



*International Labour Organisation:
Promoting Decent Work For All*

Independent Final Evaluation

**ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2015 – 2017
funded projects in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar
and Vietnam**

Final Report

**Theo van der Loop
The Hague, 1 August 2018**

Administrative information:

Evaluation Title:	The ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2015 – 2017 funded projects in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam
Priority Area Titles:	1) Skills development – Mutual recognition of skills in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar towards the ASEAN Economic Community 2015 and beyond. 2) Supporting the implementation of social protection floors for workers and their families in ASEAN. 3) Supporting implementation of Labour Law Reform in Vietnam and Myanmar.
Type of Evaluation:	Independent Final Evaluation
TC Project Code:	<i>RAS/15/50/ROK; RAS/15/51/ROK; and RAS/15/54/ROK</i>
Consultants team leader:	Theo van der Loop, International consultant
Project Duration:	April 2015 – May 2018
Donors:	The Ministry of Employment and Labor of the Republic of Korea (MOEL/ROK)
Total approved budget:	US\$ 2,000,000
Geographic Coverage:	Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Viet Nam
ILO Administrative Unit:	ROAP and DWT-Bangkok
ILO Technical Backstopping:	SKILLS, SOCPRO, LABAMIN, OSH and EMP/INVEST
Evaluation Manager:	Ms. Raviprapa Srisartsanarat, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, Regional Programming Services Unit, ILO-ROAP in Bangkok
Evaluation Duration:	April – July 2018
Evaluation Budget:	US\$29,000
Disclaimer	<i>The views expressed in this report are those of the author, and are not necessarily the views of the International Labour Office (ILO). The Consultant is solely responsible for any errors or omissions in the text of the report.</i>

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iv
List of Abbreviations	v
Executive Summary	viii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background and Context	1
1.2 Purpose, Scope and Clients of the Evaluation	2
2 Purpose and Methodology of the Final Independent Evaluation	4
2.1 Conceptual Framework: Evaluation Criteria	4
2.2 Methodology, Work Plan and Key Deliverables.....	4
3 Overall Findings	8
3.1 Intervention Progress and Effectiveness	8
3.2 Effectiveness of Management Arrangements.....	15
3.3 Efficiency of Resource Use.....	19
3.4 Impact Orientation and Sustainability	23
3.5 Findings measured against the Recommendations of the 2013 Evaluation	24
4 Conclusions and Recommendations	27
4.1 Conclusions	27
4.2 Recommendations	31
5 Lessons Learned and Good Practices	34
5.1 Lessons Learned	34
5.2 Good Practices	37

List of Annexes

Annex 1 Terms of Reference (TOR)	41
Annex 2 Findings of the Previous Evaluation in 2013	53
Annex 3 Inception Report for the Final Independent Evaluation	54
Annex 4 Program of Field Visits	62
Annex 5 List of Skype Interviews	67
Annex 6 Evaluation Questions and Criteria	68
Annex 7 DWCP Priorities of four countries	70
Annex 8 Selection of Documents Consulted	71

List of Tables

Tables:

2.1	Number of people met during the fieldwork phase by gender (M/F)	6
3.1	Expenditure categories of the Total Actual Spending for all three Projects (in %).	21
3.2	Expenditure categories of the Actual Spending only for Project 3 on OSH and PEP (in %).	21
3.3	The findings of the 2013 Evaluation compared to the findings of the 2018 Evaluation.	24-26

List of Abbreviations

ABND	Assessment Based National Dialogue
ACTEMP	(ILO) Bureau on Employers' Activities
ACTRAV	(ILO) Bureau on Workers' Activities
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AEC	ASEAN Economic Community
ALM	ASEAN Labour Ministers
AMS	ASEAN Member States
AQRF	ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
ASEC	ASEAN Secretariat
ATP	ASEAN TRIANGLE Project
ATUC	ASEAN Trade Union Council
AWF	Asian Welding Federation (Singapore)
CAMFEBA	Cambodian Federation of Employers and Business Associations
CARD	Council for Agricultural and Rural Development (Cambodia)
CEMA	National Committee for Ethnic Minority Groups (Viet Nam)
CLM(V)	Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Viet Nam
CO	Country Office
COMWEL	Korea Workers' Compensation and Welfare Service
CPO	Country Programme Outcome
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DFATD	Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development
DFID	Department for International Development (United Kingdom)
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
DWT	ILO Decent Work Technical Support Team for Southeast Asia
EDCF	Economic Development Cooperation Fund (Korea)
EII	Employee Injury Insurance
EIIP	Employment Intensive Investment Programmes
EPS	Employment Permit System (Korea)
EO	Employers' Organisation
EU	European Union
FGD	Focused Group Discussion
FGLLID	Factories and General Labour Laws Inspection Department (Myanmar)
FOW	Future Of Work
GIZ	Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit, German Development Agency
HRD Korea	Human Resources Development Service of Korea
IFE	Independent Final Evaluation
ILO	International Labour Organization
ILS	International Labour Standard
IOM	International Organization for Migration
ITC	(ILO) International Training Centre in Turin
KEAD	Korea Employment Agency for the Disabled
KEIS	Korea Employment Information Service

KOICA	Korea International Cooperation Agency
KOILAF	Korea International Labour Foundation
KOSHA	Korea Occupational Safety and Health Agency
KRIVET	Korea Research Institute for Vocational Education and Training
KUT	Korea University of Technology and Education
Lao PDR	Lao People's Democratic Republic
LDC	Least Developed Country
LRB	Local Resource-Based
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MICS	Myanmar Industries, Craft and Services
MoEL	Ministry of Employment and Labor (Korea)
MoEYS	Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports (Cambodia)
MoHS	Ministry of Health and Sports (Myanmar)
MoL	Ministry of Labour (Thailand)
MoLIP	Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population (Myanmar)
MoLISA	Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs (Vietnam)
MOLSW	Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (Lao PDR)
MOLVT	Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training (Cambodia)
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRA	Mutual Recognition Agreement (ASEAN)
MRS	Mutual Recognition of Skills
NCTP	National Committee for Tourism Professionals (Cambodia).
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NPC	National Project Coordinator
NSPPF	National Social Protection Policy Framework (Cambodia)
NSSA	National Skills Standards Authority (under MoLIP, Myanmar)
NSSF	National Social Security Fund (Cambodia)
NTDF	National Tripartite Dialogue Forum (Myanmar)
NTP-SPR	National Targeted Program for Sustainable Poverty Reduction (Viet Nam)
ODA	ODA official development assistance
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OHSSC	Occupational Health and Safety Standards Committee
OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicators
OWSO	One Window Service Office
PEP	Public Employment Programme
RBM	Results-Based Management
RMCS	Regional Model Competency Standards
ROAP	(ILO) Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
RSTWG	Regional Skills Technical Working Group
SLOM	ASEAN Senior Labour Officials Meeting
SPF	Social Protection Floor
SSB	Social Security Board (Myanmar)
SSDM	Social Service Delivery Mechanism (Cambodia)
SWS	Single Window Service
TICA	Thailand International Cooperation Agency
TOT/ToA	Training of Trainers/Training of Assessors
TPR	Technical Progress Report

TVET
UN
VZF

Technical and Vocational Education and Training
United Nations
Vision Zero Fund

Executive Summary

Background and project description

In 2003, the Ministry of Employment and Labour of the Republic of Korea (MoEL/ROK) signed a memorandum of understanding with the International Labour Organization (ILO) to formalize their partnership for development. In October 2013, the ILO commissioned an independent final evaluation and following its recommendations the next phase for 2015 – 2017 was therefore revised with a view to enhance efficiency and achieve more profound impacts for the Programme, including a change from one-year budget cycles to a three-year cycle. The Programme framework for 2015 – 2017 focused on three major areas: employment and labour policy, social protection, and labour law reform in four selected countries: Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic (PDR), Myanmar and Vietnam with a total budget of US\$ 2 million, excluding costs for Korean experts on secondment and on loan.

Objective and Methodology of the Final Independent Evaluation

The two main purposes of the independent final evaluation are promoting accountability, and enhancing learning within the ILO, the MoEL/ROK and other key stakeholders. Following the ToR (see Annex 1), the evaluation will address four Evaluation Criteria: (1) Intervention progress and effectiveness; (2) Effectiveness of management arrangements; (3) Efficiency of resource use; and (4) Impact orientation and Sustainability. For each of these four Evaluation Criteria a series of evaluation questions were already identified in the ToR, and this list of questions has been adjusted in the Inception Report (see Annex 6). The methodology is explained in Section 2.2, and the schedule of meetings during the field mission from 14 to 28 May 2018 is given in Annex 4.

