN 109)</p> <p>Specific Objective 2: Skills development increases the employability of workers, the competitiveness of enterprises and the inclusiveness of growth (P&B Outcome 2)</p> <p>Outcome 2.1: Member States, with ILO support, make relevant training more readily accessible in rural communities (P&B Indicator 2.2.)</p> <p>Output 2.2.1: Multi-faceted initiatives for job creation in the enterprise sector in Zimbabwe (CPO: ZWE 101)</p> <p>Outcome 2.2: Member States, with ILO support, strengthen employment services to deliver on employment policy objectives (P&B Indicator 2.4.)</p> <p>Output 2.2.1: The employment service and job placement system is strengthened in Ecuador (CPO: ECU 158)</p> <p>Outcome 2.3: Member States, with ILO support, develop and implement policies and programmes to promote productive employment and decent work for young women and men (P&B Indicator 2.5.)</p> <p>Output 2.3.1: Employability and job opportunities for young people in selected regions in Jordan increased (CPO: JOR104)</p> <p>Output 2.3.2: Employment, and especially youth employment, is placed at the centre of national development policies and programmes in Morocco, including through building the capacities of national tripartite partners (CPO: MAR 101)</p> <p>Output 2.3.3: Improved decent employment opportunities for youth in Samoa through entrepreneurship development and support services and skill training, including School-to-Work Transition surveys and tools (CPO: WSM 126)</p> <p>Output 2.3.4: Government and social partners in Sri Lanka enhance employability and productivity of young women and men through market oriented skills training and measures to facilitate entry into the labour force (CPO: LKA 102)</p> <p>Output 2.3.5: The Ministry of Labour and Social Security and other relevant ministries in Uruguay strengthen their capacity to design and implement public policy aimed at promoting employment and skills development for youth (CPO: URY 155)</p> <p>Output 2.3.6: Enhanced employment and self-employment opportunities for the target groups in Zambia through access to BDS, finance and skills development (CPO: ZMB 127)</p>
<p>Specific Objective 3: Support to the implementation of country-level initiatives (GLO 927)</p> <p>Outcome 3.1: Knowledge development and dissemination (Global Component 1)</p> <p>Output 3.1.1: Research on the young “working poor” conducted to explore employment approaches that are effective in improving conditions of work and livelihood of young under-unemployed, informal young workers and youth in low pay-jobs in developing countries.</p> <p>Output 3.1.2: A knowledge management facility established to disseminate good practices on what works for youth employment.</p> <p>Outcome 3.1: Technical support and capacity building (Global Component 2)</p> <p>Output 2.1: Ten country projects formulated and monitored during implementation</p> <p>Output 2.2: A training package on decent work for youth finalized</p> <p>Output 2.3: A standard capacity-building programme on youth employment for governments, employer’s organizations and trade unions implemented.</p>

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation will address the OECD DAC **evaluation criteria** as defined below:

- **Relevance and strategic fit** – to what extent the intervention is relevant to the strategy outlined by the Call for Action and ACI 2, the national priorities and needs and Sida’s policy priorities?
- **Validity of design** – to what extent did the design of the programme intervention contribute to producing results?
- **Coherence** – to what extent are the various components coherent and complementary in their design and implementation?
- **Effectiveness** – to what extent the programme outputs can be said to have contributed to the Call for Action and ACI 2, and more concretely whether the stated outputs have produced integrated policies and programmes that promote productive employment and decent work for young women and men;
- **Efficiency** – to what extent the outputs achieved are derived from an efficient use of financial, material and human resources;
- **Impact** - positive and negative changes and effects caused by the project at the national level, i.e. the impact with social partners and various implementing partner organisations;
- **Sustainability** – the extent to which adequate capacity building of social partners has taken place to ensure mechanisms are in place to sustain activities and whether the existing results are likely to be maintained beyond project completion.

8

The evaluation will examine the programme on the basis of the **questions** detailed in the Evaluation Matrix (annex 1) and against the standard evaluation criteria mentioned above. Gender equality concerns will be taken into particular consideration.

