

**SELF EVALUATION  
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**Employment Promotion in Disaster Response in Asia and the  
Pacific**

**RAS/14/61/JPN**

Krishna Pribadi

FEBRUARY 2016

## **Table of Content**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. The Project**
- 3. The Evaluation**
- 4. Evaluation of the Project**
  - 4.1 Relevance and Strategic fit
  - 4.2 Validity of Design
  - 4.3 Project Effectiveness
  - 4.4 Effectiveness of Management arrangement
  - 4.5 Efficiency of Resource Use
  - 4.6 Impact and Sustainability
  - 4.7 Gender mainstreaming
- 5. Lessons Learned**
- 6. Conclusions and Recommendation**

ANNEXE 1 : List of Respondents and Questionnaire Response

ANNEXE 2 : Interview note with CTA

## **Acknowledgements**

The evaluator wishes to thank all those who contributed to this self-evaluation work, in particular to Ms Shukuko Koyama, CTA, and Ms Nattakan Suvanprateeb, Administrative and Programme Assistant to the EPDR Project. The evaluator also wants to acknowledge the valuable input from all the project stakeholders through written response to the questionnaire prepared for the evaluation.

## **Disclaimer**

This evaluation report does not necessarily reflect the views of the International Labour Organization-Decent Work Team (ILO-DWT) in Bangkok or those of EPDR Project Management. ILO-DWT nor EPDR Project Management do not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this work. The views expressed herein are those of the evaluator only, and any substantial errors are the responsibility of the evaluator.

## 1. Introduction

The Employment Promotion in Disaster Response in Asia and the Pacific Project (hereafter EPDR Project or the Project) builds on the ILO experiences in the various ILO crisis response programmes in Philippines, Cambodia, Indonesia, Myanmar, Timor Leste, Pakistan, India, Afghanistan, Fiji and the Solomon Islands to support the ILO in developing, demonstrating and disseminating a regional strategy or approach to promote employment creation in post-natural disaster recovery, reconstruction and development work. The EPDR Project also contributes to further advancing knowledge and know-how on how to prepare for and recover from natural hazards, and promotes the exchange of such knowledge and mutual learning between selected countries in the Region. A self-evaluation is to be conducted according to the ILO evaluation policies.

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

The purpose of the self evaluation is to provide feed back from the findings, lessons learnt and recommendations of the self-evaluation into the design and implementation of ILO projects of similar kind and projects that respond to crisis in the future.

The purpose of this Draft Final Report is to discuss the initial evaluation findings while looking for further input from relevant project stakeholders for improvement of the report before finalizing the evaluation, which incorporate the input and comments from various stakeholders to the draft.

## 2. The Project

Project Title : Employment Promotion in Disaster Response.  
Country : Asia and the Pacific Region with special focus on the Philippines

Administrative Unit: DWT Bangkok  
Collaborating ILO Units: ILO Country Offices, ILO ROAP, DEV/INVBEST

Project Duration : From 01 January 2015 to 29 February 2016  
Budget : USD 400,000

Outcomes:

There are three outcomes defined for this project :

- 01 Employment promotion in disaster response in the Asia Pacific Region
- 02 Project Management
- 03 Programme Support Costs and Provision for Cost Increase

Output :

There are five output expected in order that the outcome of employment promotion in disaster response in the Asia Pacific Region is achieved:

- (1) An assessment of opportunities, challenges and impact of employment promotion

activities in recent natural disaster response in the region (Pakistan, Philippines, Japan)

- (2) Employment creation strategies in post crisis response promoted with international disaster networks, UN agencies, donors and other development partners
- (3) Country offices in the region supported with the integration of employment promotion strategies in their crisis response in case natural disasters occur
- (4) A regional ILO crisis response strategy and approach formulated based on recent experiences in Philippines and other countries
- (5) Generic and country-specific guidelines (Philippines), assessments and best practices produced, collected and disseminated

The Project has experienced several changes in the budget allocation (without any additional cost) as well as change in the project timeline (project end date extended from 31 December 2015 to 29 February 2016). Table 1 shows the changes in budget allocations, as well as the project status in terms of budget absorption :

