



**Report of the Independent Evaluation of African Country Programme Outcomes (CPOs) funded from 2012-2013 RBSA in the Thematic Area of Social Protection**

**Title:**

**Type of evaluation:** Independent Evaluation

**Timing of the evaluation:** Final

**Countries covered by the evaluation:** Botswana, Ethiopia, Mauritania and Senegal

**Period of the evaluation:** 27 April-18 June 2015

**End of the project:** 31 December 2013

**Name of the evaluation consultant:** Dr. Mohamadou SY

**Name of evaluation manager:** Ms Elleni HADDIS

**ILO office administrating the project:** Regional Office for Africa (ROAF)

**Donor and project budget in US\$:** RBSA funds (335, 000)

**Cost of the evaluation in US\$:** 14,235

**Key words:** social protection, tripartism, capacity building.

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

## Table of contents

Quick facts .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
List of acronyms .....	iv
<b>1. Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Description of the CPOs .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Brief background on project and context .....	6
2.2 Description of the CPOs.....	7
<b>3. Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. Methodology .....</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1 Evaluation approach.....	9
4.2 Desk review.....	9
4.3 Interviews .....	10
4.4 Limitations of the methodology .....	10
<b>5. Findings for each criterion and CPO.....</b>	<b>11</b>
5.1 Design of the CPOs .....	11
5.2 Relevance and strategic fit .....	12
5.3 CPOs effectiveness.....	13
5.4 Efficiency of resources used.....	16
5.5 Effectiveness of management arrangements.....	17
5.6 Sustainability .....	18
<b>6. Conclusions .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>7. Recommendations.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>8. Lessons learned and good practices.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>9. Annexes.....</b>	<b>26</b>
9.1 Terms of reference .....	26
9.2 List of persons interviewed.....	35
9.3 List of documents reviewed .....	36

## List of acronyms

<b>AUEC</b>	The African Union Executive Council
<b>CLTM</b>	Confédération Libre des Travailleurs de Mauritanie/Free Confederation of Workers of Mauritania
<b>CNSS</b>	Caisse Nationale de Sécurité Sociale/National Social Security Fund
<b>CO</b>	Country Office
<b>CNP</b>	Conseil National du Patronat/National Employers Council (Senegal)
<b>CNTS</b>	Confédération Nationale des Travailleurs du Sénégal/National Confederation Workers of Senegal
<b>CPO</b>	Country Programme Outcome
<b>CSO</b>	Civil Society Organisations
<b>CSR</b>	Corporate Social Responsibility
<b>DWAA</b>	Decent Work Agenda for Africa
<b>DWCP</b>	Decent Work Country Programme
<b>DWT</b>	Decent Work Support Team
<b>ILO</b>	International Labour Organisation
<b>ILC</b>	International Labour Conference
<b>IRIS</b>	Integrated Resource Information System
<b>IT</b>	Information Technology
<b>ITC/ILO</b>	International Training Centre of the ILO
<b>M&amp;E</b>	Monitoring and Evaluation
<b>MLHA</b>	Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs (Botswana)
<b>MLSA</b>	Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (Ethiopia)
<b>MoARD</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (Ethiopia)
<b>NGOs</b>	Non Governmental Organisations
<b>NSPP</b>	National Social Protection Platform
<b>OBWs</b>	Outcome-Based Work plans
<b>ODA</b>	Official Development Assistance
<b>P&amp;B</b>	Programme and Budget
<b>ROAF</b>	Regional Office for Africa
<b>RBSA</b>	Regular Budget Supplementary Account
<b>SPF</b>	Strategic Policy Framework
<b>SOCPRO</b>	ILO Social Protection Department
<b>SRSC</b>	Régime Simplifié des Petits Contributeurs/Simplified Regime for Small Contributors
<b>TORs</b>	Terms of Reference
<b>UNICEF</b>	United Nations Fund for Children
<b>WHO</b>	World Health Organisation
<b>XBTC</b>	Extra Budgetary Technical Cooperation

# 1. Executive Summary

## **Project background**

The RBSA is an account based on the voluntary contributions of Member States, in addition to their assessed contributions to the regular budget. It is directed to the implementation of decent work priorities and outcomes formulated in dialogue with tripartite constituents.

The ILO Evaluation Framework and Policy requires that RBSA-funded initiatives are evaluated in order to assess their contributions towards achieving relevant Programme and Budget Outcomes. This particular evaluation deals with the Programme and Budget Outcomes 2012-2013 related to social protection.

## **Evaluation background**

The final thematic evaluation was carried out in Botswana, Ethiopia, Mauritania and Senegal. The four countries are on the DAC list of ODA recipients, therefore eligible to RBSA funding. The CPOs of the four countries are related to P&B Outcome 4 on Social Security formulated as follows “More people have access to better managed and more gender equitable social security benefits”.

## **Evaluation methodology**

The evaluation approach was participatory, consultative, process-oriented and qualitative. A desk review analysed CPOs and other documentation provided by the evaluation manager. A total of 20 stakeholders were interviewed either face to face or through telephone/Skype.

Two limitations were identified. Firstly, the evaluation of the CPOs of Mauritania and Botswana was entirely based on the desk review, Skype and telephone interviews instead of face to face meetings and interaction with stakeholders. Secondly, the main challenges faced by the Mission included the inability to access final implementation reports for some CPOs including SEN126, MRT104 because of the seemingly poor information management.

The independent evaluation took place in May and June 2015 and abides by the ILO evaluation policy, the norms and standards for evaluation as set out by the UNEG and based on OECD principles and guidelines.

## **Evaluation findings**

The **design of the CPOs** was logical and coherent and the selection criteria used for RBSA funding were objective, the iterative process was transparent due mainly to the use of the IRIS. The CPOs were relevant and encompassed various aspects such as legal, social, economic, fiscal and actuarial aspects of social security. All selected countries were on the DAC list of ODA recipients and the amounts requested were compatible with the resource gaps. However, there was limited risk analysis in the design of CPOs and

time frames were generally optimistic; a common concern expressed by the majority of constituents was the limited RBSA resources available to undertake the activities.

In terms of **relevance and strategic fit**, the four CPOs in the area of social protection have been matched to the ILO SPF, P&B 2012-2013, DWAA, and DWCPs. Each country outcome contributed to one or more strategic objectives of the SPF. In response to the needs of ILO constituents, Outcome 4 on social security has been systematically addressed. All stakeholders interviewed agreed that the CPOs were relevant because they dealt with key issues in Social Protection in the four countries.

**CPOs effectiveness** varies according to countries. The first result for **BWA126** was the feasibility study of the establishment of a National Pension Fund and the second one was training on costing of national social protection floors with the ITC/ILO. This activity also resulted in a program to assist the country with funds obtained from ONE UN Framework. Due to delays beyond the ILO's control as well as the Constituents, the attainment of output two "a comprehensive national social security policy developed and implemented" was then deferred to the 2014/2015 biennium.

As far as **ETH154** is concerned, the National Social Protection Policy was finalized in 2012 and adopted in 2015. It was a joint effort of NSPP members. The document will be translated from Amharic into English. The ILO contributed financially and technically to the achievement of the output. Advocacy and awareness campaigns on the advantage of pensions were conducted instead of developing a strategy for the implementation of the new Private Organisation Employees' Pension Proclamation. Key staff of agencies have been trained in basic social protection security principles and administration of social security.

For **MRT104**, major outputs have been achieved. The CNSS has been provided with an IT master plan and the legal framework has been revised. Altogether, 60 CNSS executives and tripartite constituents have been trained. In terms of limitations, the statistical data collection system has not been operational yet and the actuarial study is facing data collection problems.

Concerning **SEN126**, the ILO worked in close partnership with the members of the Social Protection Joint Programme chaired by UNICEF. As there was institutional change in 2012, the ILO adapted its priorities and put emphasis on social protection of workers in the informal sector. In this regard, all five studies related to the SRSC were conducted in 2013 and the first National Dialogue held in January 2014. The PRODOC and the action plan for 2014-2016 are available. The National Social Security Training Centre project was not implemented (output not planned to be funded by RBSA). The ILO's work on social protection for workers of the informal sector is promising as Government has an Order establishing the technical committee on SRSC and the Ministry of Finance has promised a financial contribution of 3 000 000 USD.

The total RBSA allocations for the four countries amounted to 335 000\$. Regarding **efficiency of resources used**, there was sufficient justification for RBSA allocations for the achievement of intended outcomes. In the case

of Ethiopia, RBSA resources were used as seed money and helped raise about 340, 150 USD from several donors. The rate of RBSA budget implementation was high (98, 48 %).

**The management arrangements were in general effective** because all parties involved in the CPOs understood their roles and responsibilities and tripartite constituents were involved in an appropriate manner in the implementation of CPOs. Work arrangements were guided by the ILO's policies and procedures. OBWs provided framework for RBSA allocations. The ILO field offices monitored the CPOs in partnership with the R.O, social protection specialists, and the HQ. In spite of the limited number of ILO experts and the absence of a social protection specialist in the DWCT of Dakar, management and technical and administrative backstopping was found good.