6. METHODOLOGY

6.1. Evaluation framework

The methodology for the evaluation will take into account: i) the need for identifying country specific issues, needs and constraints; ii) the need to evaluate both country and global levels of achievement, lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations – and taking into account the different stages of progress in the participating countries; iii) the Programme's contribution to the P&B ACI 2 and to progress in achieving the Outcomes 1 and 2; iv) the need to formulate conclusions and recommendations as an input into future strategy and follow-up.

It will be carried out in adherence with the relevant parts of the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy, the UN System Evaluation Norms & Standards, and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard.

6.2. Evaluation Principles

- **Usefulness:** The evaluation aims to be useful, particularly to support decision-making.
- **Impartiality:** Evaluator will avoid bias and protect impartiality at all stages of the evaluation, thereby supporting the credibility of the evaluation process and results. The reports will present the evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations in a complete and balanced way.
- **Independence:** The evaluator has been selected with due regard to their independence and professionalism to avoid potential conflicts of interest.
- **Quality:** The evaluation will employ design, planning and implementation processes that are inherently quality oriented, covering appropriate methodologies for data collection, analysis and interpretation.
- **Competence:** Those engaged in conducting the evaluation have all necessary skills to conduct high-quality and ethical work.
- **Transparency and consultation:** Transparency and consultation with the major stakeholders are essential features in all stages of the evaluation process. This improves the credibility and quality of the evaluation. It can facilitate consensus building and ownership of the findings, conclusions and recommendations

6.3. Methods and Techniques

The selection of methods and techniques has been established in order to assure relevant data collection regarding, the evidence needed to best answer the evaluation questions and the analyses that are most appropriate to generate useful findings and address the evaluation criteria.

Evaluation methods and techniques will collect primary and secondary data. Primary data will consist on information the evaluator gathers directly from stakeholders about their first-hand experience with the intervention. This data will be collected through,

meetings, group discussions, and interviews. It can facilitate deeper understanding of the programme, the programme's results and the observed changes and the factors that contributed to change. Collection of data through interviews will be carried out in a confidential manner and will be guided by the *Competencies and Ethics* defined by the UNEG Norms and Standards¹.

Secondary data is documentary evidence that has direct relevance for the purposes of the evaluation and that has been produced by the ILO, other individuals or agencies for purposes other than those of the evaluation.

Evaluation methods and techniques will include:

1. Comprehensive document review

Including key documents pertaining to ILO's Strategy on youth employment and skills - in particular, the Call for Action and ACI 2 - and ILO RBM systems, as provided by the ILO; documents related to the programme and country level initiatives, including: project documents, progress reports, previous evaluations and reviews; other relevant documents related to projects design and relevance. This could include project appraisal reports, Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP), National Action Plans etc.

2. Semi-structured interviews with programme's technical and managing staff (and related ILO-HQ departments)

To gather information and opinions about the role played by the different actors involved in the design, implementation and management of the program.

3. Semi-structured interviews with project's stakeholders in Morocco and Uruguay (and related ILO HQ/RO staff)

These interviews will mainly serve to collect qualitative data on the development of the project's cycle in its different phases, their effects and their relevance, and also, to investigate the rest of the criteria considered in the evaluation.

4. Groups interviews with project's stakeholders in Morocco and Uruguay.

In some cases arranging individual meetings with key stakeholders (worker's and Employer's representatives) might present difficulties. In these cases, group interviews with their representatives (group interviews with Workers' Organizations representatives and group interviews with Employer's Organizations representatives) instead of individual interviews will be carried out in order to ensure the collection of qualitative information necessary for the evaluation.

¹ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/22>

Group interviews with key stakeholders will be useful to obtain qualitative information about their opinions of the project and its effects, according to their subjective perceptions.

5. Phone and Skype interviews, emails with project's stakeholders in Zambia, Jordan, Samoa (and related ILO RO staff)

In the instance of these project countries, arrangements will be made to interview and gauge feedback from ILO staff and national stakeholders (i.e. phone and Skype interviews, emails). These interviews will help to gather qualitative data on the project's implementation and results and also to assess the rest of the evaluation criteria and questions.

6. Focused interviews

When necessary, the evaluator will carry out additional focused interviews, to deepen those aspects that may require further investigation (these interviews will most likely be conducted electronically –skype, e-mail-after the field visit phase).