Table 1 Budget allocations and budget absorption

	Budget (V1)	% of Total Project (V1)	Budget (as of 8 Feb 2016)	% of Total Project (V3)	Actuals (as of 8 Feb 2016)	Act/Budget %	Encumbrances	Expected Expenditure	Balances	Exp/Budget %
<b>Total Project Cost (USD)</b>	<b>400,000.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>400,000.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>286,014.31</b>	<b>71.50</b>	<b>16,116.82</b>	<b>302,131.13</b>	<b>97,868.87</b>	<b>75.53</b>
Outcome 01 Employment promotion in disaster response in the Asia Pacific Region	87,000.00	21.75	113,040.07	28.26	80,702.00	71.39	9,809.47	90,511.47	22,528.60	80.07
Output 01 Assessment studies	30,000.00	7.50	70,937.66	17.73	56,947.00	80.28	0	56,947.00	13,990.66	80.28
01.01 Country assessment for Philippines	9,000.00	2.25	10,716.66	2.68	10,716.00	99.99	0	10,716.00	0.66	99.99
01.02 Country assessment for Japan	14,000.00	3.50	50,221.00	12.56	36,231.00	72.14	0	36,231.00	13,990.00	72.14
01.03 Country assessment for India	7,000.00	1.75	10,000.00	2.50	10,000.00	100.00	0	10,000.00	0.00	100.00
Output 02 Forum & Meetings	5,000.00	1.25	19,575.41	4.89	6,164.00	31.49	9,809.47	15,973.47	3601.94	81.60
Output 03 In country technical support in case natural disaster occurs	27,000.00	6.75	20,000.00	5.00	15,066.00	75.33	0	15,066.00	4,934.00	75.33
Output 04 Regional strategy for crisis response	25,000.00	6.25	2,527.00	0.63	2,525.00	99.92	0	2,525.00	2.00	99.92
Output 05 Generic/country specific guidelines (Philippines)	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0.00	
Outcome 02 Project Management	250,125.00	62.53	239,117.93	59.78	174,408.00	72.94	6,000.00	180,408.00	58,402.58	75.45
1. Personnel	217,887.00	54.47	217,887.00	54.47	165,532.00	75.97	0	165,532.00	52,355.00	75.97
2. Operation	24,238.00	6.06	13,230.93	3.31	6,876.00	51.97	307.35	7,183.35	6,047.58	54.29
3. M & E	8,000.00	2.00	8,000.00	2.00	2,000.00	25.00	6,000.00	8,000.00	0.00	100.00
Outcome 03 Programme Support	62,875.00	15.72	47,842.00	11.96	32,904.31	68.78	0	32,904.31	14,937.69	68.78

There are several issues that can be raised from the evaluator's point of view on the distribution of budget over different output and activities. Firstly, the budget allocation for the three outcomes seems to be unbalanced, budget allocated for the achievement of the principle objective, i.e. employment promotion in disaster response in the Asia Pacific Region is relatively low compared to the other outcomes (21.75 % initially and increased eventually to 28.26% during the course of the project). Discussion with Project Management revealed that the large component of Project Management (59.78%) was instrumental for the success of the project, as it involved a huge coordination and communication with various project stakeholders and network, which is crucial for the effective implementation of all the activities within the Outcome 01. A more balanced budget allocation however would possibly increase significantly the achievement of the principle objective and useful in having a more straight forward

evaluation of output effectiveness, due to clearer budget line positioning. Secondly, the budget allocation within the Output 01 Assessment studies seems also to be unbalanced, country assessment for Japan was allocated 12.56% of the budget compared to Philippines and India (2.68% and 2.50% respectively). However, this is understandable as further review of the products shows that actually budget for country assessment for Japan was also used for carrying out assessment in Nepal recovery (as a follow on of the Gurkha's earthquake 25 April 2015), comparative study of the four countries (Japan, Philippines, Nepal and India), and other studies as well (trade union). There also seems to be a change in the focus of the principle objective on the issue of a regional ILO crisis response strategy, as budget allocation was reduced from 6.25% to 0.63%, and a review of the product documents show that there is no significant product document depicting what is the regional ILO crisis response strategy as a learning process from recent disaster experiences in the region. While it is acknowledged that some policy documents related to ILO crisis response are already available, there is no policy or strategy document produced by the Project that include learning points from the case studies over recent disaster in the Asia Pacific region, which mean that the Project may have missed the opportunity to develop a stronger and more comprehensive ILO regional crisis response strategy.