Findings

The findings of the evaluation are categorized according to the four evaluation criteria identified above which are used throughout this report.

1) Intervention progress and effectiveness

On the whole, it can be concluded that the three projects made solid progress towards their planned results as these are specified in the three different Results-Based Management (RBM) systems in the Project Documents (PRODOC). For an overview of the main achievements in each of the three projects reference is made to Section 3.1. The intervention progress went very much according to schedule and there are only a few cases in which progress diverged from the RBM's, e.g. in the case of the Public Employment Programme (PEP) in Vietnam which was stopped by ILO because staff costs were weighing too heavily on the country office budget in Hanoi, and the Single Window Service (SWS) in social protection was dropped in particular because it is not a government priority at this time. An important challenge faced in the skills development area is the delay in Thailand for translating their standards into English, which may be caused by different factors (e.g. Thailand prefers to revise its own standards first, and/or political reasons related to migration issues). In Myanmar a specific challenge occurring in all projects is the relatively large number of donors that is operating in this country (including the German Development Agency GIZ, the Danish Embassy and the Asian Development Bank ADB), resulting sometimes in adjustments to the programme. Nevertheless, the large number of important achievements provided in Section 3.1 leads to the conclusion that the intervention progress has been very substantial, with the exception of progress made in Lao PDR where much less activities took place than in Cambodia and Myanmar.

Overall, gender mainstreaming has received clear attention in the ILO/Korea projects, but has not always been actively addressed, and it is sometimes underdeveloped in tripartite organisations. On the one hand, the majority of beneficiaries of the social security funds are female, specific social security measures are directed at women only, and in the tourism sector a substantial 30% of Master Trainers/Assessors is female, while overall the participation of women in the workforce especially in government organisations is quite widespread. On the other hand, more explicit attention is needed for gender issues, as was shown in several examples: five out of the six occupations selected for Mutual Recognition of Skills (MRS) in three countries, Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar (CLM), are male-dominated and regional trainings mostly involve men; gender mainstreaming is not very explicit in MRS, more specific gender indicators and gender provisions are needed in social protection, while in Myanmar gender mainstreaming has often not been acknowledged as an important issue by the stakeholders interviewed. Regarding the other cross-cutting issues, the attention differed substantially, whereby tripartite processes and capacity development received the most attention (see below).

The ILO/Korea project contributed substantially to policy formulation in Cambodia especially through its support to the National Employment Policy (NEP), but less so in Myanmar although the setting up of the National Tripartite Dialogue Forum (NTDF) by the ILO Liaison Office (LO) is an important step towards this goal. In all countries there are clear connections between the three projects and the respective Decent Work Country Programme's, DWCP (see Annex 7). The ILO/Korea project also contributed substantially to capacity building in Cambodia and to a lesser extent in Myanmar, while it was in particular appreciated by many stakeholders to learn-while-working together with experts, consultants, staff, etc. Policy formulation and capacity building were much less explicit in Lao PDR and in Vietnam.

The Government Organisations (GO) interviewed in the different CLM countries plus Vietnam (CLMV) are generally very satisfied with the quality of the specific outputs in the projects and have clearly used the tools and practices developed, and this applies even to Vietnam where the project was terminated in late 2017. The ILO/Korea projects have generally more focussed on the GO than on Employers' Organisations (EO) or Workers' Organisations (WO), although they have clearly participated in selected activities, and sometimes even took the lead in certain activities under the ILO/Korea projects.

2) Effectiveness of management arrangement

In view of the substantial number of achievements made by the three projects, it is not surprising that the main project counterparts are generally very satisfied with the support received by ILO and the Republic of Korea (ROK). The long-standing partnership contributes to this feeling of satisfaction as does the continuity in the activities undertaken over several partnership periods. For the CLMV countries and/or the region of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) the support provided through this partnership is quite important, not only for the countries involved and for the region, but also for the progress made in the different areas supported. The Government Organisations in all four countries are generally satisfied with the Management Arrangements. A major challenge, however, was that the donor did not allow for staff costs, and ILO tried various strategies to deal with this condition, such as leveraged its own resources (Regular Budget Supplementary Account, RBSA, and Vision Zero Fund, VZF), cost sharing with other projects, and even to succeed in getting exceptional approval by MOEL/ROK to fund two national staff in Myanmar and Cambodia for the work on social protection. However,

combined with the lack of funding for administrative/financial support staff this remained an important bottleneck.

The Programme Framework was revised following the 2013 evaluation of the partnership and this led to a more efficient allocation of resources in the current phase by changing from an annual to a three-year budget cycle, and by a more focussed approach (i.e. less geographically scattered and more thematically focused) which was appreciated by most stakeholders. Compared to the previous phase of the partnership, the Results-Based Management (RBM) of the three ILO-Korea projects has clearly improved, but still requires substantial further improvements in the areas of coordination between the three RBMs, of an officially verifiable Log Frame for each project, and of the formulation of proper assumptions and Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI). The three Log Frames should be more systematically developed along similar and comparable lines.

The workers' and employers' organizations (WO/EO) in the three CLM countries face many challenges, such as limited resources, a low level of public-private partnership and a general lack of information (Ruttiya Bhula-or 2018). Regarding WO specifically, their focus is on strengthening labour unions by increasing union membership and by regularly campaigning for workers' fundamental rights at work, and as a result, concerns about e.g. skills development are found to be often secondary and limited. The involvement of the EO and WO in the activities of the ILO/Korea partnership has differed between the three projects, but generally they have been involved in the implementation of projects through tripartite fora, for example the Regional Skills Technical Working Group (RSTWG), based in Bangkok, the National Social Security Fund (NSSF) in Cambodia, the National Skills Standards Authority (NSSA), the Social Security Board (SSB) and the National Tripartite Dialogue Forum (NTDF) all in Myanmar, as well as the Lao National Advisory Chamber for TVET and Skill Development; and sometimes they have been involved also more directly, such as their participation in Myanmar in developing the Law on Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) from the beginning, the cooperation between the Myanmar Engineering Society and the Asian Welding Federation (AWF), and the involvement of WO in the OSH awareness campaign of the Factories and General Labour Laws Inspection Department (FGLLID) of the Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population (MOLIP) in Myanmar.

In skills development, EO are usually more involved than WO, but the participation of employers is considered to be crucial and needs to be further enhanced. A challenge is that sometimes only selected unions are being invited while sharing among unions has been limited. On the whole, ensuring tripartite participation across all the intervention fields is an area for improvement, while one WO (the Myanmar Industries, Craft and Services, MICS), as an emerging union, felt sometimes somewhat neglected and left out from activities of the ILO Myanmar, although the Liaison Office makes sure that it always treats all WO's equally.

Generally, the delivery of core services and the communication with ILO were considered effective by the main stakeholders. The contributions of the lead specialists and the experts of the ILO Decent Work Technical Support Team (DWT) were considered of good quality. In the MRS project national stakeholders had more contact with the lead specialists in Bangkok than with the LO in Yangon. The two Korean experts on loan from the Korean Partner Institutions, COMWEL and KOSHA, were involved in particular in different capacity building activities which have been appreciated very much by the stakeholders. There is no sharing of information between the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme and the KOICA Country Offices.

3) Efficiency of resource use

All stakeholders interviewed agreed that the ILO/Korea projects clearly delivered value for money, and that the resources have been allocated strategically and efficiently to achieve the intended results. The resource use has been judged as quite efficient especially also compared to a relatively limited budget per project per country. In addition, cost-sharing with other projects has been considered as positive. On the whole, therefore, the key stakeholders are positive on the delivery of value for money, and they indicated that more resources are indeed needed, and specific proposals have been made by the respective counterparts in the three projects (see Section 3.3).