The intersection of qualitative data – from interviews- and quantitative data - basically obtained through documentary analysis- will allow an external validation of the different subjective perceptions.

7. EVALUATION PHASES (Steps)

8.1. Preparatory Phase (activities to date)

A preparatory phase was conducted prior the elaboration of the present inception report and before the field work and the remote interviews with the project's stakeholders. This phase included the following activities:

a) Preliminary desk review of project information. The evaluator reviewed some key documents to better understand the programme and adjust the evaluation methodology, methods and techniques; and to elaborate the work plan (Annex 2).

b) Preliminary interviews. The evaluator conducted skype interviews and exchanged emails with ILO HQ officials and staff and with a donor representative.

The interviews and email exchanges involved aspects of the evaluation including the project's implementation, evaluation questions, timelines, methodology, reporting requirements, and in-country visits related arrangements.

c.) Preparation of in-country visits and remote interviews. Intense exchanges were held between the evaluator and different ILO officials (HQ, ROs and COs) to coordinate the country visits and the remote interviews.

d.) Geneva Discussion and Interviews

The evaluator travelled to ILO HQ in Geneva on February 9 and 10 to have preliminary meetings with the Evaluation Manager; project management staff; EMPLOYMENT Department staff and other ILO officials involved (please refer to annex 3). The discussions and interviews involved aspects of the evaluation including the evaluation scope, the programme's implementation, results, evaluation questions, timelines, methodology, and reporting requirements.

e) Preparation of the Inception report

Containing the methodological approach to the evaluation, including the main aspects of operational planning of the evaluation.

7.3. Desk Review of project information

The evaluator will reviewed all the documents and relevant materials from secondary sources needed for the successful implementation of the evaluation.

7.4. Field Phase

The Field Phase will consist of two components:

1. *In-country work*: in Morocco and Uruguay will be undertaken by the evaluator according to the methodology prepared in the first phase. The review methodology will include interviews with key stakeholders at the country level, remote interviews with backstopping ILO officials at the ROs, and any other data collection processes as appropriate.
2. In addition, ILO staff (CO and ROs) and national stakeholders in **Zambia, Jordan and Samoa** will be interviewed remotely using telephone, Skype and other electronic means.

7.5. Reporting Phase

a. Draft report

The evaluator will analyse and process the information and data collected in prior Phases to produce a **Draft Report**.

The Draft Report will provide an objective assessment of the evaluation criteria and clear answers to the evaluation questions. The report will identify strengths, weaknesses and challenges framed within the programme context, and enabling environment. Examples of best practice will be highlighted. The lessons learned/recommendations will propose the measures needed for rectifying identified weaknesses and gaps. The draft report will be submitted to the Evaluation Manager for comment and factual correction.

13

b. Final evaluation report with executive summary

The evaluator will produce a final independent evaluation report, taking into account feedback from the Evaluation Manager. The final evaluation report will follow the format below and will be accompanied by an executive summary and the lessons learned and emerging good practices templates.

1. Title page
2. Table of contents
3. Acknowledgments
4. List of Acronyms
5. Executive summary
6. **Background and Project description**
 - Background
 - Project Description
7. **Purpose and Methodology of the evaluation**
 - Purpose of the Evaluation
 - Evaluation Methodology

8. Findings

- Relevance and strategic fit
- Validity of design
- Coherence
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Impact
- Sustainability

9. Conclusions

10. Lessons learned and Emerging Good Practices

- Lessons learned
- Emerging Good Practices

11. Recommendations (Recommendations will: specify who is called upon to act; Distinguish priority or importance; Specify the recommended time frame for follow-up; Acknowledge whether there are resource implications)

List of Annexes:

1. Executive summary template
2. Lessons learned template
3. Emerging good practice template
4. Terms of reference
5. Inception report (with data collection instruments)
6. List of persons interviewed;
7. Bibliography.

14

The report will be written in English and reviewed by an English language native, for correctness and quality assurance.

c. Presentation of final report

A presentation will be prepared for the ILO and Sida on the final report, to be used during a debriefing in Geneva.