It is hoped however, that in the future this need can be addressed to provide ILO with a better tools to response to the disaster response and recovery in the region, as well as in any other parts of the world. The Output 05 Generic and country specific guidelines (Philippines) was not allocated any budget, as the Project Management considers that this output is achievable using the resources already allocated in other budget lines.

### **3. The Evaluation**

The evaluation is examining in particular : the quality of outputs produced by the Project; modality of project implementation including the project management, coordination mechanisms and collaboration among various stakeholders; outreach and dissemination strategy; and challenges faced by the project. Despite the extension of the EPDR timeline from 31 December 2015 to 29 February 2016, the evaluation will only consider all the activities undertaken by the EPDR Project from January 2015 to the end of December 2015 (12 months). The project documentation obtained from the Project Management for the purpose of the evaluation can be put into five categories of project documents, i.e. project planning and administration documents, existing ILO policy and knowledge documents, product documents, mission reports and documents, and lastly the dissemination documents and reports. Each of document categories served as data sources for different evaluation objectives.

The evaluation applies the five OECD/DAC and UNEG criteria for evaluating development assistance: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and/or sustainability (Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations 2nd edition (2013) [http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_168289/lang-en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_168289/lang-en/index.htm)) as well as additional cross-cutting issues (on gender mainstreaming, labour standards, and social dialogue).

The evaluation work started on the 22<sup>nd</sup> December , 2015 and communication with Project Management has been since quite intense to obtain all the needed information and documents relevant for the evaluation purpose. It was planned to communicate with

a number of project stakeholders through email correspondence and phone/skype conversation, but eventually as most of the project stakeholders had very tight schedules, the evaluation is based mostly on the stakeholders' response to questionnaires prepared by the evaluator to get relevant opinion and information concerning the project achievements. A list of respondents and the responses are shown in Annexe 1. The evaluator had also an opportunity to attend to the IRP Forum 2016 Post-event "Open Dialogue Session" on Issues, Challenges and Opportunities in Long-term Recovery and Build-Back-Better Processes" in Kobe, 27 January 2016. This event provided the evaluator with a better understanding of stakeholders' needs in the area of employment and livelihood promotion in post-disaster response. During the event, the evaluator had a chance also to interview the Project CTA, Ms Shukuko Koyama to discuss some pertinent issues (Interview note shown in Annexe 2).

#### **4. Evaluation of The Project**

This section discusses the evaluator's view for each of the evaluation criteria.

##### **4.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit**

Relevance is defined as the extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies.

The Project was designed to "contribute to the recovery, reconstruction and development of areas struck by natural disasters in disaster-prone countries in Asia and the Pacific", and it would "strengthen, promote and disseminate the overall ILO approach which entails immediate employment support during the emergency phase that transitions into medium-term livelihood recovery during the recovery phase and build capacity of constituents". The Project have adopted a strategy with three components : (1) to learn and share knowledge on employment-focused disaster risk reduction and recovery throughout the Asia and Pacific region based on lessons learned from experiences in recent disasters (2) to formulate a natural disaster response strategy with employment creation at its core, which will allow the ILO to engage with other stakeholders in the Region and promote its employment creation and livelihood recovery in crisis response (3) support selected countries in the Region, to plan, mainstream and implement employment creation strategies in crisis response programmes and projects, including supporting ILO's pro-active role in coordinating and promoting employment creation in case a natural disaster occurs in the region during the project period and international support is requested.

In the evaluator's view, the Project has been designed to correctly address the identified problems and real needs in the Asia Pacific, as one of the most disaster prone region in the world. A respondent of the evaluation questionnaire stated that most significant need of the region was "building livelihoods through securing and creating jobs in the disaster affected areas", and the project was aimed at fulfilling this need through promoting ILO's approaches on immediate employment support during the emergency phase that transitions into medium-term livelihood recovery during the recovery phase.

From the project documentation, the evaluator feels that during the life of the project there was a shift of focus by not further pursuing the component of developing an ILO regional natural disaster response strategy. One of the reasons for this was the project adaptation to the emerging needs aroused during the project life, in particular the Gurkha Earthquake in Nepal, 25 April 2015. Nevertheless, the other foci addressed in the proposal were found to be followed strongly and even produced remarkable output, compared to the initial project concept note. In particular, the Project seems to have excelled in achieving the second output of promoting employment creation strategies in post crisis response, as it has been able to build a strong relationship with and interest from the international disaster networks, UN agencies, donors and other development partners from various countries. IRP is a fine example where the products of EPDR project have been considered as greatly contributing to the IRP's objective in promoting tools, methodologies and knowledge to support partners and countries to achieve build-back better outcomes (response from IRP to the questionnaire).