As far as **sustainability** is concerned, tripartite constituents and partners recognized that in Botswana, Ethiopia, Mauritania and Senegal significant contributions have been made to advance social protection. Countries are struggling to implement the Social Protection Floors Recommendation 202. All results of the social protection outcome were anchored in national institutions. The majority of constituents reaffirmed their will and commitment to continue with the projects but they were not confident in their capacity to raise sustainable financial resources. The technical capacity of national constituents is still weak in some areas such as the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of social protection floor policies and programmes.

## Conclusions

- The process of CPOs was iterative and transparent and their design was logical and coherent. However, some completion dates were over-ambitious, which combined to institutional inertia and lack of coordination of nationals created unexpected delays.
- Interventions have influenced all four countries in their social protection policies. Various improvements were noticed in terms of capacity building, project design, policy reforms, etc.
- Outputs involving government inputs have not been fully achieved for reasons such as government “machinery” or the burden of bureaucracy, limited institutional leadership, delays in getting resources and arrangements in place.
- The Mission was not able to examine the efficiency of resource use in detail. However, based on financial data available and discussions with various stakeholders, the general view was that there was sufficient justification for RBSA allocations. Limited RBSA funding and delays in the disbursements were cited as the most important bottlenecks.
- RBSA is an innovative and flexible means of funding but its strategic objectives were not well understood by the majority of constituents who continue to claim for more funding from the ILO.

- The management arrangements were effective. Parties involved in the implementation of CPOs understood their roles and responsibilities. The ILO has provided quality advisory backstopping services to constituents in the four countries. The ILO field offices monitored the CPOs effectively.
- To some extent, the ILO has been able to develop sustainable capacities in the area of social protection. Results of the social protection outputs were anchored in national institutions. However, capacity and financial gaps remain in the four countries at the national level.

### **Lessons learned and emerging good practices**

- In order to implement successfully targeted CPOs, it is capital for constituents to have gap filling financial resources or at least the capacity to write funding proposals in order to mobilize financial resources at national and international levels.
- The generic phrase “social protection floors”, in the plural, refers to a variety of “possible floors”. It is important to “adapt” each global policy to country-specific circumstances.
- Social protection floor components can be maintained on a long-term basis only if sufficient capacity and financial resources are made available by governments themselves and the constituents.
- The successful implementation of Social protection policies requires the involvement of the Ministries of Labour together with the Ministries of Finance of recipient countries at an early stage of the formulation process of social protection policies.
- The creation of national and multi-stakeholder social protection platform and joint programmes in Ethiopia, in Senegal and Botswana emerged as a good practice.
- The ILO initiative on SRSC is promising because it can contribute to provide workers in the informal sector with an appropriate social protection system.
- It is crucial to build consensus among constituents and partners, develop a common action plan on the basis of agreed CPOs and resource mobilisation and allocation.
- Donor support and partnerships with other institutions have proved critical in the effective and timely delivery of services to constituents and in leveraging resources and policy influence.
- Building tripartite constituents’ capacity to design and implement social protection initiatives typically requires advocacy work and partnerships that may span several years and not just a biennium.

- The ILO must be well prepared to engage with countries and a wide range of stakeholders over the medium to long term in order to yield sustainable results.

## **Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1:** The ILO Office should do advocacy work and urge African countries to devote a percentage of national income to social protection measures at a basic level.

**Recommendation 2:** The ROAF should emphasise on building the capacity of constituents in resource mobilisation.

**Recommendation 3:** COs should promote the values and strategic objectives of RBSA which is a flexible and catalytic fund with leveraging capacity.

**Recommendation 4:** COs are recommended to build strong and sustainable partnerships in order to achieve greater and more sustainable impact with RBSA limited funding.

**Recommendation 5:** The COs and ROAF should improve the formulation of CPOs and the information management system.

**Recommendation 6:** The RO should conduct the RBSA evaluation at the end of each biennium.

**Recommendation 7:** The RO should disburse RBSA funds in time to allow proper, appropriate and effective implementation of CPOs.

**Recommendation 8:** Cos and ROAF are advised to promote innovative and multi-policy approaches (social security, enterprise creation, social dialogue, and working conditions) to achieve more and better social protection of the informal sector workers with strong participation of their representatives.

**Recommendation 9:** It is recommended to tripartite constituents to develop national leadership and ownership of social protection policies with the ILO assistance but not its leadership.



## 2. Description of the CPOs

### 2.1 Brief background on project and context

As described in the TORs in appendix 1, the Regular Budget Supplementary Account (RBSA) is an account established based on the voluntary contributions of Member States, in addition to their assessed contributions to the regular budget. It is directed to the implementation of decent work priorities and outcomes formulated in dialogue with tripartite constituents in Member States. RBSA can only be used in direct support to member States, as part of Official Development Assistance (ODA).

The ILO Evaluation Framework and Policy requires that RBSA-funded initiatives are evaluated in order to assess the contributions of RBSA towards achieving relevant Programme and Budget Outcomes, through achievement of country/sub-regional/regional programme outcomes, as envisaged in the relevant Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs)/ Sub-regional Decent Work Programmes (SRDWPs) mainly implemented through the Regular Budget and/or Extra-budgetary resources. This particular evaluation will deal with the Programme and Budget Outcomes related to social protection indicated as follows:

- ✓ Outcome 4: Social security - More people have access to better managed and more gender equitable social security benefits
- ✓ Outcome 5: Working conditions - Women and men have improved and more equitable working conditions
- ✓ Outcome 6: Occupational safety and health - Workers and enterprises benefit from improved safety and health conditions at work
- ✓ Outcome 7: Labour migration - More migrant workers are protected and more migrant workers have access to productive employment and decent work
- ✓ Outcome 8: HIV/AIDS - The world of work responds effectively to the HIV/AIDS epidemic

The ILO has received over US\$ 36 million for the RBSA for 2012-13. These funds are allocated to help achieve specific results in ODA-eligible countries, as identified in DWCPs. RBSA typically complements resources from the ILO's Regular Budget and extra-budgetary resources for Technical Cooperation, making it possible to scale up and accelerate activities. RBSA can also be used as seed money to develop larger technical cooperation projects or to fill in important funding gaps where other resources are not available, making it a critically important component of the resource mix to deliver decent work results. RBSA also allows the Office to work in developing countries that do not attract donor funding easily. RBSA is used to address the highest priorities of the ILO to achieve the Decent Work Agenda. It is the flexibility of RBSA and the opportunity to complement and leverage other resources through RBSA that makes it such an essential component of the ILO's integrated resource used.

One of the work areas funded by the RBSA is enhancing the coverage and effectiveness of social protection for all. The Decent Work Agenda for Africa (DWAA), which guides ILO’s work in the region, also has significant focus on the social protection strategic objective.

## 2.2 Description of the CPOs

The following 4 CPOs have been selected for this independent thematic evaluation of RBSA support:

**Table 1:** Overview of CPOs

CPO	Office	Amount in USD	P&B Outcome	Approval Date
<b>BWA126:</b> Government and social partners have developed and implemented policies on improving management and effectiveness of the national social security system.	DWT/CO-Pretoria	135,000	4	4 June 2012
<b>ETH154:</b> National plans and strategies social protection package in place to extend social protection and basic	CO-Addis	40,000	4	4 June 2012
<b>MRT104</b> <sup>1</sup> : In partnership with national social partners, the Government designs and implements social protection strategies	DWT/CO-Dakar	90,000	4	29 June 2012
<b>SEN126</b> <sup>2</sup> : The technical, legal, financial and institutional framework of formal social protection systems is reinforced	DWT/CO-Dakar	70,000	4	29 June 2012

The four countries, namely Botswana, Ethiopia, Mauritania and Senegal are on the DAC list of ODA recipients, therefore eligible to RBSA funding. The CPOs of the four countries are related to P&B Outcome 4 on Social Security formulated as follows “More people have access to better managed and more gender equitable social security benefits”.

<sup>1</sup> In French, le gouvernement en concertation avec les partenaires sociaux élabore et met en œuvre des stratégies concernant la protection sociale

<sup>2</sup> In French, le dispositif technique, juridique, financier et institutionnel des systèmes formels de protection sociale est renforcé

### 3. Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

The ILO project evaluations are used to improve project performance and contribute towards organizational learning. The independent evaluation is conducted to assess the achievements obtained through the support of RBSA to CPOs in the African Region concerning the enhancement of the coverage and effectiveness of social protection. The evaluation was conducted by an external evaluator and covered the CPOs in the above four countries.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are:

1. Assess the contribution of the RBSA fund to achieve the biennium CPO targets;
2. Assess and highlight progress and achievements obtained with the support of RBSA to the respective CPOs, in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the outputs and outcomes;
3. Assess the factors that affected the progress and achievements obtained;
4. Highlight problems encountered and constraints faced;
5. Identify main lessons from the support of RBSA to the respective CPOs;
6. Provide recommendations for the future support of RBSA to the CPOs addressing the coverage and effectiveness of social protection for all.

The evaluation specifically addresses progress and achievements obtained with the support of RBSA for the biennium 2012-2013. The evaluation also considers the totality of work undertaken to achieve the CPOs, including with sources of funding other than RBSA.

Five core evaluative questions guided the evaluation. In particular, the RBSA evaluation aimed to assess the relevance of project design and strategic fit as it relates to the adequacy of the planning/CPO selection process, the extent to which planned objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities were realistic. The evaluation explored also the contribution of the four CPOs to ILO's policy frameworks. Finally, it considered the effectiveness of CPOs, efficiency of resource use, effectiveness of management arrangements, sustainability of achievements, and emerging good practices and lessons learned.