8. WORK PLAN

What	Where	Product	When
Review of documents	Home	--	Feb 1-12
Mission to Geneva	Geneva	--	Feb 9 & 10
Remote interview with donor's representative	Home	--	Feb 5
Preparation of inception report	Home	Inception report	Feb 15
Remote interviews with key stakeholders in selected countries	Home	--	Week of Feb 15
Field visit to Uruguay	Uruguay	--	Week of Feb 22
Pending remote interviews with key stakeholders in selected countries	Home	--	March 1-4
Field visit to Morocco	Morocco	--	Week of March 7
Draft report	Home	Draft report to the evaluation manager	March 30
Comments to Draft Report	--	--	April 15
Revision and finalisation	Home	Final report to ILO taking into account all comments received	April 30
Presentation of the evaluation report	Geneva	PPT Presentation	May 15

ANNEX 1 EVALUATION MATRIX

Evaluation Aspects	Key indicators	Evaluation questions	Data collection techniques and stakeholders involved per country
<p>1. Relevance and strategic fit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Validity of the programme approach and strategies to support the Call for Action on youth Employment and ACI2. ▪ Appropriateness of the sectors/target groups and locations chosen to develop the programme ▪ Programme’s support and contribution to NEP/YEP formulation/ implementation ▪ Programme’s support and contribution P&B Outcomes and indicators ▪ Quality of problems and needs analysis ▪ Extent to which the strategy fits in with the national priorities: constituents and beneficiaries ▪ Institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders. ▪ Linkages between the GC and the Country level interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent are the programme and its project interventions relevant to the implementation of the Call for Action on youth Employment and ACI2? To what extent were ILO’s overall strategies linked with needs on the ground? ▪ To what extent has the programme linked work on national employment policies with the promotion of youth employment indicators? How did the programme and project interventions align with and support national development plans and priorities of the ILO constituents? ▪ Were the criteria for the selection of countries relevant and demand based? Have the stakeholders taken ownership of the project since the design phase? ▪ To what extent did the global component support and connect the country level interventions and vice versa? 	<p>Morocco:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document Review ▪ One-to-one interviews with: ILO officials (HQ, CO); Ministry of Labour and any other relevant ministries and services; Workers and Employers’ Organizations ▪ Group Interviews: Workers’ Organizations ▪ Focused interviews: ILO officials (HQ, CO) ▪ Remote interviews with: ILO officials (RO)

Evaluation Aspects	Key indicators	Evaluation questions	Data collection techniques and stakeholders involved per country
<p>2. Validity of design</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Level of ownership regarding youth employment among constituents ▪ Improvement of national capacities to formulate/implement and measure progress in NEP/YEP ▪ Improvement of technical and institutional capacities to implement NEP/YEP ▪ Development of NEP/YEP ▪ Number of recommendations followed ▪ Relevance, quality and effectiveness of the actions undertaken. ▪ Activities implemented, outputs delivered and outcomes reached during the programme's implementing period. ▪ Clarity of conceptualisation ▪ Appropriateness of methodology ▪ Quality of description and alignment of Activities, Outcomes/Outputs, indicators, Objectives in the Action Plan and the Logframe 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent did the design of the programme contribute to mainstreaming youth employment in national employment policies? ▪ To what extent did the project build up on the recommendations of the final evaluation for the 2012-13 phase? ▪ To what extent was the programme duration (2014-15) appropriate? To what extent did the process followed for the design of interventions take into consideration the overall programme duration? ▪ To what extent did the design of the programme contribute to effective results based management and reporting? 	<p>Uruguay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document Review ▪ One-to-one interviews with: ILO officials (HQ, CO); Ministry of Labour and any other relevant ministries and services; Workers and Employers' Organizations ▪ Group Interviews: Workers' Organizations ▪ Focused interviews: ILO officials (HQ, CO) ▪ Remote interviews with: ILO officials (RO) <p>Zambia</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document Review ▪ One-to-one interviews with: ILO officials (HQ) ▪ Remote interviews with: ILO officials (CO, RO); Ministry of Labour and any other relevant ministries and services; Workers and Employers' Organizations ▪ Focused interviews: ILO officials (HQ, RO, CO)
<p>3. Effectiveness</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality and quantity of outputs delivered and outcomes reached. ▪ Effectiveness of the GC and the country level interventions in contributing to the programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has the programme achieved its overall objective? ▪ How effective was the connection between National Employment Strategy development 	