The total budget for the three projects was US\$ 2 million for three years 2015-2017. The MOEL/ROK has agreed to a no-cost extension until 31 May 2018, with final reporting due by 15 August 2018. Tables 3.1 provide the financial data for the three projects. Regarding actual expenditure categories, activities such as seminars, subcontracts, training and grants, accounted together for 38.5%, followed by international and national consultants (24.6 %) and National Professional Staff and Local Support Staff (20.6 %), whereby the latter concerns in large majority the staff costs of the ILO/Korea Management Team in Bangkok. The differences between the three projects are, in fact, quite moderate. In Project 1 on employment and labour policy (including MRS), and in Project 2 on social protection there is more use of international consultants, while Project 3 on labour law reform uses much more often national consultants. Costs for seminars were substantial for all three, while subcontracts and grants were more often used by Project 1. Table 3.2 provides details for Project 3 separately and shows that for OSH in Myanmar almost 60% was spent on seminars and another 20% on subcontracts. In contrast, for PEP in Vietnam almost 57% was spend on national consultants, and another 18% on international consultants, showing a completely different approach than in the OSH sub-project.

The allocation of resources requires important modifications in particular in the area of the management arrangements since there were no provisions made for national professional and for support staff. It has been shown to be imperative to have a full-time national professional staff in the ILO local office who can coordinate the activities in the three projects in the country in question. In addition, allocations need to be made for part-time support for the administrative and financial tasks in each country. As a result of such allocations, project implementation would become much more effective.

Concerning costs involved to enhance gender equality, this does not seem a major issue, as most of the efforts involved persuading women to join in project activities which they mainly seem to have done without hesitation. In addition, an important gender issue was the composition of the membership of the NSSF in Cambodia and the SSB in Myanmar; in both cases, the majority of the 1.4 million and 1.15 million respectively were women, which is the more important since international research studies have indicated that women spend much of their income on the immediate needs of the entire family than men tend to do.

4) Impact orientation and Sustainability

Various strategies have been put in place in Cambodia and Myanmar to ensure the continuation of mechanisms/tools/practices provided by the projects once the support from the project ends ('exit strategy'). These include, among various others, the embedding of MRS activities in the ASEAN Senior Labour Officials Meeting (ASEAN-SLOM) process and in the ASEAN Secretariat (ASEC), the established national tripartite mechanisms, the capacity building efforts in particular

the trained master trainers and assessors and the trainings in Korea by the Korean Partner Institutes, the lasting impression left by the OSH awareness raising campaign, and the contribution to the increase in the number of beneficiaries of the NSSF and SSB. While in Lao much less activities were implemented systematically, it contrasts with Vietnam which can be considered as a case in point of sustainability as the government is in the process of integrating the products of the partnership after the ILO exited. These strategies are generally expected to be effective for the purpose for which they were intended, not specifically for a broader form of sustainability. On the whole, the ILO/Korea projects do concern a real Partnership Approach in the sense that the multi-country approach enhances working together and learning together, with a focus on knowledge sharing.

The three projects are considered by many stakeholders as relevant and very timely in the current state of development of their respective countries. The overall impression acquired during the interviews is that the Government Organisations, in particular but not exclusively the ministries of labour, have taken clear ownership of the activities implemented under the ILO/Korea partnership. With respect to the employers' and workers' organisations, this is generally much less the case, although especially the EO have shown ownership in selected activities as discussed in the above. In conclusion, therefore, the three projects have been very effective in establishing and fostering national ownership among GO, but much less so among EO and in particular among WO.

The findings and recommendations of the 2013 Evaluation of the ILO/Korea Partnership 2009-2013 have been analysed against the findings of the present evaluation study in Section 5.3 and for a summary of this analysis reference is made to Table 3.3.

Recommendations

The recommendations relate also to the four Evaluation Criteria distinguished above and are as follows:

Intervention progress and effectiveness

- 1) **Design more activities in the next phase that can (also) be implemented in Lao PDR** as it has the greatest need for support and was left out in several cases in the current phase; in addition, **make sure that the next evaluation mission also includes a visit to Lao PDR.**
- 2) **Enhance visibility of the donor organisation** by making sure that logos and acknowledgements are properly used and by having more activities such as workshops and training courses in Korea itself. The latter is also so attractive that countries are willing to pay the logistics costs for their own staff members attending such events.
- 3) **Maintain a high level of attention for Gender Mainstreaming in the country interventions** as this attention was found to be widely varying and did not come automatically and **include it in all the M&E tools**, such as Log Frame (including assumptions and OVI), Theory of Change and Risk Analysis.

Effectiveness of management arrangement

- 4) **Reach out more to the employers' and especially also to workers' organisations and make in the new phase substantial allocations for capacity building** of these organisations and enhance the role of the private sector through the employers' organisations. It could also pay attention to the formalisation of the informal economy, laid

down in ILO's landmark Recommendation 204 adopted by the ILO in 2015, which has so far received limited attention in the Partnership.

- 5) **Make provisions for costs of national professional staff as well as for (part-time) financial and administrative support staff.**
- 6) **Design three coordinated and comprehensive M&E systems with complete Log Frames** with clear assumptions, OVIs and milestones, and an appropriate Theory of Change and a solid Risk Analysis.

Efficiency of resource use

- 7) **Make sure that the new phase of the ILO-Korea Partnership is even further focused by leaving out the PEP programme and focusing on three topics only.** From the viewpoint of more focus in the partnership, the termination of the PEP programme is supported by the evaluation, and as shown in the above the Government of Vietnam is itself capable of owning this programme and the valued products that came out of it. In addition, more efficiency could further be reached by reducing the time between budget-cycles (before the actual release of the funds in the new cycle).
- 8) **Enhance the efficiency of the involvement of the Korean Partner Institutes and of the Korean experts on loan from these institutes.** This is a repeat of the recommendations of the previous evaluation in 2013, and focuses partly on **the profile of the Korean experts** seconded from these institutes (not only technical expertise, but also soft skills and communication abilities including in the English language), and partly on **the communication in particular towards the ILO Country/Liaison Offices** where a broadly felt demand was found for more information on these institutes, on the management set-up in Bangkok and on information regarding financial monitoring.

Impact orientation and Sustainability

- 9) In the area of MRS: **Move from** the preparation of MRS in the current phase **to completing the process for the six occupations with certification and assessment, and then to the actual implementation and piloting of MRS** in the next phase. **Maintain thereby close relations with the ASEAN Secretariat (ASEC)** on the workplan of the ASEAN Labour Ministers including the ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQR)-TVET and maintain/expand the training programme in Korea of HRD Korea.
- 10) In the area of Social Protection: **Continue the support for the different priorities in different countries:** in Myanmar SSB's first priority is the MIS/IT reform; in Cambodia support is needed for the NSSF and the new National Social Protection Policy Framework (NSPPF 2016-2025), while also the training courses of COMWEL and KEIS are mentioned as priority.
- 11) In the area of OSH in Myanmar: **Continue the work as soon as the OSH Law has been enacted (expected within several months) with the following priorities of different organizations:** Improve the accident-reporting system of the FGLLID including another study tour (only for FGLLID staff) and continue to conduct the KOSHA training courses and the OSH awareness raising campaigns in all regions and states.
- 12) **Develop a proper exit strategy at the outset for all the three projects** in case the donor funding might end in 2021.

Lessons Learned and Good Practices

Finally, from the experience gained by evaluating the ILO-Korea Partnership in the present report three Lessons Learned (LL) and three Good Practices (GP) have been compiled in Chapter 5.

1 Introduction

The present Evaluation Report is mandated by the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Final Independent Evaluation of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2015 – 2017 funded projects in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam. In this report we will firstly summarize the background and context, followed by the purpose, scope and clients of the Partnership. In Chapter 2 the purpose of the evaluation and the methodology used will be explained. The actual evaluation exercise consists of the analysis of the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions (Chapter 3). The conclusions and recommendations are the subject of Chapter 4, while the final Chapter presents several Lessons Learned and Good Practices.

1.1 Background and Context

In 2003, the Ministry of Employment and Labour of the Republic of Korea (MoEL/ROK) signed a memorandum of understanding with the ILO to formalize their partnership for development. A year later, the Government of Korea provided funding to institutionalize the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme, which focuses on realizing the objectives set out in the Asian Decent Work Decade.

In October 2013, the ILO commissioned an independent final evaluation of the USD 5 million, five-year framework of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme towards the realization of the Asian Decent Work Decade (June 2009 – May 2014). The evaluation found that the Programme have been effective in delivering its planned outputs and could enhance effectiveness, sustainability and impact by becoming more selective and focused in its approach and deepening the assistance provided to specific processes.