Main users of the findings are expected to be ILO staff involved in the implementation of the CPO activities, ILO programming units, concerned specialists, ILO M&E staff at country, sub-regional, the Regional Office for Africa (ROAF), HQ, tripartite constituents in the relevant countries and potential donors and implementing partners.

The independent evaluation took place in May and June 2015.

## 4. Methodology

The methodology follows the requirements of the TORs as set out in Appendix 1.

### 4.1 Evaluation approach

The evaluation approach was participatory, consultative, process-oriented and qualitative. As far as possible, it was based on principles of impartiality of the evaluator, independence, objectivity and transparency of the evaluation process, sufficient and appropriate evidence to support conclusions, and fair and balanced reporting.

The evaluation was carried out through a combination of desk reviews, interviews by telephone/Skype with key ILO staff and stakeholders in ILO headquarters and field offices in Africa. For consultations with ILO's Regional Management, staff and constituents as well as other key stakeholders, field visits included specific countries such as Ethiopia and the ILO Office in Dakar<sup>3</sup>.

The evaluation abides by the ILO evaluation policy, the norms and standards for evaluation as set out by the UNEG and based on OECD principles and guidelines.

### 4.2 Desk review

A desk review analysed CPOs and other documentation provided by the evaluation manager. The documents were related to texts of approved CPOs/RPO, Programmes Decisions Minutes, technical reports, RBSA guidelines/IGDS, P&B for 2012-13, Programme Implementation Report and DWAA.

On the other hand, relevant regional and global policy documents related to the strategic objective of Strengthening Social Protection were also analysed (list of documents reviewed in appendix 3). The desk review involved also the analysis of documents provided by the C.Os, constituents and partners. The inputs by all ILO and non-ILO stakeholders involved in the implementation of the CPOs/ RPO have been also reviewed.

The draft evaluation report was shared with a selected group of key stakeholders with a request for comments within a specified time frame. The draft report was finalized thereafter.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ethiopia is included in order to facilitate in-depth interviews with the Regional Office for Africa for all CPOs concerned. In addition, the consultant will be able to liaise with CO-Addis concerning ETH802. A field visit to DWT/CO-Dakar has also been included for in-depth information on the relevant CPOs for Mauritania and Senegal, the technical backstopping of which are provided from this office.

### 4.3 Interviews

A total of 20 stakeholders were interviewed either face to face or through telephone/Skype. The list of interviewees (appendix 2) included (i) ILO Headquarters Social Protection Department (SOCPRO), the ROAF, ILO Decent Work Support Teams (DWT), C.O (ii) tripartite constituents in the four countries, and (iii) other stakeholders as required.

The three expected outputs of the evaluation were:

1. An evaluation summary according to the ILO's template for summaries of independent evaluation reports;
2. A draft evaluation report;
3. A final evaluation report incorporating comments provided by key stakeholders.

### 4.4 Limitations of the methodology

Two limitations were identified. Firstly, the evaluation of the CPOs of Mauritania and Botswana was entirely based on desk review and telephone interviews instead of face to face meetings and interaction with stakeholders.

Secondly, implementation reports of the C.Os for the biennium 2012-2013 and disaggregated data on capacity building workshops and awareness campaigns, and non RBSA resources mobilised were not most of the time available. As a consequence, certain gaps may remain. The main challenges faced by the Mission included the inability to access final implementation reports for some CPOs including SEN 126, MRT 104, and the seemingly poor information management.

## 5. Findings for each criterion and CPO

The following chapter deals with the findings of the report in terms of design, relevance and strategic fit, CPOs effectiveness, efficiency of resources used, effective management arrangements, and sustainability.

### 5.1 Design of the CPOs

The ILO established the RBSA to support decent work priorities and outcomes through un-earmarked voluntary contributions to the ILO technical cooperation programme. The planning and selection process of the CPOs were conducted as follows:

-CPOs were proposed by C.O and the ROAF and prioritized and budgeted, followed by an appraisal on the basis of their fitness with DWCP results and indicators. Criteria such as the achievement of targets established in the P&B 2012-2013, the contribution to national development objectives and office wide collaboration were used.

-CPOs were supported by a results framework and summarised in the Implementation Planning Module of the Integrated Resource Information System (IRIS) in addition to outcome-based work plans (OBWs) comprising project rationale, milestones and specific outputs, expanded strategies, and total resource requirements and resource gap for each CPO.

-Candidate countries were on the DAC list of ODA recipients and the amount requested were compatible with the resource gaps reflected in the IRIS SM/IP module.

According to stakeholders, the planning of CPOs was realistic for the implementation of some activities such as capacity building, public awareness campaigns and feasibility studies. For other activities which involved government inputs such as drafting policy documents and legislation, the process was slow. Consequently, there was a reprogramming of some CPOs for the biennium 2014-2015.

The extent to which planned activities and outputs could logically and realistically be expected to meet desired outcomes depended on factors such as the availability of financial resources to fund non RBSA supported activities, the availability of institutional and individual capacity for the implementation of activities and the nature of the bureaucracy in the country.

Some tripartite constituents recognized that they did not know well the ILO criteria and process in selecting CPOs for funding. This was particularly the case of workers and employers in the various countries. They were informed that their countries were selected for RBSA funding but did not know why and how.

A common concern expressed by the majority of constituents was the limited RBSA resources available to undertake the activities. According to them, this is the reason why RBSA impact was limited.

The RBSA allocations were approved in June 2012. As financial resources should be normally spent in the biennium in which they were allocated, delays in disbursements might result in delays in CPOs implementation.

Finally, timing of the RBSA evaluation was late as some stakeholders thought it should take place just after the biennium, in early 2014.

## **5.2 Relevance and strategic fit**

The four CPOs in the area of social protection have been matched to the ILO SPF, P&B 2012-2013, DWAA, and DWCPs. Each country outcome contributed to one or more strategic objectives of the SPF. In response to the needs of ILO constituents, Outcome 4 on Social security has been systematically addressed.

All stakeholders interviewed agreed that the CPOs were relevant because they addressed key issues in Social Protection in the four countries.

### 5.3 CPOs effectiveness

CPOs effectiveness in the four countries is summarized as follows:

**Table 2:** CPOs achievements in Botswana and Ethiopia

Countries /CPOs	Major planned outputs and milestones	Output achieved in 2012-2013	Comments
<b>Botswana BWA 126</b>	Government and social partners have developed and implement policies on improving management and effectiveness of the national social security system.		
	1. By June/July, financial studies towards the establishment of a new Occupational-Based Pension Scheme are conducted and submitted to national authorities for endorsement.	Feasibility study of the establishment of Botswana's National Pension Fund achieved in time.	Training workshops and consultative meetings organized.
	2. By October/November, a comprehensive national social security policy developed and implemented.	Not achieved during the biennium.	The output is planned again for the 2014-2015 biennium
<b>Ethiopia ETH 154</b>	National plans and strategies in place to extend social protection and basic social protection package.		
	1. National Social Protection Policy finalized	Output achieved. National Social Protection Policy finalized in 2012 and adopted in 2015	This output is a joint effort of NSPP .The document will be translated from Amharic <sup>4</sup> into English
	2. Strategy for the implementation of the new Private Organisation Employees' Pension Proclamation in place and extension of its coverage developed and made operational	The output was modified	The ILO conducted advocacy and awareness campaigns on the advantage of pensions
	3. All newly recruited core staff members trained in basic social security principles and administration of social security.	Output achieved. However, only key members of agencies were trained.	ILO resources used for the training.
	4. Support the development of the social protection strategy.	Output achieved.	The strategy is in place but it is still a draft
	5. Support the pilot testing of social protection strategy in 3 regions of the country.	Output achieved. The process was initiated by UNICEF.	The ILO gave its support.

<sup>4</sup> One of Ethiopia's local language



The first result for Botswana was the feasibility study of the establishment of Botswana's National Pension Fund. The tangible result is the published report adopted by the national social protection working group, a tripartite task team of 17 members.

The second one was training on costing of national social protection floors with the International Training Centre of the ILO (ITC/ILO). This activity also resulted in a program to assist the country with funds obtained from ONE UN Framework.

The output related to "a comprehensive national social security policy developed and implemented" was not achieved due to delays beyond the ILO's control as well as the Constituents. The ILO inputs for the drafting of the Botswana bill were in place. The attainment of the output was deferred to the 2014/2015 biennium.

As far as Ethiopia is concerned, the National Social Protection Policy was a key output. The Policy was finalized in 2012 and adopted in 2015. It was a joint effort of NSPP<sup>5</sup> members. The ILO contributed financially and technically to the achievement of the output.

---

<sup>5</sup> The NSPP was established in 2009. The NSPP functions as a national multi-stakeholder mechanism that advocates for social protection at different levels and serves as a forum for building strategic partnerships and organizing analysis and dialogue on policy options.