Evaluation Aspects	Key indicators	Evaluation questions	Data collection techniques and stakeholders involved per country
	<p>meeting its outcomes and specific objectives (P&B outcomes and indicators).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project’s contribution to strengthen project partners capacities ▪ Project’s contribution and support to the enabling environment at national levels ▪ Development of NEP/YEP ▪ Programme/Projects adjustments to changes (context, priorities...) ▪ Performance of the monitoring system put in place. ▪ Number and quality of good practices collected and disseminated. ▪ Number/type of interventions “shaped” by the good practices disseminated. ▪ Number and quality of good practices collected and disseminated by country. 	<p>and youth employment (indicators 1.1 and 2.5)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In which area did the project have the greatest achievements and the least achievements? ▪ To what extent have the country level interventions contributed to policy development with youth employment as a priority? ▪ What national capacities have been targeted by the project, and what does evidence suggest has changed? ▪ Has the project adapted its approach to specific country contexts? Has it been responsive to political, legal, and institutional challenges where it operates? ▪ Have the performance-monitoring system and the collection, analysis and dissemination of good practices on “what works for youth employment” helped in shaping evidence-based interventions in line with the implementation strategy for ACI2? ▪ Are there lessons to be learned from countries that have been more successful in using technical and policy advice and data? Can these lessons be replicated in other countries within the scope of the project? 	<p>Jordan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document Review ▪ One-to-one interviews with: ILO officials (HQ) ▪ Remote interviews with: ILO officials (CO, RO); Ministry of Labour and any other relevant ministries and services; Workers and Employers’ Organizations ▪ Focused interviews: ILO officials (HQ, RO, CO) <p>Samoa:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document Review ▪ One-to-one interviews with: ILO officials (HQ) ▪ Remote interviews with: ILO officials (CO, RO); Ministry of Labour and any other relevant ministries and services; Workers and Employers’ Organizations ▪ Focused interviews: ILO officials (HQ, RO, CO)

Evaluation Aspects	Key indicators	Evaluation questions	Data collection techniques and stakeholders involved per country
<p>4. Efficiency of resource use</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Degree of integration between the GC and CLI. Contribution to the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the different interventions ▪ Degree of coherence, synergies and avoidance of overlap ▪ Degree of efficiency in the organisation, management, implementation of the programme. ▪ How effectively has the project leveraged relevant resources ▪ How well has the project coordinated and collaborated with other youth employment focused interventions supported by other organizations? ▪ Quality and quantity of outputs delivered and outcomes reached (by country) within the programme's time frame 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has the establishment of a global component and of ten country interventions contributed to creating synergies among interventions and an efficient use of resources? ▪ Are the existing financial structures efficient and flexible enough to adapt to unexpected circumstances that may arise and lead to the necessity to transfer funds from a given country? ▪ Has the process established for the design and monitoring of the country interventions been appropriate to enhance efficiency? ▪ Has the distribution of resources across outputs been functional to achieving planned results? ▪ Has the project's budget structure facilitated an efficient use, allocation and re-allocation of resources? ▪ Is the system to launch, decentralise and implement the initiatives adequate and effective given the timeframe (biennium)? 	<p>Sri Lanka:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document Review ▪ One-to-one interviews with: ILO officials (HQ) ▪ Focused interviews: ILO officials (HQ, RO, CO) <p>Ecuador:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document Review ▪ One-to-one interviews with: ILO officials (HQ) ▪ Remote interviews with: ILO officials (RO) ▪ Focused interviews: ILO officials (HQ, RO, CO) <p>Zimbabwe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document Review ▪ One-to-one interviews with: ILO officials (HQ) ▪ Focused interviews: ILO officials (HQ, RO, CO)
<p>5. Effectiveness of management arrangements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effectiveness/Efficiency of the programme's organisation, management, implementation. ▪ Institutional arrangements, roles, and capacities at ILO HQ, RO and CO. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Was the management structure clearly established? Has the programme management structure facilitated action and decision making in a responsive and timely manner? Has it produced synergies among the different 	