The ILO/Korea Partnership Programme framework for 2015 – 2017 was therefore revised with a view to enhance efficiency and achieve more profound impacts for the Programme. The Programme framework for 2015 – 2017 focused on three major areas: employment and labour policy, social protection, and labour law reform in the following selected countries: Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam. The Programme for 2015 – 2017 also changed the projects' funding period from one-year to three-year cycle.

In May 2015, the MoEL/ROK and the ILO signed a Letter of Agreement to implement the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for 2015-2017. While the total budget amounted to US\$ 3,000,000, one third thereof was intended for global projects to be managed by ILO Geneva, while 2 million was to be managed by ROAP-Bangkok. The MOEL/ROK and the ILO agreed on the following priority areas/projects, whereby selected Korean Partner Institutions were involved:

Priority Areas/Projects	Country	Budget (USD)	Korea Partner Institutions
1) Skill development – Mutual Recognition of Skills (MRS)	Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar & regional level	800,000	HRD Korea
2) Social Protection Floors (SPF)	Cambodia, Myanmar & regional level	800,000	COMWEL & KEIS
3) Labour Law Reform	Viet Nam & Myanmar	400,000	KEIS & KOSHA
Total		2,000,000	

Goal and Objectives of the Programme

The ILO/Korea partnership programme, in fact, consists of three 'Asia-Pacific Regional Projects' as indicated in the above table. Therefore, the programme is not guided by one single, overall Project Document (PRODOC), but there are three different PRODOCS with different objectives as follows:

For skill development, two immediate objectives are specified:

1. Benchmarking of skills standards in priority sectors/occupations enhanced (or increased/improved) among ASEAN member states for improved mutual recognition of skills of migrant workers;
2. A social dialogue mechanism at national and/or sectoral level established and promoted for a more demand driven Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) and to guide MRS.

For social protection, there are three immediate objectives:

1. Social security schemes created & strengthened with the view to facilitate access to social protection for uncovered groups;
2. Access to social protection services enhanced through the progressive expansion of effective delivery mechanisms; and
3. ASEAN countries are knowledgeable about relevant practices to extend social protection to all, including vulnerable and unprotected groups

For labour law reform, two immediate objectives are specified:

1. By 2017, the Government in Myanmar (MOLIP/FGLLID) in consultation with the social partners has increased capacity to formulate, implement, monitor, review and/or enforce a modern OSH legal framework; and
2. For Vietnam to have an effective Public Employment Programme by the end of 2017 that provides income earning opportunities for income-poor and disadvantaged groups.

An overview of the programme management structure is given in the ToR (see Annex 1).

1.2 Purpose, Scope and Clients of the Evaluation

Purpose and Objective of the Evaluation

The two *main purposes* of the independent final evaluation are:

- A. promoting accountability, and
- B. enhancing learning within the ILO, the MoEL/ROK and other key stakeholders.

The *specific objectives* of the independent final evaluation are to:

- (i) Assess satisfactory involvement of tripartite constituents and the project counterparts in processes and procedures of the revised Programme framework for 2015 – 2017;
- (ii) Assess effectiveness and efficiency of the three-funded Asia-Pacific Regional projects, including the progress in achieving results (including intended and unintended, positive and negative results), the challenges affecting the achievement of the results, factors that hindered or facilitated achievement so far, and effectiveness of management arrangements;

- (iii) Assess effectiveness and efficiency of overall performance of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for 2015 – 2017;
- (iv) Identify factors that influenced (positively or negatively) the sustainability of the interventions of the three -funded Asia-Pacific Regional projects;
- (v) Identify good practices at the Programme and project levels that can and should be replicated; and
- (vi) Identify lessons learned that should be reflected in the design and implementation of similar projects and programmes in the future.

Scope and Clients of the Evaluation

This independent final evaluation is in line with the ILO evaluation policy guidelines and MoEL/ROK's interest. The evaluation is scheduled for implementation from April – July 2018. The evaluation covers the three priority areas/projects administered by ROAP and implementation of all three-funded Asia-Pacific Regional projects. The evaluation covers all geographic coverage of the three projects.

The final evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations are primarily addressed to the primary clients of this evaluation as follows: the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme team, ROAP, DWT-Bangkok, and MoEL/ROK. Secondary clients are tripartite constituents, the project counterparts, and partner institutions in Korea.

Limitations

The independent final evaluation (IFE) of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2015-2017 is in fact the evaluation of three projects, each with their own specific PRODOC and more or less detailed Results-Based Management system. In fact, the third project consists in itself, again, of two different projects: one on OSH in Myanmar, and one on PEP in Vietnam. In addition, the IFE does not concern the evaluation of one project in one country, but four countries are involved as well as a regional component, whereby the project Management Team is located in a fifth country, i.e. in Thailand (Bangkok), just as the experts on loan from Korean partner institutes, the lead experts and the ILO DWT-experts. The evaluation is thus much more complex than a one project/one country evaluation, and has posed limitations on timing and logistics, on the number of documents that could reasonably be studied, as well as on the depth of detail the evaluation could reach without resulting in a report that would become too voluminous. Such limitations have been mitigated by a number of measures, including in particular:

- by focusing on the main documents only (partly also indicated by the key stakeholders),
- by visiting only two out of the four countries,
- by selecting only the key stakeholders for interviews or skype calls,
- by focusing on the aspects that stand out during the interviews with key stakeholders during field missions and during skype interviews, and
- by trying to look for common factors when analysing the evaluation criteria instead of discussing each and every detail of individual projects in specific countries.

2 Purpose and Methodology of the Final Independent Evaluation

2.1 Conceptual Framework: Evaluation Criteria

The present independent final evaluation of the ILO/Korea Partnership will be based upon the ILO's evaluation policy and procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations system's evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

Following the ToR (see Annex 1), the evaluation will address four Evaluation Criteria: (1) Intervention progress and effectiveness; (2) Effectiveness of management arrangements; (3) Efficiency of resource use; and (4) Impact orientation and Sustainability. For each of these four Evaluation Criteria a series of evaluation questions were already identified in the ToR, and this list of questions has been adjusted in the Inception Report (cf. Annex 3) on the basis of the documents review, including the three PRODOCS and the report of the previous evaluation of the ILO-Korea Partnership (2009-2013) done in 2013 (see also below). Annex 6 provides the complete list of criteria and related questions used during this evaluation study; it also indicates sources of data, relevant stakeholder interviews and specific methods (further to be discussed in the next chapter on Methodology).

Cross-cutting issues

The evaluation has paid special attention to assessing the core ILO cross-cutting priorities of gender equality and non-discrimination. It has also assessed promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes, and constituent capacity development. In particular, the gender dimension was considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. To the extent possible, data collection and analysis were disaggregated by sex as described in the ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines and relevant Guidance Notes (see ToR in Annex 1).

Findings of the Previous Evaluation

Particular attention was further given to the findings and recommendations of the Evaluation of the 2009-2013 ILO/Korea partnership phase. The evaluation report of December 2013 identified 14 main findings and formulated a recommendation for each one of them. These are summarized in Annex 2, and a number of them have already been included in the evaluation questions in Annex 6. The Findings/Recommendations of this 2013 Evaluation will be analysed in depth against the findings of the present evaluation (see Section 3.5).

2.2 Methodology, Work Plan and Key Deliverables

Methodology

The methodology of the evaluation has been mixed, with both qualitative and quantitative methods employed. It includes a preparatory phase of documents review and discussions with the evaluation manager and the management team in Bangkok. The drafting and finalizing of the Inception Report was also part of this phase (see Annex 3).

This phase was followed by the evaluation fieldwork which has been qualitative and participatory in nature. Qualitative information was obtained through interviews with key informants and focus

group discussions (for example with trade unions) as appropriate. Opinions coming from stakeholders have improved and clarified the quantitative data obtained from project documents including the Technical Progress Reports (TPRs) and the projects' monitoring and evaluation plans/frameworks. The added benefit of this approach is that the participatory nature of the evaluation will contribute to the sense of ownership among stakeholders.

A combination of sound quantitative and qualitative research methods has been developed for each evaluation question in Annex 6. It was attempted to collect data from different sources by different methods for each evaluation question, so that the findings could be triangulated to draw valid and reliable conclusions. Data were disaggregated by sex where possible and appropriate.