Hence, in the evaluator's opinion, the EPDR project is relevant to the real needs of the beneficiaries and the strategy developed by the project to achieve its immediate objectives is fit with the overall strategy of ILO and other stakeholders in responding to post-disaster crisis in term of employment creation and livelihood recovery.

#### 4.2 Validity of Design

The project document has passed several modifications, from concept-note, approvals, inception report, logical framework up to implementation plan matrix, but in overall, the modifications did not change the immediate objectives and all principle outcomes defined initially within the project concept-note. It is also interesting to note that the concept-note, inception report and project implementation were carried out by different people. All the modifications were found to be for the improvement of the Project and responded to the adaptation need of the Project to the changing situation during the project implementation. One change of the targeted country (from Pakistan to India) for the assessment studies occurred as an adaptation to understanding of situation on the ground, when it was found that there was not enough information available on recent post-disaster response in Pakistan. The 25 April 2015 Nepal Earthquake occurrence has provided an opportunity to the project to add the case study countries by adding Nepal, which was in fact a good opportunity to learn from more recent disaster in a totally different setting. Needless to say that the project design had initially been correctly prepared for this situation, by setting up the output 03 "Country offices in the region supported with the integration of employment promotion strategies in their crisis response in case natural disasters occur", and the intervention in Nepal had been successfully carried out by the Project.

The Project Manager felt that the Project has identified and been interacting with the most suitable stakeholders, given their existing expertise and network. The stakeholders' involvement was crucial and indispensable. In the Philippines, for instance, the trade union stakeholders showed stronger interests in the project's assistance than initially expected. They could be involved at the project formulation process for similar projects and/or activities in the future.

Experts and specialists equipped with both labour and disaster risk reduction expertise are still rare, however. This indicates a potential area for the ILO to invest in the future



in order to mainstream employment and labour perspectives in the area of disaster risk reduction. As part of a development process in the post-disaster situation, the evaluator feels also that, judging from the available documentation, stakeholders from agencies/organization in charge of disaster management and disaster risk reduction as well as development planning at the country level should have been more involved in the whole process, even from the project formulation stage.

On the indicators to measure the project achievement, it was clear that the current indicators used in the Project are mainly quantitative, based on the number of reports produced or meetings participated/organized. The evaluator shares the view of the Project Manager that as the main focus of the Project being the production and dissemination of research findings and strengthening regional partnership, the Project requires more indicators to capture qualitative impacts and consequences, which can reflect better whether the project has really achieved its objectives or otherwise.

The dissemination strategy adopted by the Project is based more on the various strategic international forums and in-country meetings, which are unfortunately limited only to the meetings in the case study countries. A more aggressive in-country roadshows in the Asia Pacific region countries are expected to provide more buy-in by national stakeholders.

Lessons learned reports from the case studies are accessible through ILO website, while the production of guidelines and best practices (from the Philippines) are uploaded in the ILO KSP website. Unfortunately the KSP website is only accessible to those owning ilo.org emails, hence limited to those within the ILO circle. The objective of promoting employment creation would be achieved better if public access to the documents can be provided.

#### 4.3 Project Effectiveness

Effectiveness is the extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance and is as such the core of an evaluation.

There are one principle outcome and five output to be achieved by the end of this project. In general, the immediate objective as the principle outcome : promoting employment creation in disaster response in the Asia Pacific Region has been achieved by this project, and this is supported by the views of most of the questionnaire respondents. The various events where the project has been involved show that the project has effectively conducted an aggressive promotion of employment creation in disaster response, such as at 3<sup>rd</sup> UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in Sendai, 14-18 March 2015, the IRP Strategy Retreat in Tokyo (6-7 August, 2015), the culminating event “Strengthening Partnerships: Livelihood at the Forefront of Recovery Following Haiyan” in Manila (6 August, 2015), the 13th ASEAN-Japan High Level Official Meeting on Caring Societies in Kobe (20-22 October, 2015), the ILO Consultation Workshop (Trade Union Workshop) in Manila (19 November, 2015), and last but not least the International Recovery Forum 2016 Post-event: “Open Dialogue Session” : Issues, Challenges and Opportunities in Long-term Recovery and Build-

Back-Better Processes (27 January, 2016). In addition to those international events, the exposure and involvement of ILO in the post-disaster response activity in 25 April Nepal Earthquake has exemplified the success of bringing the employment creation and livelihood recovery in the forefront of post-disaster response effort, which provided an excellent opportunity for achieving the project immediate objective.