Evaluation Aspects	Key indicators	Evaluation questions	Data collection techniques and stakeholders involved per country
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality and quantity of outputs delivered and outcomes reached. ▪ Effectiveness of the GC support to country level interventions ▪ Inclusion of transferring models of intervention, promising practices, and lessons learned ▪ Clear and effective organisation and complementarities, within the ILO, the national partners and others ▪ Extent to which the strategy fits in with the national priorities: constituents and beneficiaries ▪ Institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders. ▪ National Ownership and enabling environment ▪ Performance of the monitoring system put in place. 	<p>programme components? What can be done to further improve the effectiveness of the management arrangements?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent has the flexibility of funding allowed the ILO to be more agile? ▪ Did the project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners? Did it receive adequate support from the ILO offices in the field and the responsible HQ units in Headquarters? ▪ How effective was the communication between the project team(s), the donor and other stakeholders? ▪ Has the project made strategic use of coordination and collaboration with other ILO projects and with other partners to increase its effectiveness and impact? ▪ How effectively did the project monitor project performance and results? 	<p>Burkina Faso:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document Review ▪ One-to-one interviews with: ILO officials (HQ) ▪ Focused interviews: ILO officials (HQ, RO, CO) <p>Sudan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document Review ▪ One-to-one interviews with: ILO officials (HQ) ▪ Focused interviews: ILO officials (HQ, RO, CO)
<p>6. Impact and sustainability of results</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Validity of the programme approach and strategies to support the Call for Action on youth Employment and ACI2 ▪ Level of ownership regarding youth employment among constituents ▪ Improvement of national capacities to formulate/implement and measure progress in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What contribution did the programme and project interventions make towards the implementation of the ACI 2 strategy and the follow-up plan of the Call for Action? ▪ Did the project contribute to capacity building of ILO constituents? 	

Evaluation Aspects	Key indicators	Evaluation questions	Data collection techniques and stakeholders involved per country
	<p>NEP/YEP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improvement of technical and institutional capacities to implement NEP/YEP ▪ Development of NEP/YEP ▪ Improvement of local and national capacities to implement and measure progress towards youth employment. ▪ Participatory approach and inclusion of national/local stakeholders in project planning, monitoring and implementation ▪ Extent to which a phase out strategy has been defined and planned and what steps have been taken to ensure sustainability (e.g. tripartite involvement). ▪ Improvements to capacity in all respects (organisational, staff skills etc) of national/local partners (i.e. tripartite constituents) ▪ Financial commitments at country level ▪ Inclusion of YE in national development plans to improve economic development ▪ Design and implementation of improved legislation ▪ Success in leveraging resources for on-going and continuing efforts to implement NEP/YEP. ▪ The level of private sector / employers' organizations support towards a NEP/YEP, paying specific attention to how these groups participated in project activities. ▪ Financial Commitments of development partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the likelihood that the results of the programme and project interventions will be sustained and utilized after the end of programme? ▪ What needs to be done to enhance the sustainability of the programme? ▪ To what extent did the country-level interventions produce lessons learned that can inform the range of ILO's technical assistance on youth employment after the completion of the Sida-supported programme? 	

Annex 2: Documents reviewed

1. Web-page of the Partnership (background info and updated information on progress)
2. Sweden – ILO Factsheet
3. SIDA-ILO Partnership Agreement 2014-17
4. 2014's Progress Report of the Partnership Programme
5. Mid-Term Review of the Partnership Programme
6. Final Evaluation of Previous Phase of the Partnership Programme (National Employment Policies and Youth Employment)
7. 2012 Resolution "The youth employment crisis: A call for action"
8. Programme and Budget for 2014-15
9. ACI 2 Implementation Strategy: "Area of critical importance on jobs and skills for youth"
10. Project documents

ANNEX 3

ILO-SIDA Final Independent Evaluation Interviews with Mr Rafael Muñoz Sevilla Geneva, 9-10 February 2016