The methodology and work plan for the collection of evidence was implemented in three phases:

- 1) An inception phase based on a review of existing documents to produce the Inception Report (see Annex 8). This includes a review of the project documents, progress reports, previous evaluations completed by the ILO, meeting minutes, training manuals, tools, technical guidelines, other publications used or developed by the three projects, and national policies on employment, labour, social protection, and occupational safety and health in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam.
- 2) A fieldwork phase to collect and analyse primary data; a detailed schedule is given in Annex 4. The independent evaluator travelled to Bangkok to interview the programme management team in ROAP, the lead specialists and other relevant specialists and ILO officials. The evaluator then travelled to Cambodia and Myanmar to conduct a field mission to interview in each country the key stakeholders with support from a national consultant, Mr. Somith Sok and Ms. Min Min Han respectively. These stakeholders included the ILO Country/Liaison offices staff, government counterparts, employers' and workers' organizations, and other project counterparts. At the conclusion of the field mission, the evaluator has conducted stakeholder workshops in Cambodia and in Myanmar to validate information and data collected through various methods and to share the preliminary findings with key stakeholders in each respective country. The evaluator has also debriefed the management team in ROAP in Bangkok on 28 May 2018 by means of a PowerPoint presentation of the preliminary findings from the field missions before departing the region. Those key counterparts who were not available during the mission have been interviewed through skype (see Annex 5).
Lao PDR and Vietnam are each only involved in one of the three projects (respectively the first on MRS and the third on PEP); for these countries the evaluator has conducted skype interviews with the main project counterparts (Annex 5) and interviews in Bangkok with the respective Lead Specialists (Annex 4).
- 3) A data analysis and reporting phase to produce the final evaluation report. Based on data collected during the inception phase and the inputs from the key stakeholders' discussions/interviews during the field mission and skype interviews, the evaluator has drafted the evaluation report and directly send it to the evaluation manager. The evaluation manager will forward the report to stakeholders, including the project management team, the lead specialists and tripartite constituents, for their inputs/comments to the report. The evaluation manager will consolidate the comments and forward them to the evaluator for consideration in finalizing the draft report. The evaluator will finalize the report, taking into consideration the stakeholder comments.

The gender dimension has been considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation.

The total number of people met is given in Table 2.1 below, whereby it must be noted that both in the group interviews and in the three workshops a substantial number of people did not contribute to the discussions. The number of men and women that has been met during the fieldwork is not substantially different (54% compared to 46% respectively).

Table 2.1: Number of people met during the fieldwork phase by gender (M/F).

Location of Stakeholder	Individual Interview		Group Interview		Skype Interview		Workshop Presentation		Total	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Bangkok	6	5	2	5		3	6	6	14	19
Phnom Penh	6	3	4				8	3	18	6
Nai Pyi Taw			8	13					8	13
Yangon	5	3					10	5	15	8
Vientiane					1				1	
Hanoi						1				1
Seoul					1				1	
Manila						1				1
Geneva						1				1
Total	17	11	14	18	2	6	24	14	57	49

Note on Quantitative Ranking of Projects

The Republic of Korea has expressed its wish to compare projects in different countries preferably by means of a quantitative ranking by means of statistical scales (for example the Likert scales, which are a common ratings format for surveys, whereby respondents rank quality from high to low or best to worst using five or seven levels). This was brought to the attention of the evaluator only after the inception report was already approved; it would also have required more time in the field in terms of explaining to respondents the method, the Likert scale itself and the purpose. More importantly, however, in the present case this method could not be used because the numbers of respondents per project in a country were far too small to be anywhere even remotely approaching statistical significance. For example, the numbers of respondents in Lao and Vietnam were, in fact, two (including lead experts from Bangkok), while those in Cambodia and Myanmar might have reached about 8 and 10 for respectively two and three *different* projects.

Key Deliverables

The evaluator will provide the following deliverables and tasks:

- 1) Deliverable 1: Inception report (see Annex 3);
- 2) Deliverable 2: Three PowerPoint presentations held at the two stakeholder workshops in Cambodia and Myanmar and the debriefing in Bangkok.
- 3) Deliverable 3: First draft of the evaluation report.
- 4) Deliverable 4: Final evaluation report with evaluation summary in the ILO Template.

Management Arrangements

A designated ILO staff who has no prior involvement in the project, Ms. Raviprapa Srisartsanarat, is managing this independent evaluation with oversight provided by the ILO Evaluation Office. An

international consultant, Dr. Theo van der Loop, was commissioned to conduct this evaluation. The evaluation was funded from the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme budget. A list of tasks of the evaluation manager is detailed in the ToR in Annex 1.

The ILO/Korea programme management team and relevant ILO officials has handled administrative contractual arrangements with the evaluator and provided logistical and other assistance as required. The ILO/Korea programme management team and relevant ILO officials were responsible for the tasks detailed in the ToR (see Annex 1).

The independent evaluator reports to the evaluation manager. The consultant has led the evaluation and is responsible for delivering the above evaluation deliverables using a combination of methods as mentioned above. In Cambodia and Myanmar, the Country offices have assisted in finding appropriate national consultants, respectively, Mr. Somith Sok and Ms. Min Min Han.

3 Overall Findings

The independent final evaluation of the ILO-Korea Partnership 2015-2017 is based on the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, and in the previous chapter four evaluation criteria have been identified which will be discussed in depth in the present chapter (Sections 3.1 – 3.4). These criteria have been investigated for the three projects and the four countries with the help of the evaluation questions identified in Section 2.1 (see Annex 6) which will be reiterated below in bold. Since the partnership concerns essentially three different projects with each their own specific PRODOC, it was chosen to present the data collected through a narrative based on the four evaluation criteria instead of presenting the country initiatives in detail.

3.1 Intervention Progress and Effectiveness

- 1) **To what extent have the three projects and the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for 2015 – 2017 been making sufficient progress towards its planned results in the different Results-Based Management (RBM) systems and Log Frames (including intended and unintended, positive and negative)?**

This evaluation question will be discussed separately for the three projects/PRODOCS. However, on the whole, it can be concluded that the three projects made solid progress towards their planned results, and, in fact, adhered quite closely to the three different RBM's identified in the PRODOCS. The few cases in which progress diverged substantially from the RBM's, e.g. in the case of PEP, will be indicated in the below analysis. The RBM's and Log Frames of the PRODOCS themselves show some important flaws which will be discussed in Section 3.2.

Highlighted performances in the three projects are as follows:

a. Project 1: Towards a Mutual Recognition of Skills (MRS) in CLM countries for AEC 2015 and beyond.

This project on MRS has several components, a regional one and three country components. At the **regional level**, the following main achievements can be identified:

- Comprehensive action plans were developed in the CLM countries within the framework of the ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRf).
- The Regional Model for Competency Standards (RMCS) was published for six selected sectors, i.e. Agriculture/Aquaculture, Construction, Domestic work, Garment, Mechanical services, and Welding services, and for two general components, i.e. Core competencies and Guidelines on RMCS. In addition, the project started to use the RMCS for leveraging and benchmarking.
- Capacity Development activities were undertaken in cooperation with Korean Partner Institutions, such as ToT and ToA, as well as the fellowships in Korea provided in cooperation with HRD Korea which amounted to 10-18 (tripartite) fellowships per year; illustratively, staff from the MOLSW in Lao PDR were very satisfied about these fellowships and the training they received from HRD Korea in Seoul and Bangkok.
- The Regional Skills Technical Working Group (RSTWG) was initiated in August 2015 in Bangkok with the 'ASEAN Skills Focal Point Meeting' and has since been held annually by eight of the ten ASEAN Member States (Brunei and Singapore have not attended any of