**Table 3: CPOs achieved in Mauritania and Senegal**

<b>Countries /CPOs</b>	<b>Major planned outputs and milestones</b>	<b>Output achieved in 2012-2013</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Mauritania MRT104</b>	In partnership with national social partners, the Government designs and implements social protection strategies		
	1.The CNSS <sup>6</sup> is provided with an operational information technology (IT) master plan.	Output achieved.	
	2. The legal framework of the CNSS is revised.	Output achieved.	
	3.The structure of CNSS is revised.	Output achieved	
	4. CNSS executives are trained to make operational the new “environment”.	Output achieved	2 workshops organised for 60 participants
	5.The statistical data collection system is reorganised and made operational.	Output partly achieved	The system was reorganized but it was not operational
	6.An actuarial study is conducted with the support of the ILO	Output partly achieved	Statistical data not collected
	7. Board Members are trained.	Output achieved	
<b>Senegal SN 126</b>	The technical, legal, financial and institutional framework of formal social protection systems is reinforced		
	1.The Senegalese legal and institutional framework of formal social security systems is updated and consolidated/	Output achieved	2 workshops organized
	2. Mechanisms of social protection extension to informal and migrant workers are studied.	Output achieved (5 studies conducted in 2013).	Project document has been drafted
	3.Relevant social protection conventions are popularized.	Output achieved	
	4.The National Social Security Training Centre project is implemented	Output not achieved	Not planned for RBSA funding.
	5. The action plan for the extension of social protection gives to migrant workers and their families’ access to social services.	Output achieved An action plan 2014-2016 is available	Not planned for RBSA funding.

<sup>6</sup> The National Social Security Fund. In French, Caisse Nationale de Sécurité Sociale.

In Mauritania, major outputs have been achieved. For example, the CNSS has been provided with an IT master plan and the legal framework has been revised. Altogether, 60 CNSS executives and tripartite constituents have been trained. In terms of limitations, the statistical data collection system has not been operational yet and the actuarial study is facing data collection problems.

In Senegal, the ILO worked in close partnership with the members of the Social Protection Joint Programme chaired by UNICEF. As there was institutional change in 2012<sup>7</sup>, ILO adapted its priorities and put emphasis on social protection of workers in the informal sector. In this regard, all five studies related to the Simplified Regime for Small Contributors<sup>8</sup> (SRSC) were conducted in 2013 and the first National Dialogue held in January 2014. The Project document (PRODOC) and the action plan 2014-2016 are available. ILO's contribution is promising as the Government has an Order establishing the technical committee on SRSC. The Ministry of Finance has promised a financial contribution of 3 000 000 USD.

Finally, in all countries, tripartite constituents have been involved in the implementation of activities. The constituents were members of the national platforms and working groups and took part to the training workshops and awareness campaigns. In Mauritania<sup>9</sup> and Senegal<sup>10</sup> some of the representatives of social partners claimed for better communication with the C.O and more participation in the design and implementation of CPOs.

#### 5.4 Efficiency of resources used

Table 4 summarizes RBSA contributions, expenses and additional resources mobilised by countries.

**Table 4:** CPOs expenses in 2012-2013

<b>Description</b>	<b>RBSA contribution (USD)</b>	<b>RBSA expenses (USD)</b>	<b>Other contributions (USD)</b>
Botswana <b>BWA 126</b>	135, 000	111, 415 <sup>11</sup>	N/A
Ethiopia <b>ETH 154</b>	40, 000	40, 000	340, 150
Mauritania <b>MRT104</b>	90, 000	85, 297	N/A
Senegal <b>SEN126</b>	70,000	70, 000	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>335 000</b>	<b>306, 712</b>	<b>340, 150</b>

<sup>7</sup> The new Senegalese authorities gave priority to developing social safety nets initiatives.

<sup>8</sup> In French, it is named Régime simplifié pour les petits contribuables

<sup>9</sup> The representative of Workers

<sup>10</sup> The representative of Employers

<sup>11</sup> The original balance of the Botswana CPO was reduced by 23,584.64\$.

The total RBSA allocations for the four countries amounted to 335 000\$. The rate of RBSA budget implementation was 98, 48%. RBSA contribution was used as seed money in Ethiopia. It helped raise about 590 150\$ from several donors.

RBSA allocations for the achievement of planned outcomes were used efficiently for the purposes set out in the OBWs. Financial resources were spent in relevant activities and disbursements and expenditures were in line with budgetary plans.

Through RBSA contributions, a package of initiatives was delivered in the four countries. RBSA has enabled the countries to help formulate policies and projects, and build the capacity of constituents. In Senegal, Ethiopia and Botswana, RBSA funds were complemented by resources brought in by partners.

Dependence on external funding partners meant that initiatives could not be funded or were delayed. Recipient countries did not contribute financially to the implementation of the CPOs. As a consequence, the ILO inputs were in line with the schedule whereas outputs requiring government inputs were generally delayed.

The general view of tripartite constituents was that RBSA funds were modest and they found that it would be difficult to achieve greater impact with limited funds.

## 5.5 Effectiveness of management arrangements

Parties involved in the projects said that they understood their roles and responsibilities. In general, relevant ILO stakeholders were involved in an appropriate manner in the implementation of CPOs. For illustration, the Ethiopian Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (MLSA) is assuming a leadership role in the development of the NSPP.

Work arrangements were guided by the ILO's policies and procedures. OBWs provided framework for RBSA allocations. The RBSA was subject to the evaluation framework and policy and operated according to similar procedures to the regular budget of the ILO. Likewise, it was subject to the same governance and oversight rules.

At the HQ level, PROGRAM and FINANCE monitored respectively the use of RBSA within the periodic OBWs reviews and within the context of established periodic resource reviews. At the regional level, the ILO Director for Africa, with the support of C.O Directors and DWTs, has been responsible for overseeing the coordination of outputs.

As far as the use of IRIS is concerned, the offices utilised the system just for planning the CPOs because only the planning module was operational in 2012-2013 for the African region.

Backstopping was needed; however the ILO had a limited number of experts. With an average of one social protection specialist for 15 countries, it was difficult to provide all constituents with the technical advisory services they needed in a timely way. In spite of the limited number of experts and the absence of a social protection specialist in the DWCT of Dakar, management and technical and administrative backstopping was found good. The technical specialists have provided policy advice and technical assistance specifically to ILO's constituents on social protection to influence national policies. They have also advocated the inclusion of social protection priorities in the DWCPs in the countries of coverage.

The ILO field offices monitored the CPOs in partnership with the R.O, social protection specialists and the HQ. Every six months, OBWs were reviewed and bottlenecks identified. At the end of the biennium 2012-2013, an implementation report was prepared by the ROAF as a contribution to the global ILO Programme implementation report produced on 31 January 2014. The regional output was derived from the contributions of the R.O of Dakar, Addis Ababa and Pretoria.

Finally, C.Os responded to changing circumstances and emerging needs through regular dialogue and interaction with tripartite constituents. For example, the C.O in Senegal produced an innovative proposal on SRSC.

## 5.6 Sustainability

For tripartite constituents, building national capacity through trainings and participation to the national platforms and working groups on social protection was one of the best ways to achieve sustainability. In spite of ILO's efforts to build the capacity of constituents in order to make social protection floors a national reality, the technical capacity of national constituents is still weak. Constituents expressed their capacity building needs in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of social protection floor policies and programmes. Tripartite constituents underlined the fact that a limited number of constituents had the chance to be trained. It was difficult for the ILO to involve many participants in the trainings organised at the ILO/ITC.

At the institutional level, in addition to technical capacity, the main signs of sustainability were the leadership of the MLSA in the design and implementation of the CPOs in Ethiopia. The ILO's expertise helped to reposition the MLSA as the main government body in charge of social protection policy formulation and implementation<sup>12</sup>. The MLSA and the MoARD chair the NSPP.

---

<sup>12</sup> Previously, the Ethiopian Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MoARD) was in charge of social protection.

Tripartite constituents and partners recognize that in Botswana, Ethiopia, Mauritania and Senegal significant contributions have been made to advance social protection. Countries are struggling to implement the Social Protection Floors Recommendation adopted by the ILC in June 2012 (No. 202) with the objective of “implementing social protection floors within strategies for the extension of social security that progressively ensure higher levels of social security to as many people as possible”.

All results of the social protection outcome were anchored in national institutions. The majority of constituents reaffirmed their will and commitment to continue with the projects but they were not confident in their capacity to raise sustainable financial resources. Those resources are needed not only to sustain the CPOs but also to extend social protection. For most of them, donor funding will be needed in the coming years for the design and implementation of new social protection policies and the running of national social protection platforms, as well.

It is a fact that all tripartite constituents relied on donor funding for the implementation of the CPOs. National social protection platforms were run with donor money and governments contributed generally in human resources.

## 6. Conclusions

### Design of CPOs

- The criteria used for the iterative selection of CPOs for RBSA funding were objective and the selection process was transparent thanks to the IRIS planning module. The CPOs design was logical and coherent.
- The reprogramming of some CPOs for the biennium 2014-2015 was a consequence of the delays in CPOs implementation. Those delays derived mainly from the lack of adequate financial resources and the burden of bureaucracy.
- In terms of limits of the design, the evaluation noticed that there was no risk analysis of CPOs, some completion dates were over-ambitious, institutional inertia and sometimes lack of coordination of nationals created unexpected delays.