In terms of the project output as a means to achieve the immediate objective, it can be said safely that the Output 01 “Assessment studies of opportunities, challenges and impact of employment promotion activities in recent natural disaster response organized and carried out”, Output 02 “Forums, international meetings and conferences to promote employment creation strategies in post crisis response with international disaster networks, UN agencies, donors and other development partners”, and Output 03 “In-country technical support to constituents to integrate and mainstream employment promotion strategies in national crisis response in case natural disasters occur” have been effectively achieved. Output 01 has exceeded the initial plan by completing four assessment studies (Philippines, Japan, India, Nepal) plus a comparative study and trade union study. Output 02 has been achieved effectively by organizing for the employment creation promotion in all the meetings and conferences. Output 03 has been effectively achieved through all the efforts in supporting the response and recovery process in Nepal (contribution in safety and health in the cash for work program, coordinating and leading employment and livelihood issues in the PDNA process, as well as in the preparation for Nepal Post-earthquake Recovery Strategy). On the other side, the Output 04 “A regional ILO crisis response strategy and approach formulated based on recent experiences in Philippines and other countries” seems to be not well achieved, as there was a shift in the follow through of the related activities toward new emerging needs in responding to Nepal Earthquake. Output 05 “Generic and country-specific guidelines (Philippines), assessments and best practices produced, collected and disseminated” seems to have been effectively achieved, judged from the various guidelines and best practices document for the Philippines prepared by the Project.

From the point of view of the donor, in this case ILO/Japan SSN Fund, the analysis of three disaster-affected countries (plus Nepal) in terms of job security is most relevant to the SSN Fund’s aims and objectives. The EPDR Project found that placing people’s jobs at the centre of the recovery is the key to sustainable recovery from disasters, and this is in line with the ILO/Japan SSN Fund cooperation framework, and this can also be considered as an indicator for the project effectiveness. There is one point to note however, on the shifting in focus on the formulation of a regional ILO crisis response strategy and approach based on recent disaster response experiences in the region. The shift has shown that the project design could have been more realistic to the situation on the ground, if there were enough intensive discussions on how ILO, as an international development organization, would like to really contribute to disaster response and mitigation strategy/program in the Asia Pacific region, knowing that this region is prone to natural hazards.

Another issue to consider when evaluating the effectiveness of a promoting effort is to see whether there are buy-ins by the targeted audience, in this case the countries in the Asia Pacific region, at least in the four countries studied. Indication of buy-in can be seen in Nepal and the Philippines.

According to Mr Jose Assalino, Director CO Kathmandu, the post disaster need assessment which was conducted by the National Planning Commission with all Government and development partners and a strong technical support from ILO has analysed effect in different 4 sectors and 18 sub sectors. The National Planning Commission and Government departments set coordination mechanism and different standards, and policy for trainings and house reconstruction. District Disaster Relief Committee has been formed at all districts to coordinate and communicate all partners for effective implementation.

In the Philippines, Mr Simon Hills, Officer-in-charge a.i. CO Manila noted that following ILO's approach, the program has been successful in getting NGOs, government and UN agencies to agree that emergency response programs should ensure at least minimum wage rates, social security coverage and health and accident insurance coverage, alongside provision of personal protective equipment. ILO has also worked closely with the social security system (SSS) and Phil Health, to ensure that they can ramp up coverage and will look to support other NGOs and UN agencies in implementing disaster response programs to ensure their beneficiaries are covered by SSS and Phil Health. While further improvements are still necessary, the work ILO has done in facilitating this process has been well received.

IRP felt that the Project contributed to the IRP's work in identifying and promoting tools, methodologies and knowledge/ information management systems that are available to support partners and countries to achieve build-back-better outcomes.