Tuesday, 9 February 2016

<i>Time</i>	<i>Person</i>	<i>Office</i>
9:15 - 9:45	Ms Giorgia Muresu Senior Specialist, Public-Private Partnerships - Evaluation Manager	9-53
10:00 - 11:45	Ms Maria Prieto , Youth Employment Specialist, YEP Ms Miranda Kwong , Technical Officer CEPOL	8-82
11:45 – 12:30	Mr Valter Nebuloni , Head of YEP	8-80
12:30 - 13.15	Mr Jean Francois Klein , Evaluation Focal point, Employment Policy Dept Ms Dorothea Schmidt-Klau , Head of MSU, Employment Policy Dept	8-42
	Lunch	
14:15 - 15:00	Ms Azita Berar Awad , Director, Employment Policy Department	8-48
15:00 - 15:30	Ms Naoko Otobe , Senior Employment Specialist (support to NEP under SIDA funding 2012-2013, Sri Lanka)	8-64
15:45 – 16:15	Ms Claire Harasty, Senior Employment Specialist (support to NEP, Zambia)	8-60
16:30 – 17:00 16.00-17	Ms Susana Puerto Gonzalez , Youth Employment Specialist (support to impact evaluation TREE, Zimbabwe)	8-74

Wednesday, 10 February 2016

<i>Time</i>	<i>Person</i>	<i>Office</i>
9:30 – 10:30	Ms. Eleonore d'Achon , Employment Specialist (support to NEP, Morocco & Burkina Faso)	8-62
10:45- 11:15	Ms Carlien Van Empel , Coordinator Development Cooperation Mr Ramiro Pizarro , Senior Development Cooperation Officer Partnership and Field Support Department	9-63
11:30–12:30	Mr Andrea Marinucci Desk officer for Sweden Mr Pawel Gmyrek Senior Administration Officer Partnership and Field Support Department Ms Francesca Fantoni , Programme Analyst - PROGRAM Mr Oktavianto Pasaribu , Programme Analyst - ACI2 - PROGRAM	9-77
	Lunch	
14:00-14:45	Ms. Miranda Kwong , Technical Officer CEPOL Ms. Maria Prieto , Youth Employment Specialist, YEP (Review of data and documents available)	8-82
14:45 -15:15	Ms. Giorgia Muresu (Wrap-up meeting)	9-53

ANNEX 4

Rafael Muñoz Sevilla - MISION EVALUACION PROGRAMA JOVENES ACI 2

Montevideo, 22-26 de febrero de 2016

Llegada a Montevideo: Lunes 22.2.16, 08:30

Lunes 22 de febrero

15.00 confirmada	-Gonzalo Graña (OIT) -Fabio Bertranou (a confirmar),	En OIT/Cinterfor Avda. Uruguay 1238 Tel: 2902-9716 / 0557
------------------	---	---

Martes 23 de febrero

09.00	Fabio Bertranou, Gonzalo Graña Enrique Deibe/Fernando Vargas/Fernando Casanova (OIT/Cinterfor)	En OIT/Cinterfor Avda. Uruguay 1238 Tel: 2902-9716 / 0557
Solicitada	Ernesto Murro , Ministro de Trabajo y Seguridad Social	En MTSS, Juncal 1511 Tel: 2916-3703 2915-7140
14.30 confirmado 15.00 confirmado	-Eduardo Pereyra , Director Nacional de Empleo/ MTSS -Gabriela Rodríguez , Asesora	Tel: 1928 1411
GG	-Tair Kasztan Flechner , Responsable del Depto. De Empleo Juvenil -Natalia Vibel , Depto. De Empleo Juvenil	Tel: 1928 int. 1427

Miércoles 24 de febrero

Solicitada	-Pelayo Scremini, Cámara de Industrias del Uruguay (CIU) -Juan Mailhos (CNCS) (viajará esa semana a OIT-Ginebra, y sugiere conferencia por Skype la semana siguiente)	Lugar a confirmar
GG	-Santiago Soto , Director del Instituto de la Juventud (INJU)	En INJU, 18 de Julio 1865 Tel: 2400 0302- int: 7011
GG	-Lilián Ion , Empleo Rural / DINA E	En MTSS, Juncal 1511 Tel: 1928 1785

Jueves 25 de febrero

10.30 confirmada	-Milton Castellano , Director del Instituto Cuesta Duarte – PIT/CNT -Tania Falero , Responsable de Proyectos -Vanessa Bustamente	En ICD/PIT-CNT Jackson 1283 Tel: 2409-6680 int. 124
pm	Gonzalo Graña	