### Relevance and strategic fit

- The CPOs were relevant because they addressed key issues in social protection in all four countries. The CPOs in the area of social protection encompassed various aspects such as legal, social, economic, fiscal and actuarial aspects of social security. In this regard, they contributed to ILO's SPF, P&B 2012-2013, DWAA, and DWCP. Likewise, CPOs implementation has influenced national, sub regional and regional policy agendas on social protection. All RBSA funded outputs were relevant to the outcomes.
- The CPOs were consistent with beneficiary requirements, country needs and donor policies. The ILO has used its comparative advantage in the formulation and implementation of CPOs.

### Effectiveness of CPOs

- Activities/inputs such as capacity building and project design were in line with the schedule of outputs as defined by the C.O and work plans.
- Outputs involving government inputs have not been fully achieved in the four countries for several reasons such as government burden of bureaucracy, limited coordination at the institutional level, delays in getting resources and arrangements in place. For example, in Botswana, a comprehensive national social security policy was not developed and implemented due to delays beyond the ILO's control as well as the Constituents. Ethiopia's social protection strategy is still a draft. Planned outputs in Mauritania and Senegal are being implemented in a slower pace than expected.
- Interventions have influenced all four countries in their social protection policies. Various improvements were noticed in terms of capacity building (all countries), project design, policy reforms, etc.

- Mobilizing sustainable resource was a challenge to all countries.

### **Efficiency of resource use**

The Mission was not able to examine efficiency of resource use in detail. There were minor differences between the financial data provided to the consultant. However, based on financial data available and discussions with various stakeholders, the general view was that:

- There was sufficient justification for RBSA allocations for the achievement of intended outcomes. The rate of RBSA budget implementation was high (98, 48 %).
- RBSA funds were allocated strategically and efficiently. Disbursements and expenditures were in line with budgetary plans.
- Limited RBSA funding and delays in the disbursements were cited as the most important bottlenecks.
- RBSA is an innovative and flexible means of funding however its strategic objectives were not well understood by the majority of constituents who continue to claim for more funding.

### **Effectiveness of management arrangements**

- All parties involved in the implementation of CPOs understood their roles and responsibilities. Relevant ILO stakeholders and tripartite constituents were involved in an appropriate manner in the planning and implementation of CPOs.
- The ILO has provided quality advisory backstopping services to constituents in the four countries on the design, management and governance of social security schemes. In partnership with UN institutions, the ILO has also built the capacity of constituents and facilitated national dialogues on national social protection strategies.
- The ILO field offices monitored the CPOs effectively in partnership with the R.O, social protection specialists, and the HQ. Every six months, OBWs were reviewed and bottlenecks identified. At the end of the biennium, a regional implementation report synthesising C.O reports was prepared by the R.O as a contribution to the global ILO Programme implementation report for 2012-2013.

### **Sustainability**

- In all four countries significant contributions have been made to advance social protection in the sense that enabling environments have been partly built or strengthened. The Social Protection Floors Recommendation R202 providing guidance to Members to “implement social protection floors within strategies for the extension of social security that progressively ensure higher levels of social security to as many people as possible” is put in practice gradually.



- To some extent, the ILO has been able to develop sustainable national, sub regional and regional capacities in the area of social protection through capacity building workshops and awareness campaigns. However, capacity gaps remain in Senegal, Mauritania, Ethiopia and Botswana in areas such as actuarial science, pensions and social welfare management.
- It is a fact that all tripartite constituents relied on donor funding for the implementation of the CPOs. National social protection platforms were run with donor money and governments contributed generally in human resources. All results of the social protection outcome were anchored in national institutions. For sure, the great majority of constituents are willing and committed to continue with the projects. The unanswered question is whether they will have the financial capacity to sustain the outputs and extend social protection.

## 7. Recommendations

**Recommendation 1: The ILO should advocate for the mobilisation of national and sustainable financial resources to fund social protection policies.**

While mobilizing external resources can be beneficial, the ILO should urge the four African countries to devote a percentage of national income<sup>13</sup>-even though modest- to social protection measures at a basic level.

**Recommendation 2: Emphasise on building the capacity of constituents in resource mobilisation**

It is recommended to the ILO Office to build the capacity of tripartite constituents in resource mobilisation. The Office should provide constituents with information on funding opportunities, resource mobilisation tools, skills in proposal writing (capacity to prepare sellable and competitive proposals), monitoring and evaluation as well as assistance and advice in the area.

**Recommendation 3: Promote the values and strategic objectives of RBSA**

C.O should better communicate on the values and strategic objectives of the RBSA, a flexible and catalytic fund with leveraging capacity that complements ILO extra budgetary Technical Cooperation (XBTC)

**Recommendation 4: Build strong and sustainable partnerships in order to achieve greater and more sustainable impact with RBSA limited funding.**

It is recommended to C.O to reinforce the partnerships with other relevant financial and technical partners, international NGOs, local civil society organizations (CSO), decentralized entities and private enterprises

---

<sup>13</sup> Studies by the ILO, in consultation with the IMF, show that in countries such as Benin, el Salvador, Mozambique and Vietnam, major social protection floor programmes would cost between 1 and 2 per cent of GDP.

interested in developing corporate social responsibility (CSR). It is a way of “Delivering as One” and a means of building mutual capacity and strong partnerships. For such partnerships to be successful, targeted CPOs must be clearly defined and agreed upon.

**Recommendation 5: Improve the formulation of CPOs and the information management system at the C.O and ROAF levels.**

During the design phase of CPOs, it is recommended to C.O and the ROAF to improve the risk analysis of CPOs and identify remedial actions. Information management of CPOs is capital to allow decision making processes and organizational learning. The ILO’s advocacy work for social protection extension should go beyond tripartite constituents. The technical leadership of the Ministries of Labour is pivotal but it is not enough without the financial collaboration of the Ministries of Finance and the Parliaments who play strategic roles.

**Recommendation 6: Conduct the RBSA evaluation at the end of the biennium.**

The R.O should conduct the RBSA evaluation in time (at the end of the biennium). Not only it makes the RBSA evaluation easier but also it provides constituents with lessons learned.

**Recommendation 7: Disburse RBSA funds in time.**

The ILO Headquarter should strive to disburse or release RBSA funds in time to allow proper, appropriate and effective implementation of CPOs. Funds should be available at the beginning of each biennium.

**Recommendation 8: Promote innovative and multi-policy approaches** (social security, enterprise creation, social dialogue, and working conditions) to achieve more and better social protection of the informal sector workers with strong participation of their representatives.

Many workers of the informal sector<sup>14</sup> can benefit from social protection services if the services are trustworthy and adapted to their needs and financial capacity. The workers need systems with a community background and strong relationships patterns (case of micro insurance systems).

**Recommendation 9: develop national leadership and ownership of social protection policies**

It is recommended to the tripartite constituents to develop ownership of social protection policies and to take the lead in their implementation. The ILO can play a supportive role. It is up to national constituents to take the lead for strategic and sustainability reasons.

---

<sup>14</sup> The workers of the informal sector are not civil servants or formal business workers.

## 8. Lessons learned and good practices

1. The generic phrase “social protection floors”, in the plural, refers to a variety of “possible floors” depending on specific countries. Therefore, it is important to “adapt” each global policy to country-specific circumstances (horizontal approach versus vertical approach). In any case, it is recommended to build new social protection policies anchored in traditional values of solidarity and self help.
2. It is important for constituents to have gap filling resources or at least the capacity to mobilize financial resources for successful implementation of targeted CPOs. If no, the delivery of planned outcomes during the biennium becomes difficult.
3. The successful implementation of Social protection policies requires the involvement, among others, of Parliaments, Ministries of Finance and Labour at an early stage of the formulation process. It is important for all stakeholders to better understand that social protection represents a win-win investment that pays off both in the medium and long term due to the impact on human development.
4. Social protection floor components can be maintained on a long-term basis only if sufficient financial resources are made available by governments themselves and the constituents. Donor aid can help to kick-start the process of creating social floors in low-income countries; however in the long run its implementation has to be technically and financially sustainable at national levels.
5. The creation of national multi-stakeholder platforms and joint programmes (Ethiopia, Botswana and Senegal) that advocate for social protection and support strategic partnerships and cooperation at the national level is an example of good practice. National platforms allow members to sit together, build consensus<sup>15</sup>, speak in one voice and join their efforts and resources to achieve better social security.
6. Conditional cash transfer programmes are very useful as they target families in need of social protection. However, contributive systems are equally important for sustainability reasons. In this regard ILO’s work in Senegal on the SRSC is promising.
7. Donor support and institutional partnerships have been critical in the effective and timely delivery of services to constituents and in leveraging resources and policy influence.
8. Building tripartite constituents’ capacity to design and implement social protection initiatives and influence policies typically requires advocacy work and partnerships that may span several years and not just a biennium. Significant results typically require more than two years to reach maturity.

---

<sup>15</sup> In Ethiopia, the fact of using the African Union definition of social protection as an entry point helped a lot in the definition of priorities and facilitated collaborative work.

9. The ILO must be well prepared to engage with countries and a wide range of stakeholders over the medium to long term in order to yield sustainable results.