- them). The title of the 4th RSTWG Meeting on 10-11 July 2018 in Manila is “*Moving Towards the Mutual Recognition of Skills’ Implementation in ASEAN*”. One staff member of the respective ministries of labour is assigned in each ASEAN country as a focal point, and the ASEAN Secretariat (ASEC) based in Jakarta has always been participating actively in this RSTWG. Importantly, the action plans of CLM are discussed in side-meetings of the RSTWG.
- One other main achievement is that the technical capacities and skills systems of the countries were established, whereby the country with the most challenges was identified as Lao PDR.
 - Action Plans were set up for the implementation of MRS between sending and receiving countries for selected occupations, especially bilateral cooperation between Thailand and CLM countries. The ASEAN Secretariat (ASEC) in Jakarta was at first reluctant to engage in MRS, since they already were initiating MRA’s for the free flow of skilled labour, but after several meetings the complementarity of the two systems were recognized.
 - Attention was raised for the Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) in assessment centres especially when this learning was acquired in the informal economy.
 - An interesting and very detailed study was also funded by ILO/Korea into the Employers’ and workers’ associations’ practices on skills development in the automotive, construction, garment, tourism and domestic work sectors in CLM countries (Ruttiya Bhula-or 2018). It is a pity that this study, for which the fieldwork was conducted between October 2015 and February 2016 has not yet been fully completed 2.5 years later (although it is in its final stages of editing).
 - In addition to the MRS work, the ILO/Korea partnership initiated two other activities:
 - A regional debate on Skills and the Future of Work (FOW) through the ILO/Korea TVET Forum in October 2016, and the Regional Meeting on Skills and the FOW in October 2017; and
 - Capacity building for Vocational Training in the Asia-Pacific region with the support to the development of a publication on skills and the FOW, and to the organization of advanced level TVET training courses, i.e. the advanced level training for Master Trainers in the Automotive and ICT Sectors with Korea-Tech in Korea (December 2017).

When we look at the **CLM Countries**, with respect to the Mutual Recognition of Skills (MRS) they aim to first negotiate it bilaterally with Thailand, and then only proceed to negotiate it within ASEAN. The development of a MoU/Collaborative Agreement on MRS activities and standards between CLM and Thailand remains a challenge. Although initially it was Thailand that had requested support from ILO on this a few years ago, after the political changes in this country the progress was less than anticipated; one of the problems is that the Thai standards have not yet been translated into English, indicating that this has not been among the greatest priorities in Thailand, and one stakeholder suggested that Thailand is itself revising their standards first. In contrast, in Myanmar the standards are *developed* firstly in the English language and are only then translated into the Myanmar language. An additional problem is political in nature since it concerns migration issues and agreements between countries.

The ministries of labour in the respective countries coordinated the development and improvement of the skills/competency standards in two occupations selected based on demand in each country, as follows:

Country	Occupations selected
Cambodia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masonry • Building Electrical Wiring
Lao	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bricklaying • Plastering
Myanmar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewing Machine Operator • Welding

On capacity building, the Department of Skill Development of the Thailand Ministry of Labour organised the Training of 25 Trainers and Assessors (ToT/ToA) in Cambodia on the skills standards for bricklaying and plastering, and of 20 Trainers and Assessors in Myanmar on the skills standards for garment manufacturing sewing machine. For Lao PDR this type of training is expected later in 2018. This ToT/ToA was funded jointly from the Thailand International Cooperation Agency (TICA) and the ILO/Korea Partnership. The challenge here was that the Ministry of Labour (MoL) in Thailand needed to spend a great deal of time to secure the funding from TICA (a lot of correspondence between MoL, TICA and ILO).

In **Cambodia**, several additional achievements related to MRS are as follows:

- Awareness raising on MRS, for example through workshops, organised by MLVT.
- Preparations are ongoing at the MLVT to set up, register and test 10 competency assessment centres in Cambodia in 2018.
- In the growing Tourism sector only about 30% of the 620,000 direct jobs are formally trained and certified. The ILO/Korea Partnership also supports the Ministry of Tourism in the organization of training workshops of national master trainers and assessors in the food and beverage sector, of Spa & Wellness consultations on ASEAN standards, and of the dissemination of knowledge on the green job concept. Here the focus is on MRA. In addition, a pilot project was supported on the assessment of RPL. With the ILO inputs, the National Committee for Tourism Professionals (NCTP) has conducted a SPA & Wellness awareness workshop, and it played an important role in facilitating the establishment of the SPA and Wellness Association.
- The project made it also possible for the Ministry of Tourism to collaborate with the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports (MoEYS) and MoLVT in incorporating the MRS into the national education curriculum.

For **Myanmar**, we need to mention among the achievements also the following:

- MOLIP chairs the National Skills Standards Authority (NSSA) for Quality Assurance.
- Apart from the two occupations mentioned in the above, MOLIP with support from the project was also able to develop competency standards for the Hotel and Tourism sector, whereby the MRS took place between Myanmar and the Philippines.
- MOLIP was further able to complete the *identification* of 25 occupations for which they will in the future set up the competency standards.
- The project, furthermore, promoted a better understanding of the skills standards and certification system developed for the welding sector and practiced by employers' associations and industries, thereby fostering a better collaboration between employers' associations and government agencies.
- A workshop was held in November 2017 to review and benchmark the National Skill Certification System for the welder occupation.

In Myanmar a relatively large number of donors are operating in the area of skills, in particular GIZ with a national skills standards project (excluding a testing system).

In *Lao PDR*, less activities took place than in the other two countries, but the priorities of the MOLSW are in line with the above, whereby Lao's first priority is the revision and comparison of the Lao and Thai standards. Other priorities are: improve the Lao standards; improve skills training curricula; and the setting-up and piloting of a module for skills testing and certification. Skills training is already supported by an ADB-funded project.

b. Project 2: Supporting the implementation of sustainable social protection floors for the workers and their families in ASEAN.

At *Regional level*, the main achievement is the yearly held training undertaken in Korea, in particular on employment insurance, provided by the Korean partner institute, KEIS, in partnership with ITC Turin. A compromise has been reached on the target group since KEIS has preference for high-ranked government officers (e.g. DG-level), while ILO prefers tripartite participants and practical level government officers.

In *Cambodia*, the achievements are:

- The support to the Sub-Decree on “National Health Insurance Scheme” for workers of the formal private sector which was endorsed by the Prime-Minister in 2016.
- Support in 2016 to the NSSF which is collecting contributions and paying the benefits concerning 1.4 million clients (which were accumulated since 2008). Significantly, 64% of these paying members are working in garment and footwear factories which are mainly women workers, and therefore, the NSSF members are in majority female (over 80%).
- The tripartite NSSF (in the MLVT) has now extended its coverage to the public sector and offers benefits to pregnant women ('baby bonus' and cash transfers), health insurance, work accident compensation, survivor pensions, and health check and treatment. Several other groups, e.g. civil servants and people with disabilities, are insured through the Ministry of Social Affairs.
- ILO/Korea also supported actuarial studies in public and private sectors on health insurance, as well as on pension scheme reform (in 2018).
- TA on the drafting of an Investment Policy for the Employment Injury Insurance, EII (2017) of NSSF.
- Analytical work led in 2017 to the development of a new reform: the National Social Protection Policy Framework (NSPPF) with new benefits; it is a ten-year rolling plan (NSPPF 2016-2025) created to coordinate the different social protection funds.
- The National Social Protection Council is responsible for policy adoption and monitoring. The Council includes 13 ministries.
- Studies on the expansion of social protection service to informal workers is under preparation (with support from EU and ILO).
- Capacity Development was also undertaken in Korea through courses organised by the Korean Partner Institutions, COMWEL and KEIS. Under the ILO-Korea Project, NSSF sends at least two staff every year to attend a week-long training course in Korea, and in total over 20 NSSF staff have already attended. In the courses organized by KEIS the Cambodian tripartite constituents participated.

One unintended, negative result in this project was that the SWS component was dropped for several reasons, but partly also because it is not a government priority at this time (cf. CARD).

In **Myanmar**, the main achievements are:

- Support to the SSB which has already reached 1.15 million insured persons (up from 600,000 in 2012). Like several other ministries in Myanmar (e.g. Military and Railway), the SSB runs its *own* hospitals. However, the quality of health care is poor compared to outside medical services, partly also because there is a lack of health staff in these hospitals; as a result, SSB indicated that they have received a lot of complaints in this area.
- SSB has been aiming at four reforms of which two with support from ILO-Korea:
 - 1) Legal reform: Reform of the 1954-Law in 2012, but, still, this law needs substantial further improvements.
 - 2) IT reform: ILO with help of an international consultant prepared a ToR to set up an IT system for MIS: 85 companies bought the tender form (deadline 28 March 2018) and 15 of these companies submitted the technical and commercial proposal (deadline 31 May 2018). This consultant will monitor the implementation through the ILO/Korea project, while logistical funding will be provided by MOLIP (cost-sharing).