Other buy-in in other countries in the region are yet to be seen in the future, as the expected result of the high level meetings on the employment creation issues in post-disaster response. Nevertheless, further ILO's effort in this regard is much needed to carry on the flame and getting adopted by organizations and agencies, government and non government, in the Asia Pacific countries.

From the financial point of view, two interpretations may arise. First, as the actual disbursement by February 2016 reached only 75.53 % of the budgeted cost (encumbrances included), it can be said that the project effectiveness may still need to be improved in order to be able to absorb better the allocated budget. Country assessment for Japan, in country technical support in case natural disaster occurs, project management and programme support are the areas where effectiveness improvement may need to be carried out. On the other side, the lower than planned budget absorption may also indicate the high efficiency of budget use, and this has been confirmed by the CTA during an interview that in particular the networking meetings and forums have been able to mobilize support from other organizations in the form of in-kind contribution, which is also a good indication of buy-in. The in-country technical support carried out in Nepal for the post-earthquake response has also benefitted from the support from other donors as well as other unit (DWT Bangkok), such as that the budget allocation for this output was not totally absorbed.

#### 4.4 Effectiveness of Management arrangements

The effectiveness of management arrangements has been demonstrated by the fact that the Project can be completed within time and budget, producing the expected output and achieving the immediate objective. As the Project is based in Bangkok it has received sufficient administrative support as well as technical back-stopping from DWT Bangkok as well as from other units. However, there is a remark from a respondent to the evaluation questionnaire, that if the political supports to the Project were stronger, the project could have had a better chance to improve its immediate objective achievement.

The Project Manager, responding to the evaluation questionnaire, suggested that the Project had received adequate support from ROAP, DWT Bangkok and Country Offices in Nepal and the Philippines. The April 25 earthquake in Nepal raised a risk of a delay in project implementation as it required the Project Manager to be deployed in Nepal substantially. However, with thorough administrative, financial and managerial support from all the respective offices, the Project minimized the delay in the implementation.

As the project set out country office support in case of a mega disaster as one of its output, it is also advised that the ILO's respective offices set a clear percentage of the Project Manager's level of effort to engage in rapid response operation in order to prevent risks of derailing the project implementation, otherwise the sudden additional responsibility may distract the Project Manager from fully being in control of the project management. In the case of this project period, despite the earthquake response in Nepal, the Office as well as the Project managed to implement the project activities without too much of a delay. This suggested that the management capacity and arrangement for the EPDR Project was quite adequate and did facilitate good results and efficient delivery.

Project monitoring during project life was done through progress monitoring against work plan adopted at the initial stage of the project, and at the country level such as in the Philippines, field missions were conducted to check on progress of activities a number of times. The Philippines CO considers that these events are extremely important to ensure progress is taking place and that any challenges or problems are noted and addressed as quickly as possible. Such work monitoring projects can also offer new perspective and ideas on project activities and what is truly needed on the ground.

From the respondents opinion, several challenges that were encountered during the project follow:

- The two-month delay of the project commencement, supposed to start in January 2015 but it could really start in late February 2015, in particular it caused administrative/financial issue (one year contract of staffs could not be covered), but the project managed to resolve eventually the problem.
- Extended unexpected mission of Project Manager in Kathmandu (one and half months), resolved by maintaining good communication between Project Manager and project staffs in Bangkok, and fund support from other units (DWT Bangkok)

- In particular, the project mission in Kathmandu was also faced with challenges, such as to complete the project with such huge responsibilities within a very short time. There are areas for improvement in the future for more effective response, such as local government capacity to coordinate early recovery activities, government efficient decision process, government agencies coordination capacity, and Village development committees' capacity to access government funds.

There are factors considered as contributing to the project effectiveness, such as organized project work plan, its consistency, enough time space between organized meetings/events (three meetings held/co-organized by the project), good understanding (on ILO rule and system) and very cooperative project specialist, flexibility, and team support from Finance staffs, Regional Admins, DWT Senior secretaries. The Project Manager also mentioned the flexibility of the Donor (Japan/ILO SSN fund) as being a positive factor in supporting the smoothness of the Project implementation.

#### 4.5 Efficiency of Resource Use

Efficiency is a measure of the productivity of the activity implementation process of an activity - how well and economically inputs were converted into outputs.