## 9. Annexes

### 9.1 Terms of reference

#### **Independent Evaluation of African Country Programme Outcomes (CPOs) Funded from 2012-13 RBSA in the Thematic Area of Social Protection**

22 April 2015

---

##### **1. Introduction and rationale for evaluation**

The Regular Budget Supplementary Account (RBSA) is an account established based on the voluntary contributions of Member States, in addition to their assessed contributions to the regular budget. It is directed to the implementation of decent work priorities and outcomes formulated in dialogue with tripartite constituents in Member States. Based on the endorsement of the Governing Body and approval of the International Labour Conference during the examination of the International Labour Organization's Programme & Budget for 2008-09, the ILO Director-General first announced its implementation on 28 February 2008 (IGDS Number 5 (Version 1)). The announcement stipulates that RBSA can only be used in direct support to member States, as part of Official Development Assistance (ODA).

The ILO Evaluation Framework and Policy requires that RBSA-funded initiatives are evaluated in order to assess the contributions of RBSA towards achieving relevant Programme and Budget Outcomes, through achievement of country/sub-regional/regional programme outcomes, as envisaged in the relevant Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs)/ Sub-regional Decent Work Programmes (SRDWPs) mainly implemented through the Regular Budget and/or Extra-budgetary resources. This particular evaluation will deal with the Programme and Budget Outcomes related to social protection indicated as follows:

- Outcome 4: Social security - More people have access to better managed and more gender equitable social security benefits
- Outcome 5: Working conditions - Women and men have improved and more equitable working conditions
- Outcome 6: Occupational safety and health - Workers and enterprises benefit from improved safety and health conditions at work
- Outcome 7: Labour migration - More migrant workers are protected and more migrant workers have access to productive employment and decent work
- Outcome 8: HIV/AIDS - The world of work responds effectively to the HIV/AIDS epidemic

The conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation are expected to be useful for the assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, impact, efficiency and sustainability of the interventions; to identify appropriate recommendations for a potential second phase; and to document lessons learnt for organizational learning.

Main users of the findings are expected to be ILO staff involved in the implementation of the CPO activities, ILO programming units, concerned specialists, ILO Monitoring and Evaluation staff at country, sub-regional, regional and/or HQ, tripartite constituents in the relevant countries and potential donors and implementing partners.

## **2. Brief background on project and context**

The ILO has received over US\$ 36 million for the RBSA for 2012-13. These funds are allocated to help achieve specific results in ODA-eligible countries, as identified in Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs). RBSA typically complements resources from the ILO's Regular Budget and extra-budgetary resources for Technical Cooperation, making it possible to scale up and accelerate activities. RBSA can also be used as seed money to develop larger technical cooperation projects or to fill in important funding gaps where other resources are not available, making it a critically important component of the resource mix to deliver decent work results. RBSA also allows the Office to work in developing countries that do not attract donor funding easily. RBSA is used to address the highest priorities of the ILO to achieve the Decent Work Agenda. It is the flexibility of RBSA and the opportunity to complement and leverage other resources through RBSA that makes it such an essential component of the ILO's integrated resource used.

One of the work areas funded by the RBSA is enhancing the coverage and effectiveness of social protection for all in order that people have access to better managed and more gender equitable social security benefits; improved and more equitable working conditions; workers and enterprises benefit from improved safety and health conditions at work; and there is effective response to the HIV/AIDS epidemic. The Decent Work Agenda for Africa (DWAA), which guides ILO's work in the region, also has significant focus on the social protection strategic objective. Out of the 17 targets endorsed by the ILO national tripartite constituents in the 11<sup>th</sup> African Regional Meeting for the DWAA (2007-2015), at least 5 targets directly address issues of social protection (i.e. Targets 6, 7, 8, 15 & 16). The following 4 Country Programme Outcomes have been selected for this independent thematic evaluation of RBSA support:

Country Programme Outcome (CPO)	Office	Amount in USD	P&B Outcome	Approval Date
<b>BWA126:</b> Government and social partners have developed and implemented policies on improving management and effectiveness of the national social security system.	DWT/CO-Pretoria	135,000	4	4 June 2012
<b>ETH154:</b> National plans and strategies in place to extend social protection and basic social protection package	CO-Addis	40,000	4	4 June 2012
<b>MRT104:</b> Le gouvernement en concertation avec les partenaires sociaux élabore et met en œuvre des stratégies concernant la protection sociale	DWT/CO-Dakar	90,000	4	29 June 2012
<b>SEN126:</b> Le dispositif technique, juridique, financier et institutionnel des systèmes formels de protection sociale est renforcé	DWT/CO-Dakar	70,000	4	29 June 2012

### 3. Purpose and Scope of Evaluation

In line with ILO's policy for evaluation, it is proposed that an independent evaluation is conducted to assess the achievements obtained through the support of RBSA to CPOs in the African Region concerning the enhancement of the coverage and effectiveness of social protection, specifically. More specifically, the evaluation, which will be conducted by an external collaborator/evaluator, will cover 4 CPOs in four countries (Botswana, Ethiopia, Mauritania and Senegal).

The evaluation will be thematic in scope and will cover RBSA allocated for the 2012-13 biennium.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are:

9. Assess the contribution of the RBSA fund to achieve the biennium CPO targets;
10. Assess and highlight progress and achievements obtained with the support of RBSA to the respective CPOs, in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the outputs and outcomes;
11. Assess the factors that affected the progress and achievements obtained;
12. Highlight problems encountered and constraints faced;
13. Identify main lessons from the support of RBSA to the respective CPOs;
14. Provide recommendations for the future support of RBSA to the CPOs addressing the coverage and effectiveness of social protection for all, particularly, in the improvement of access to better managed and more gender equitable social security benefits.

Whereas the evaluation would specifically address progress and achievements obtained with the support of RBSA, the evaluation would also consider the totality of work undertaken to achieve the CPOs, including with sources of funding other than RBSA.

In particular, the evaluation will cover the following questions:

### ***Design***

- The adequacy of the planning/CPO selection process. What internal and external factors were considered when selecting these four CPOs for RBSA funding
- The extent to which planned objectives/outcomes were realistic;
- The extent to which planned activities and outputs could logically and realistically be expected to meet desired objectives/outcomes.

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

The contribution of the four CPOs to ILO's policy frameworks (Strategic Policy Framework, Programme and Budget, Decent Work agenda for Africa, Decent Work Country Programmes);

- How well the CPOs complemented and fit with other on-going ILO programmes and projects in the countries;
- The extent to which the planned outcomes have been able to influence national, sub regional and regional policy agendas on social protection.
- Assess whether the RBSA funded outputs are relevant to the outcome

### ***Effectiveness***

- To what extent have the four CPOs and the related outputs been achieved or are they likely to be achieved?
- To what extent the RBSA fund was helpful to achieve the biennium CPO targets?
- Were outputs produced and delivered as per the work plans/milestones? Have the quantity and quality of these outputs been satisfactory? How do the stakeholders perceive them?
- Can the RBSA funded outputs be credibly linked to the achievement of the outcome?
- More specifically, the following questions need to be given particular emphasis:
  - o Assess to what extent the interventions have influenced countries in their social protection policies. Have constituents been involved in the implementation of activities?
  - o Assess how planned outcomes/outputs, and the implementation of activities, have addressed gender equality concerns.

### ***Efficiency of resource use***

- Assess the effectiveness of the funding modality (RBSA) for the achievement of intended outcomes;
- Assess the quality and timeliness of delivery on allocated resources;
- To what extent have resources (financial, human, institutional and technical) been allocated strategically;



- Are the activities/outputs in line with the schedule of activities/outputs/milestones as defined by the country office and work plans?
- Are the disbursements and expenditures in line with budgetary plans? If not, what were the bottlenecks encountered?

### ***Effectiveness of management arrangements***

- Assess the effectiveness of work arrangements.
- Has there been a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved?
- Assess the process of planning, approving and monitoring RBSA
- Assess the adequacy of management and technical and administrative backstopping;
- How effectively did the ILO field offices concerned monitor the CPOs? Has relevant information systematically been collected and collated? How have the offices utilised the IRIS system for planning and monitoring the CPOs? Are all relevant stakeholders (HQ, RO, DWTs, COs) involved in an appropriate and sufficient manner?
- To what extent did the work arrangements and RBSA management allow response to changing circumstances and emerging needs?

### ***Sustainability***

- In view of the above, how likely are achievements on the CPOs to be sustainable?
- To what extent were sustainability considerations taken into account in the identification and design of outcomes/outputs?
- To what extent were sustainability considerations taken into account during the execution of activities?
- In what way has the ILO been able to develop sustainable national, sub regional and regional capacities in the area of extension of social protection? Has the capacity of implementing partners been sufficiently strengthened to ensure sustainability of achievements?

### ***Lessons learned***

- Which good practices and lessons can be drawn from the implementation of the CPOs that could be applied in future cycle of RBSA funding?
- What should have been different, and should be avoided in the future cycles?

## **4. METHODOLOGY**

The evaluation will be carried out through a combination of desk reviews, interviews by telephone/Skype with key ILO staff and stakeholders in ILO headquarters and field offices in Africa. For consultations with ILO's Regional Management, staff and constituents as well as other key stakeholders, field visits will include specific countries such as Ethiopia and the ILO Office in Dakar<sup>16</sup>. Additional consultations may be decided by

---

<sup>16</sup> Ethiopia is included in order to facilitate in-depth interviews with the Regional Office for Africa for all CPOs concerned. In addition, the consultant will be able to liaise with CO-Addis concerning ETH802. A

the evaluation manager. The independent evaluator will review inputs by all ILO and non-ILO stakeholders involved in the implementation of the CPOs/ RPO. The draft evaluation report will be shared with a selected group of key stakeholders with a request for comments within a specified time frame.