The other two reforms have also received support from ILO (but not from ILO-Korea):

- 3) Health reform (with support from Luxemburg and ILO): Successfully implemented in 3 regions and the plan is to implement it in 4 more regions in 2018 with the help of an expert from Thailand (concerning payment calculations and contracts between SSB and private health centres).
- 4) Administrative reform (with support from VZF/ILO).

c. Project 3: Supporting Implementation of Labour Law Reform in Viet Nam and Myanmar.

In **Myanmar**, the achievements are related to **OSH**:

- With limited resources, this sub-project shows interesting achievements.
- The long-awaited new OSH Law is currently being discussed in the Parliament, and enactment is expected later this year. Some modifications proposed by ILO were apparently taken out of the law, but this could not be verified as the latest draft is still confidential.
- Three areas of cooperation between ILO/Korea and the FGLLID (of MOLIP):
 - 1) Accident reporting system: Study Tour to Malaysia, and a training on this reporting system in Myanmar for two days to six participants.
According to the FGLLID, ILO needs to distinguish more exactly between prevention/reporting by FGLLID, compensation by SSB, and medical diagnosis by MoHS. In addition, the participation of EO/WO is needed here.
 - 2) Capacity Building of the safety and health Inspectors: three staff were trained in the Work Improvement in Small Enterprises (WISE) program in a 4-day seminar in Myanmar, and a workshop was organized on “Technical safety, usage, storage and production of chemicals” for 15 participants in Yangon. There was a diplomatic issue with the Danish Embassy as they are cooperating with FGLLID for many years and do not want other international organisations to enter this area (officially to avoid overlaps in OSH matters but a coordination mechanism could easily be set up for that).
 - 3) OSH Awareness raising campaign was held in 5 regions from October 2017 to March 2018 and was judged by different stakeholders to be quite a success.

- Industrial Hygiene course with the MoHS and the involvement of the Korean partner institute, KOSHA. For the four days-workshop over 830 slides were developed in the Korean language and then translated into the Myanmar language. This has the disadvantage that the material would not be accessible to the counterparts in Cambodia, Lao, Vietnam and Thailand, nor to the experts in DWT/ROAP who do not speak Korean. Therefore, translation into English might be advisable. There are 30 participants who will attend this training course: 5 from FGLLID, 5 from SSB and 20 from MoHS. A specific problem is that KOSHA is expected to work only with ministries of labour, and not with other ministries (which required special provisions).
- Although there is a committee composed of SSB, FGLLID and MoHS called the “Occupational Health and Safety Standards Committee” (OHSSC) chaired by the Director General of the MoHS, the relations between these organisations are not always efficient in the area where social protection and OSH come together.
- There are many donors in the area related to OSH, and currently there are about 5 initiatives (some donors are apparently trying to escape the congestion by moving to Lao PDR).

In **Vietnam**, the achievements are related to the **Public Employment Programme (PEP)**, which was part of ILO’s Employment Intensive Investment Programme (EIIP). The cooperation between MOLISA in Vietnam suffered a bit as perceived by MOLISA from the large gap of one year between the two different DWT experts in Bangkok (although there was a national consultant during this period providing technical assistance). This cooperation has ultimately led to the formulation of a Manual with draft Operational Guidelines which were ready to be tested at the end of 2017. However, at that time the ILO decided to *terminate* the PEP component since the ILO Country Office in Hanoi did not have enough manpower and the ILO/Korea partnership could not contribute in this way. This was regretted by some stakeholders since a link was about to be made with the large, US\$ 830 million ‘National Targeted Programme on Sustainable Poverty Reduction’ (NTP-SPR) in Vietnam. Nevertheless, although MOLISA has much appreciated ILO’s support in getting the manual ready especially since PEP was a relatively new area of cooperation, it is now moving ahead on its own trying to integrate PEP into the NTP-SPR, and concretely introduce the manual in the government’s programme this year.

2) To which extent has gender mainstreaming been addressed by the design and implementation of the three projects and the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme? In how far does this also apply to the other cross-cutting issues of non-discrimination, promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes, and constituent capacity development?

Overall, gender mainstreaming has received clear attention in the ILO/Korea projects, but has not always been actively addressed, and it is sometimes underdeveloped in tripartite organisations. In **Cambodia**, gender mainstreaming is not very explicit in MRS and the two occupations selected are male-dominated. The National Social Protection Policy Framework (NSPPF) of 2017 has not identified specific provisions to promote gender. On the other hand, the majority of beneficiaries in NSSF (about 80%) are women, and social security measures have recently been more focussed on women, perhaps in the framework of the approaching national elections, including maternity benefits, baby bonus and cash transfers. In the tourism sector 60% of workers are women, and a substantial 30% of Master Trainers/Assessors is female.

Gender mainstreaming has in **Myanmar** often not been acknowledged as an important issue by the stakeholders interviewed. The selection of occupations for MRS is gender balanced with

sewing machine operators being mainly women, while welders are mainly men. In social protection, regional trainings mostly involve men, and there is a clear need for more specific gender indicators. Participation of women in the workforce is quite widespread, with government organisations like FGLLID, SSB and MoHS having a majority of female staff, and sometimes in the highest ranks (e.g. the head of the NSSA is female). In addition, the majority of the 1.15 million insured persons is female.

In *Lao PDR*, the two occupations selected for MRS, i.e. bricklaying and plastering, are male-dominated occupations, while the MOLSW explicitly encouraged women to participate in training, in workshops, etc., and the survey of training needs also included women. In *Vietnam*, the beneficiaries of PEP were selected equally between male and female according to MOLISA.¹

Regarding the other cross-cutting issues, the attention differed substantially. Non-discrimination was generally not considered explicitly, while the promotion of international labour standards and ILO Conventions was important for all three projects. Specifically, the Government of Myanmar has not yet signed ILO Fundamental Convention No. 98, and generally has only signed three out of the eight Fundamental Conventions and none of the Governance Conventions. In contrast, Cambodia has ratified all eight Fundamental, and one out of the four Governance Conventions. Tripartite processes have received a great deal of attention as will be explained in Section 3.2, while constituent capacity development is the subject of the next evaluation question.

3) What evidence exists to demonstrate that the three projects and the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme contributed to policy formulation and capacity building in the target countries?

The policy framework in *Cambodia* has in recent years become quite comprehensive with the ILO-supported National Employment Policy (NEP) 2015-2025, the National Social Protection Policy Framework (NSPPF) 2011-2014, the Industrial Development Policy, as well as the ADB-supported TVET Policy launched in June 2017. The support from the ILO/Korea Partnership was therefore very relevant, in particular through its support of the NEP which has three goals of which the second one concerns 'Skills and Human Resource Development'! This NEP brought 12 ministries to work together on employment and is being implemented at sub-national levels with an effective monitoring mechanism in place. The ILO/Korea project contributed thus substantially to policy formulation, but also to capacity building as we have seen in the above under achievements which included, for example, many capacity building, ToT/ToA and other workshops in-country, in Bangkok, Turin or Korea. It was also appreciated by many stakeholders to learn-while-working together with experts, consultants, staff, etc. The ILO/Korea projects were closely aligned to the DWCP for Cambodia (see Annex 7).

According to all stakeholders in *Myanmar*, the three projects on Skills Development, Social Protection and OSH are very relevant for its current state of development. These topics are also strongly reflected in the new DWCP 2018-2021 for Myanmar to be launched in June 2018 (cf. Annex 7). In addition, the National Tripartite Dialogue Forum (NTDF) was set up by ILO Liaison Office (LO) in particular to discuss the DW agenda. It is highly appreciated by stakeholders, for example the EO underlined this because of the relatively high number of labour disputes. The suggestion from the WO is to extend the NTDF to the regional and/or state levels. Regarding

¹ As has been rationalized in Chapter 2, visits have been made to the main stakeholders in Cambodia and Myanmar, but only selected stakeholders in Lao PDR and Vietnam were interviewed by skype. Therefore, on some evaluation questions less or no data were acquired for Lao/Vietnam than for Cambodia/Myanmar.

capacity building, there were several trainings organized with the help of the ILO/Korea funded project, for example on employment injury by KEIS in 2015 and 2017 (see further above under achievements).