It can be said that the Project was found to be very efficient in the use of its resources, as it could deliver such substantial output within time and budget. As mentioned previously, the total expenditure of the project (up to the evaluation time) is 75.53 % of the budget, meaning that there is about one quarter of the budget unused. The Project was able to mobilize various resources from different sources, including in-kind supports from its networks in co-organizing meeting events as a means of promoting employment creation in post-disaster response. In this Project, the ILO took advantage of some conferences not organized by the ILO to share lessons learned, which contributes to the efficient use of the fund. Another aspect of the efficient implementation is that the project does not directly pay the wages for cash-for-work programs in consideration of the budget.

There was a two months delay of project fund delivery, due to time taking administrative process from the donor, and the project had to cover the two months fund need with fund from other sources (Vanuatu and Laos projects). Eventually a two months no-cost project extension was approved which enable the Project to recover from the effect of the project delay, in addition to having a good opportunity to expose and disseminate the project findings in the 2016 IRP Forum event (26-27 January 2016).

There is a small note from the evaluator on the efficiency issue, related to the unused budget portion. Usually efficiency does not come hand in hand with effectiveness, if we reduce the input (in this case the fund) to the process, we might end up also with reduced output, and thus reducing the effectiveness of the project. It is then suggested that the remaining fund can be used for additional activities that will increase the project performance in achieving its immediate objective, such as promoting employment creation in disaster response in the Asia Pacific Region, by conducting more intensive roadshows to various countries prone to disaster in the region, e.g. the ASEAN,

Oceania countries, SAR region etc.. The funds can be used as seed funding to co-organize dissemination forum collaborating with national and international organizations, government and non-government, within each of the countries, to share the experiences and lessons learnt in the project, in order to get more buy-ins by the national governments and NGOs. This is said, more time and capacity is needed to organize such activities.

#### 4.6 Impact and sustainability

*Impacts* are positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

*Sustainability* is the continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed.

The Project is only ending in February 2016 and impact is focused on long-term effect, and as these cannot be found at present, the focus will therefore be on the likely impacts in the future, such as potential opportunities for it to be replicated and scaled up, possible and realistic exit strategy for EPDR.

The Project Manager informed the evaluator that the Project is currently in a close consultation with a DWT Bangkok Specialist on Workers' Activities and CO Manila on the issue of mainstreaming workers' perspectives in the country's disaster risk reduction approach. The Project discussed and agreed with DWT Bangkok that the DWT Bangkok Senior EIIP Specialist would hand over the focal point function concerning the regional partnership and that exact division of labour to be decided once a new EIIP Specialist is appointed later this year. This seems to be a good exit strategy from the Project to ensure its sustainability.

From another perspective, the IRP is coordinating a referral system and network among IRP partners for providing guidance and advice on build-back-better related issues, and this is a good opportunity for the Project to promote employment creation and livelihood recovery issues into the guidance and advises, such as that national governments in the Region incorporate systematically the issues in their development and recovery policies, planning and practises.

From the sustainability point of view, the evaluator feels that the long term project impact would only be useful if enough, appropriate and continuous promotion of the project lessons learned and best-practise is exercised, with ILO continuing strong support for promoting employment creation within post-disaster response program, and this will require a clear regional ILO strategy on post-disaster response which centering on the employment and livelihood creation focus. Replication in the future of the case studies and dissemination program in the other disaster prone regions of the world would be a good strategy to sustain the project achievements, this could include similar exercises in Latin America, Africa, and Central Asia, and in particular in Oceania, where there are small island countries prone to various natural hazards.

Another issue to consider is to collaborate with the UNISDR to workout schemes incorporating employment and livelihood issues in the build-back-better approach to be considered in the global, national and local disaster risk reduction policy and

program documents, capitalizing on the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR) , which currently does not explicitly state the employment issues in its priority strategy and actions.

#### **4.7 Gender Mainstreaming**

Gender mainstreaming is the public policy concept of assessing the different implications for women and men of any planned policy action, including legislation and programmes, in all areas and levels. Mainstreaming essentially offers a pluralistic approach that values the diversity among both men and women.

In terms of gender mainstreaming , the Project Manger informed the evaluator that the Project had ensured to mainstream gender issues through its research and response operations by using gender disaggregated data. The Project also highlighted specific challenges faced by different social groups (including women and men, youth, persons with disabilities). As for disseminating and partnership activities, the Project encouraged its counterparts to have an even number of female and male speakers.