#### **4.1 Desk review**

A desk review will analyse CPOs and other documentation provided by the evaluation manager. The desk review will lead to a number of initial findings that in turn may point to additional or fine-tuned evaluation questions. This will guide the final evaluation instrument, which should be finalised in consultation with the evaluation manager. The evaluator will review the documents before conducting any interviews.

The desk review is expected to encompass, but will not be restricted to:

- Documents related specifically to the CPOs/RPO in question and activities undertaken with support from RBSA under these CPOs/RPO. This will include:
  - o Texts of approved CPOs/RPO
  - o Programme Decision Minutes (concerning allocation of funding)
  - o Technical reports
  - o RBSA Guidelines/IGDS (internal governance documents)
  - o Programme and Budget for 2012-13
  - o Programme Implementation Report
  - o Decent Work Agenda in Africa;
- Relevant regional and global policy documents related to the strategic objective of Strengthening Tripartism and Social Dialogue.

#### **4.2 Interviews**

The external collaborator will undertake interviews through telephone/Skype with relevant ILO staff at headquarters, in particular the Social Dialogue Department, and with ILO staff in relevant DWTs and COs in the African Region. The external collaborator will also undertake interviews with ILO staff, constituents and stakeholders during field. The list of interviews will include, but not be restricted to:

- ILO Headquarters Social Protection Department
- ILO Regional Office for Africa
  - o Regional Office Management
  - o Regional Office Programming Unit
- ILO Decent Work Support Team (DWT) in Dakar
  - o DWT Management
  - o Social Protection Specialist
  - o Programming Unit
- ILO Decent Work Support Team (DWT) in Pretoria
  - o DWT Management
  - o Social Protection Specialist
  - o Programming Unit
- ILO Country Offices (CO) in Addis

---

field visit to DWT/CO-Dakar has also been included for in-depth information on the relevant CPOs for Mauritania and Senegal, the technical backstopping of which are provided from this office.

- CO Management
  - Programming Unit
- Constituents in Ethiopia during field visits. Additional constituents from remote as required and in consultation with evaluation manager.
  - Other stakeholders as required and in consultation with evaluation manager.

### **4.3 Main outputs**

The external collaborator shall prepare the following three outputs in the course of executing his/her assignment:

4. An evaluation summary according to the ILO's template for summaries of independent evaluation reports (to be provided by the evaluation manager);
5. Draft evaluation report;
6. Final evaluation report incorporating comments provided by key stakeholders (comments to be compiled by evaluation manager for integration by the evaluator).

The evaluation report shall be presented as per the proposed structure in the ILO evaluation guidelines:

- Cover page with key evaluation data
- Executive Summary
- Acronyms
- Description of the CPOs
- Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation
- Methodology
- Clearly identified findings for each criterion and CPO
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons learned and good practices
- Annexes

All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with Word for Windows.

## **5. Management arrangements, workplan and timeframe**

### **5.1 Evaluator**

The evaluation shall be conducted by an external independent collaborators/evaluator responsible for conducting a participatory and inclusive evaluation process. The external collaborator shall produce the evaluation outputs listed above based on the methodology outlined above.

### **5.2 Evaluation manager**

The external collaborator will report to an evaluation manager in the ILO's Regional Office for Africa (Ms. Elleni Haddis, [elleni@ilo.org](mailto:elleni@ilo.org)) and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with the evaluation manager should issues arise. The evaluation will be carried out with full

logistical and administrative support of the Regional Office for Africa and relevant field offices.

### 5.3 Workplan and timeframe

The evaluation process is estimated to commence on 27 April and end by 2<sup>nd</sup> of June 2015. The independent consultant will spend at least seven working days on field visits. A first draft of the evaluation report shall be submitted by the external collaborator to the Evaluation Manager no later than 26<sup>th</sup> of May 2015.

The Evaluation Manager, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, will review the draft and submit any comments to the external evaluator by 5<sup>th</sup> of June 2015.

The final report, with comments integrated will be submitted to the Evaluation Manager no later than 9<sup>th</sup> of June 2015.

The following work flow breakdown is envisaged for the evaluation process:

Item	No of working days
Document review	5 days
Consultations and interviews	5 days
Field visits	7 days
Write-up draft report	5 days
Final report submission	2 days
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>24 days</b>

### 5.4 Evaluation process

The evaluation process is foreseen to cover the following steps and time period. Final submission of the evaluation report to the Regional Office for Africa should take place no later than 9<sup>th</sup> of June 2015.

Steps	Tasks	Responsible Person	Timing
<b>I</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preparation of TORs, consultation with relevant partners and staff</li> </ul>	Evaluation manager	Third week of April 2015
<b>II</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification of independent international evaluator</li> <li>Creating contract and preparation of budgets and logistics</li> </ul>	Evaluation manager	Fourth week of April 2015
<b>III</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Telephone briefing with evaluation manager</li> <li>Desk review of relevant documents</li> <li>Evaluation instrument designed based on desk review</li> </ul>	Evaluator	27 April-1 May 2015 (5 days)
<b>IV</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultations with field offices (telephone/Skype)</li> <li>Consultations with constituents stakeholders in the field</li> <li>Field visits</li> </ul>	Evaluator	4-19 May 2015 (12 days)

<b>V</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft evaluation report based on desk review and consultations from field visits</li> </ul>	Evaluator	20-26 May 2015 <i>(5 days, draft should be submitted by 26<sup>th</sup> of May)</i>
<b>VI</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Circulate draft evaluation report to key stakeholders</li> <li>Consolidate comments and share with evaluator</li> </ul>	Evaluation manager	27 May-5 June 2015 <i>(comments will be shared with evaluator by 5<sup>th</sup> June)</i>
<b>VII</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalize the report including explanations if comments were not included</li> </ul>	Evaluator	8-9 June 2015 (2 days)
<b>VIII</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approval of report by EVAL</li> </ul>	EVAL	Second week of June 2015
<b>IX</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Official submission of evaluation report to ROAF management and HQ</li> </ul>	Evaluator	16 <sup>th</sup> June 2015

### 5.5 Terms and conditions (tbc)

Item	Unit cost (USD)	Total cost (USD)
Professional fees, 24 days	500	12,000
DSA (Addis), 5 days	207	1,035
Visa fees + others	200	200
Travel (air ticket to be provided by ILO)	1,000	1,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>14,235</b>

### 5.6 Qualifications of external collaborator/

The external collaborator is expected to have the following qualifications:

- At least a Master's Degree in International Law or related graduate qualification;
- A minimum of 10 years' experience in evaluating international development interventions in the area of labour and employment;
- Proven experience with logical framework approaches and other strategic planning approaches, M&E methods and approaches (including quantitative, qualitative and participatory), information analysis and report writing;
- Experience in evaluating organisational strategies;
- Acquaintance with ILO's Decent Work mandate and familiarity with ILO processes and working methods;
- Knowledge and experience of the UN System;
- Excellent communication and interview skills in English ;
- Excellent report writing skills;
- Understanding of the development context of Africa would be a clear advantage.

## 9.2 List of persons interviewed

Name	Title/Unit	Institution
<b>Geneva</b>		
Anne Drouin	ILO Social Protection Department	ILO
<b>Ethiopia</b>		
Mayenga Dayina	ILO ROAF Deputy Director for Africa	ROAF
Farice Y. Gugsu	Monitoring and Evaluation	ROAF
Elleni Haddis	ILO ROAF	ROAF
Kiddist Chala	Programme Officer	C.O Ethiopia
Alemseged Woldeyohannes	Permanent Secretary of NSPP	NSPP (Ethiopia)
<b>Pretoria</b>		
Luis Frota	Social Protection Specialist	
Joni Toko Musabayana	Deputy Director	
Nomaswazi Dlamini	Programme Assistant	
<b>Mauritania</b>		
Cheikh Thiam	Adviser to CNSS for legal and partnership affairs	Caisse Nationale de Sécurité Sociale (CNSS)
Samory Ould Beye	Secretary General	Confédération Libre des Travailleurs de Mauritanie (CLTM)
<b>Senegal</b>		
Redha Ameer	Programme Analyst	
Mamour Ousmane BA	DCEF Deputy Director	Ministry of Finance
Mariana Stirbu	Chief Social Policy, UNICEF	UNICEF
M. Ariel PINO	Regional Coordinator, Former Social Protection Specialist (Dakar)	Association Internationale de la Sécurité Sociale
Mamadou Racine Senghor	Social Protection Director,	Ministry of Labour
Charles Faye	Member of CNP	Conseil National du Patronat (CNP)
Atoumane Diaw	Member of CNTSS	Confédération Nationale des Travailleurs du Sénégal (CNTSS)