Viernes 26 de febrero

11.00	Salida al Aeropuerto	
-------	----------------------	--

Contactos: - Gonzalo Graña – Celular: 099 645 932
- Adriana Betbeder – Celular: 099 522 029

ANNEX 5 : DRAFT AGENDA MOROCCO

Evaluation finale du projet SIDA Maroc

Proposition d'agenda :

	Lundi 7 Mars	Mardi 8 Mars	Mercredi 9 Mars	Jeudi 10 Mars
Matin	Réunion de debriefing avec le BIT -Daniela Zampini (tel/Skype) -Eléonore d'Achon (tel/skype) -Samia Ouzgane	- Discussion avec le coordonateur du Groupe de travail 1 - Discussion avec le coordonateur du Groupe de travail 2	Réunion avec le Ministère de l'Emploi et des affaires sociales : -Secrétaire Général -Direction Emploi - Direction de la coopération -Direction du Travail	- Réunion Partenaires sociaux Syndicats + Patronat -Réunion avec quelques membres du Comité Interministériel (à définir)
AM	Discussion avec le coordonateur de l'équipe de formulation du Plan d'Action de la SNE Nicolas Serrière (tel/skype)	-- Discussion avec le coordonateur du Groupe de travail 3	- Réunion avec l'Observatoire du Marché du Travail - Réunion avec l'ANAPEC	-Réunion avec quelques membres du Comité Interministériel (à définir)

ANNEX 6: REMOTE INTERVIEWS SCHEDULE

Samoa		
Date	Person	Organization
15/02/2016	Mrs. Filomena Nelson	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment – Disaster Management Organization.
16/02/2016	Ms. Jordanna Mareko	Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development (Division for Youth)
17/02/2016	Ms. Kaisarina Salesa Mrs. Jennifer Ula Fruean	Samoa National Youth Council (SNYC)
18/02/2016	Mr. Tomasi Peni	International Labour Organization – Pacific Island Countries Office Suva.
	Mrs. Chelle Jackson	outgoing – SNAP Project Coordinator

Jordan		
Date	Person	Organization
15/02/2016	Ahmad Albadareen	ILO-Jordan National coordinator
Feb 15-16-17 (TBC)	Patrick Daru	Employment/YE specialist/Skills specialist
Feb 15-16-17 (TBC)	Eng. Mohammed Irshid	Ministry of Labour Director of Center of Accreditation and Quality Assurance (CAQA)
Feb 15-16-17 (TBC)	Mr. Mohammed Alshgerat	Ministry of Labour Director of National Employment Strategy
Feb 15-16-17 (TBC)	Ms. Maisoon Amarneh	Economic and Social Council Technical Advisor
Feb 15-16-17 (TBC)	Dr. Ibrahim Tarawneh	Vocational Training Corporation DG Assistant for Technical Affairs
Feb 15-16-17 (TBC)	Ms. Lana Babi Hani	Jordan Chamber of Commerce Advisor
Feb 15-16-17 (TBC)	Tayseer Suleiman	Hairdressing Union Deputy President

Zambia		
Date	Person	Organization
Feb 17	Lusaka team	ILO
Feb 18	Mr. Kennedy Muma Mukupa Acting Director of Youth	Ministry of Youth, Sports and Child Development
Feb 18	Ms Naomi Lunat National Youth Coordinator	Zambia Congress of Trade Unions
Feb 18	Mr.Hilary Chilala National Youth Programmes Coordinator	Zambia Federation of Employers
Feb 19	Ms. Faith Phiri President	Junior Chambers International
Feb 19	Mr. Jack Chongolo Executive Director	Alliance for Youth Entrepreneurs

ILO Regional Offices		
Date	Person	Office
March 1-4 (TBC)	Rosa Benyounes Programme officer	ILO Algiers
	Andrés Marinakis Employment/YE specialist	ILO Santiago
	Guillermo Dema Youth Employment Specialist	ILO Lima
	Rabia Jalloul Programme officer	ILO Lebanon
	Daniela Zampini	ILO Cairo
	Satoshi Sasaki Decent Work Specialist/YE specialist	ILO Suva