Taking as examples, the Nepal assessment document in its recommendation both at policy and operational levels has raised the issue of inclusive recovery and gender dimension of employment recovery, as well as gender- and age-sensitive recovery and preparedness. The Philippines assessment did raised the issue of lack of disaggregated data in the Haiyan PDNA and recovery programme, while stating the importance of inclusive economic growth. The India assessment report also raised the issue of the lack of disaggregated data and the lack of consideration for women in recovery efforts from the Uttarakhand flood. The focused group discussions for the assessment did consider the gender issues. The Japan case study showed that inclusive recovery efforts have also focuses on issues of gender and people with disabilities.

Having said that, the evaluator still feels that the gender mainstreaming issues in the case studies were dealt with using different approaches and depth, hence clear lessons learned on gender mainstreaming issue were difficult to be systematically formulated and shared to others, this is probably an area of improvement for the project in the future.

### **5. Lessons Learned**

The lessons learned discussed here is about the Project self evaluation itself. It has been an interesting process of learning by the evaluator on how important is and what has been done in the area of employment promotion in post-disaster response. Evaluating a project based on a series of document on the project planning and management, project reports, mission reports, knowledge documents provided by the Project, within a limited time, supported by some limited interview through skype and in person, without really exposed to the real activities of the Project, is really a challenge. Getting enough feedback from the project stakeholders is another challenge, as they already have a tight schedule which does not permit to really having direct communication. It would have been much easier if the evaluator was given a time to visit the project management and discussed with them intensively on various issues, which would provide a better insight into what the Project has been through.

Nevertheless, all the information provided by the project management as well as other stakeholders through written responses to the questionnaire have been very useful to the evaluator for providing its own, although limited in nature, assessment on the project achievements and performance.

## **6. Conclusion and Recommendation**

The Employment Promotion in Disaster Response in Asia Pacific (EPDR) project has been implemented properly, in a very professional way, and has achieved its immediate objective : promoting employment in disaster response in the Asia Pacific Region. All the outputs, with the exception of the planned Output 4 , were produced with very high quality, and even with other additional output such as the assessment in Nepal and a comparative study between the case studies. The intervention in Nepal during the response of the Gurkha Earthquake in Kathmandu was timely and provided an exceptional example on how employment issues can be put at the center of recovery strategy, which will ensure the sustainability of the recovery from disaster, as have been demonstrated by the case studies in the EPDR project.

The Project is efficient in using its resources, as it was able to mobilize other resources to fulfill its needs in producing the outputs and achieving its objective. The Project has been effectively coordinating with various strategic stakeholders to achieve its objective, and has been able to build strong collaboration with them and get commitment to promote employment issues in post disaster response and recovery. It is only regretted that there is a portion of the budget unused, which could have been used to share and promote experience and knowledge gained by the project to other countries, for example by organizing country roadshows in collaboration with country offices and relevant national government and agencies.

The long term impact and sustainability of the Project will yet to be seen in the future, when there is enough strong support from ILO and other international organization to continuously promote employment in disaster response and recovery, with a clear strategy on how to place people's jobs at the centre of the recovery in order to achieve sustainable and better-build back recovery. The main challenge to this effort may lie in getting enough political support from international community as well as from the national governments from the countries in the region.

It is then recommended to follow the EPDR project with the following actions :

- Promote the need of having a clear strategy on employment led disaster response and recovery within ILO
- Conduct roadshows in the Asia Pacific region countries to share the experience and knowledge gained through the EPDR project, with the support of ILO country offices and relevant national agencies and organizations.
- Based on the Project lessons learned and best practices, to produce more user friendly documents to be used by national and local government agencies and international and national organizations involved in post-disaster response and



recovery, and disseminate the documents through various media, in particular through publicly accessible websites on disaster risk reduction and recovery (UN ISDR preventionweb, IRP website, ILO website, ADRC, ADPC etc.)

- Engage more stakeholders **in** the disaster management and disaster risk reduction community to share and incorporate the employment focus in their policy and programmes.
- Develop replication programme in other disaster prone regions, such as Latin America and Africa.
- Develop more generic and country specific best practices (learning from the Philippines) in other countries.