### 9.3 List of documents reviewed

1. BIT, 2013. Appui à l'actualisation du cadre juridique de la CNSS de la Mauritanie. Rapport final.
2. BIT, 2013 Appui à la réorganisation de la production statistique de la Caisse nationale de sécurité sociale (CNSS) de la Mauritanie
3. Bit, 2014. Rapport technique sur le regime simplifié des petits travailleurs au Sénégal
4. Bit, 2014. Le regime simplifié des petits travailleurs au Sénégal. Plan d'action 2014-2016
5. BIT, 2014. Etude technique sur l'administration du RSPC au Sénégal
6. BIT, 2013. Extension de la protection sociale à l'économie informelle: vers un RSPC au Sénégal
7. BIT, 2014. Etude technique sur la branche retraite du RSPC au Sénégal.
8. BIT, 2014. Etude technique sur la branche retraite du RSPC au Sénégal.
9. BIT, 2014. Etude technique sur les secteurs, les metiers et les filières couverts par le RSPC au Sénégal et les incitations fiscales.
10. ILO, Decent Work Country Programme for Botswana, 2011-2015
11. ILO, Decent Work Country Programme for Ethiopia, 2014-2015
12. ILO, Decent Work Country Programme for Mauritania, 2012-2015
13. ILO, Decent Work Country Programme for Senegal , 2012-2015
14. ILO, 2012, Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation: principles, rationale, planning and managing evaluations.
15. ILO, Technical Cooperation Manual
16. ILO, March 2012, RBSA. Update for the Governing Body, 313 th session.
17. ILO, 2014, preparing the evaluation report
18. ILO, 2007. Conclusions of the 11<sup>th</sup> African Regional Meeting.
19. ILO, 2010, DG Announcement. The Regular Budget Supplementary Account.
20. ILO, Programme implementation 2012-2013.
21. ILO, 2012. MRT104
22. ILO, 2012. BWA 126
23. ILO, 2012. ETH154
24. ILO, 2012. SEN 126
25. ILO Strategic Policy Framework 2010-2015. Making decent work happen Geneva march 2009
26. ILO and WHO, 2009. The Social Protection Floor. A joint Crisis Initiative of the UN Executives Board for Cooperation on the Social Protection Floor.
27. ILO/TF/Botswana/R, 2014, Feasibility Study of the establishment of Botswana's National Pension Fund.
28. ILO, Botswana's quarterly reports 2012-2013
29. ILO, 2012 Botswana's DWCP Implementation Report
30. ILO, 2014. Social Budgeting and Actuarial modelling. Workshop report.

31. MLSA, Ethiopia, 2012. National Social Protection Policy of Ethiopia
32. Michelle Bachelet, 2012. Report of the Advisory Group. Social Protection Floor for a fair and inclusive globalisation.
33. NSPP, Work plan 2012-2013
34. Tamsif Ayliffe, 2014. National Social Protection Strategy of Ethiopia 2014-2019.
35. UNEG, April 2005, Standards for Evaluation in the UN System.



# ILO Lesson Learned Template

**PROJECT TITLE:** RBSA Support to Selected Country Programme Outcomes (CPOs) Concerning Promotion of Employment during the 2012 - 2013 Biennium

**PROJECT CODE:** RAF 107 and ETH 127

**NAME OF EVALUATOR:** Stanley M. Karuga

Date: 8th June 2015

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

LL Element	Text
<b>Brief description of lessons learned</b> (link to specific action or task)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✦ The need for strategic use of resources, by forging of strategic partnerships, networks and collaboration with other development partners;</li><li>✦ The need for stakeholder consultations, not just during the design of the relevant DWCP, but also the selection of CPO for enhanced ownership, “buy-in” and support by stakeholders;</li><li>✦ The need for ILO to invest in methods and assets to ensure adequate exchange of knowledge and maintenance of proper evaluation record and follow-up;</li><li>✦ The need for timely notification and release of RBSA Funds to avoid implementers from going for the “low lying fruits” which may not necessarily have high and sustainable impact;</li><li>✦ The need to be realistic in the selection of outputs/outcomes and budget estimation;</li><li>✦ The need for Regional Strategies to address regional issues;</li><li>✦ The need for systematic and timely M&amp;E and reporting of progress of CPOs;</li><li>✦ The need for Flexibility in CPO Implementation and Management in countries facing fragility and socio-economic and political;</li><li>✦ The need to avoid lumping several CPOs under CO Priority Outcomes and putting the salary of an expert across several CPOs and/or several country offices.</li></ul>

<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✦ The context and preconditions underpinning these lessons related to socio-economic and political conditions of the beneficiary Member States and beneficiary communities -the majority of whom are poor; a situation that is exacerbated high unemployment and poor condition of infrastructure especially roads; against limited RBSA funds.</li> </ul>
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✦ Governments of Member States, ILO Constituents and local communities;</li> </ul>
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	<p>Some of the factors that may affect impact and sustainability included: (a) the low capacity of many partner government institutions; (b) The high turnover of personnel not just among ILO Tripartite Constituents, but also within the ILO itself – for example, the premature departure of the Crisis and Post Conflict Expert responsible for RAF 107 who left the position quite early in the biennium (mid-2012); (c) The apparent insufficient political will and commitment by some governments; (d) lack of adequate ownership and commitment to CPOs social partners; (e) The short-term duration nature of bienniums and therefore of CPO interventions – even for projects with longer orientation; (f) Lack of effective follow-up and consolidation of results of CPOs; (g) Fragility and conflict in some of the countries (especially those under RAF 107); and (h) Lack of a regional strategy even where the interventions are or regional nature (e.g. conflict resolution, disarmament and settlement of refugees).</p>
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	<p>A major success/positive causal factor was the high relevance of CPO interventions to socio-economic and political development aspirations not just of Government of Member States as reflected in national policies, strategies and plans; but also of ILO constituents and target local communities.</p>
<b>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</b>	<p>Key administrative issues identified included: (a) inadequate stakeholder consultations during CPO selection for RBSA support due to the short notice between notification and request for proposals; (b) inappropriateness of lumping several CPOs under a country office – based CPO such as ETH 127, and putting the salary of an expert under 7 or 8 CPOs and also under as many as 3 to 4 country offices- which was bound to be problematic for several reasons including the fact that a country office like Addis CO neither had direct responsibility nor control over what other CPOs did; (c) limited involvement of the Decent Work Teams (DWTs); and (d) lack of a regional strategy upon which to implement interventions with regional perspectives.</p>

## ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

**Project Title:** Independent Thematic Evaluation of RBSA Support to Selected Country Programme Outcomes (CPOs) Concerning Promotion of Employment during the 2012 - 2013 Biennium

**Project Code:** RAF 107 and ETH 127

**Name of Evaluator:** Stanley M. Karuga

**Date:** 8<sup>th</sup> June 2015

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

GP Element	Text
<b>Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)</b>	✚ Key good practices identified include: (i) Designing of CPOs based on a clear understanding of the country context and the actual livelihood needs of target beneficiaries (both the target communities & governments of member states) as part of DWCP formulation processes; (ii) Capacity building of stakeholders; (iii) Creation of requisite socio-economic and political enabling environment; (iv) Promotion of income generating opportunities and employment creation; (v) Information sharing, networking, and promotion of strategic partnership and collaboration; and (vi) Mainstreaming interventions into government policies.
<b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>	✚ Conditions for applicability and replicability strongly hinges on (i) convergence of project purpose and interventions with socio-economic needs of target beneficiaries; (iii) Capacity building of target beneficiaries; and (iv) Continued political will on the part of target beneficiary governments of member states;
<b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b>	✚ The above listed emerging good practices resulted in broad-based support and ownership of CPO interventions -thereby contributing significantly to the performance and achievement of CPO interventions including training and capacity building of 6,799 ex-combatants under COD 102; fifty-nine 59 trainers and thirty (30) emerging entrepreneurs under GHA 101; sixty-two (62) community roads maintenance groups and 30 MPW engineers under LBR 101; fifteen (15) senior government officials, forty-six (46) community representatives, twenty (20) engineers under SLE 103; and twenty (20) senior staff at decision-making level under SSD 101.
<b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>	While it was not possible to establish the full extent of impact and sustainability of interventions of the CPOs under review primarily due to lack of M&E data and information, the Mission observed the following interventions that have real potential to contribute to impact and sustainability: (a) Initial stakeholder consultations which were in-built in the design of DWCP from which the CPOs were derived, as well as during the formulation of the ILO Regional Strategy for North Africa (2011-2015); (b) Capacity building of local stakeholder and relevant institutions through training and exposure tours; (c) Creation of requisite enabling environment in terms of promoting peace, security and development of infrastructural facilities – particularly rural access roads; (d) Promotion of income generating opportunities and employment creation; (e) Information sharing, networking, and promotion of strategic partnership and collaboration; and (f) Mainstreaming interventions into government policies, strategies and plans.
<b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>	The potential for replication of the ILO Employment Intensive Infrastructural development methods and the UN Policy for Employment in Post-Conflict approach, not only by the Governments of beneficiary member states but also ILO Constituents and local communities.

<b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)</b>	<p>The CPOs are strongly linked with, and significantly contributes to: (i) ILO's overall goal of promoting opportunities for decent work for women and men in all countries through the provision of technical and institutional assistance to constituents in Member States; (ii) ILO's Strategic Framework for 2010-2015 –specifically in relation to its priority outcomes on employment promotion; and (iii) DWCPs for of Member States – where already formulated.</p>
<b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>	<p>The ILO should have ensured adequate and regular monitoring of progress and performance of CPO interventions as well as follow-up and consolidation of results, not just to inform the decision-making processes, but also to draw lessons for improved implementation of CPO interventions in future.</p>