Policy formulation and capacity building were much less explicit in *Lao PDR*, where for example the training by the MoL in Thailand still has to take place, as well as in *Vietnam*, where the PEP programme was interrupted for more than a year in between the two DWT experts, and the project was terminated in December 2017. The ILO/Korea projects were closely aligned to the priorities of the DWCP in both countries (see Annex 7).

4) To what extent are the tripartite constituents and the project counterparts satisfied with the quality of the outputs and are likely to, or have used the tools/practices developed?

The Government Organisations (GO) interviewed in the different CLMV countries are generally very satisfied with the quality of the specific outputs in the projects and have clearly used the tools and practices developed. This was shown in the above, and the following examples underline this further:

- TVET/MRS in Cambodia is really demand-driven!
- Experts working on standards were assessed as very good in Cambodia.
- The Myanmar National Competency Standards were developed for 25 occupations, and two occupations were selected for MRS;
- The OSH Awareness campaign was judged as quite successful; and
- IT Reform is progressing well while the SSB is working on three other reforms.

In *Lao PDR*, the MOLSW is also very satisfied with the quality of the specific outputs in the projects, but much more needs to be done, while in *Vietnam*, MOLISA is clearly trying to use the output of the ILO/Korea project by integrating PEP into the NTP-SPR, and concretely introducing the manual in the government's programme this year.

The ILO/Korea projects have generally more focussed on the GO than on the EO and WO, although they have clearly participated in selected activities, and sometimes even took the lead in certain activities under the ILO/Korea projects. This will be extensively discussed in the next section (under evaluation Question No. 6).

3.2 Effectiveness of Management Arrangements

5) To what extent are the tripartite constituents and the project counterparts satisfied with processes and procedures of the revised Programme framework for 2015 – 2017, in particular less geographically scattered and more thematically focused?

In view of the substantial number of achievements made as was discussed in Section 3.1, it is not surprising that the main project counterparts are generally very satisfied with the support received by ILO and the Republic of Korea (ROK). The long-standing partnership contributes to this feeling of satisfaction as does the continuity in the activities undertaken over several partnership periods. For the CLMV countries and or the ASEAN region the support provided through this partnership is quite important, not only for the countries involved and for the region, but also for the progress made in the different areas supported.

The Government Organisations in both *Cambodia* and *Myanmar* are generally satisfied with the Management Arrangements; it is properly done by skype/email and meetings abroad, but in Myanmar there is sometimes confusion on whom to contact: ILO Liaison Office (LO), the consultants, or the lead and/or Korean experts in Bangkok. In general, the project budget did not allow staff costs, which has substantially affected the implementation of the three projects. ILO leveraged its resources (e.g. ILO-RBSA and VZF) to cover such shortage and also got exceptional approval by MOEL/ROK to fund two national staff in Myanmar and Cambodia for Project 2 on Social Protection. However, in several project components there were no national staff coordinating the work. In *Lao PDR*, the MOLSW was in particular satisfied with the progress of the RSTWG, which they consider a very good forum where the countries involved can learn from each other.

Overall Conclusion on Revised Programme Framework

A more efficient allocation of resources was started in this phase of the ILO/Korea Partnership 2015-2017 by changing from an annual to a three-year budget cycle. This was appreciated by most stakeholders. Most of the tripartite constituents and project counterparts are also satisfied with the revised Programme framework for 2015 – 2017 compared to the previous phase, in particular less geographically scattered & more thematically focused, especially because the revised framework is beneficial for efficiency, and, in fact, further focus could be beneficial. Lastly, more efficiency could even be reached if the time between cycles could be reduced: there is often a gap of four months or more before the actual release of the funds by the donor in the new cycle.

Results-Based Management (RBM) arrangements

Regarding the RBM of the ILO/Korea projects, the previous evaluation in 2013 found that indicators were often not sufficiently specified to measure success. For the present phase the RBM has clearly improved since then, but still requires substantial further improvements. First of all, there are three PRODOCS and thus three RBM's although the quality of details differs quite a bit. Only the MRS PRODOC has an officially verifiable Logical Framework (Log Frame) which is an essential condition for monitoring progress. However, there is a high degree of repetition among the assumptions in the different boxes, and the indicators are not quantified; by including in the indicators the information contained under 'Target' they could become genuine 'Objectively Verifiable Indicators' (OVI).

In the Social protection PRODOC there is not a real Log Frame, but more an overview of 'Outputs and Activities'. The assumptions, means of verification and baseline are here altogether lacking. The third PRODOC consists, in fact, of two Log Frames. The one on OSH is difficult to interpret as the premise is that the indicators can only be achieved in close cooperation with several other projects in this area and with the support of KOSHA. In other words, no OVI exist and thus there is no way of monitoring progress. In addition, the indicators specified are often too general, e.g. 'The OSH Law is passed by the Parliament'; this is more of an assumption (which by the way are fully lacking in this overview), than an indicator of project progress. Lastly, the Log Frame for PEP in Vietnam identifies indicators but for two out of the total of four outputs these indicators are not objectively verifiable as they are not concretized (e.g. number of workshops, number of programs, and number of people trained, but not how many of each), while also in this Log Frame the assumptions are lacking. It would be better to keep these suggestions in mind when designing the new phase of the partnership, and make sure that the three Log Frames are more systematically developed along similar and comparable lines.

6) To what extent have stakeholders, particularly workers' and employers' organizations been involved in projects implementation?

The study by Ruttiya Bhula-or (2018) provides an interesting and detailed overview of Employers' and Workers' Organisations (EO/WO) in the CLM countries (in early 2016). It focuses on the practices of these organisations related to skills development in five sectors, i.e. the automotive, construction, garment, tourism and domestic work sectors, but has a much broader outreach. It analyses, for example, the role of the ASEAN Confederation of Employers and the ASEAN Trade Union Council which both recognize the importance of skills training and standards, but their activities are mainly focused either on trade advocacy and development or on labour rights promotion and rights protection schemes. An interesting finding is that in certain sectors, e.g. Garments, the EO have their own training and skills development centres. Overall, in the three CLM countries the EO and WO face many challenges, such as limited resources, a low level of public-private partnership and a general lack of information. Regarding WO specifically, their focus is on strengthening labour unions by increasing union membership and by regularly campaigning for workers' fundamental rights at work, and as a result, concerns about skills development are found to be often secondary and limited.

The WO and EO in **Cambodia** have generally been involved in the implementation of projects through tripartite fora and sometimes also more directly:

- For Skills development: The government (MoLVT) always invites EO/WO for meetings, training, etc.; the latter are active to join, however, only selected unions were invited and sharing among unions has been limited. When ILO is the organizer, all unions are always invited.
- EO and WO are involved in the whole MRS process, i.e. RSTWG, Expert WG from industry and Industry Advisory Group (IAG). However, at this stage, operational work is more between GO and EO; once in the testing phase for competency the WO will also be more systematically included.
- In Tourism, a tripartite approach is being applied, i.e. some Master Trainers have been selected from the Worker and Employer Representatives. EO are also involved in the training, while some master trainers are members of the Hotel Union. The National Committee for Tourism Professionals (NCTP) developed relations with business establishments such as Naga World and others in order to provide training to their staff.
- In general, there is a need in skills development to promote more concrete activities from the private sector, which needs to become more pro-active (e.g. through training obligations, a skills development fund, and/or an apprenticeship programme).
- Regarding social protection, EO/WO participation is institutionalized through the Board of NSSF which consists of two union representatives, two from employers, and five from the government.
- In most ministries other than the ministries of labour, they are not used to working in the tripartite way (e.g. MoSA, MoH, MEF).

The involvement of the EO/WO in **Myanmar** differs according to the three projects. In skills development, generally, more participation of employers is very much needed; perhaps a tripartite system or PPP for skills development can be set up. The WO were involved in the assessment process on Competency Standards, and in NSSA, which is also working closely with the EO. A particularly good practice is the Myanmar Engineering Society working jointly with the Asian

Welding Federation (AWF) in Singapore on the standards for the welding occupation; this society and this federation really *own* the project. In addition, employers of the welders have been willing to pay for the certification fees.

In social protection, importantly there is a tripartite annual meeting of the SSB, while on the other hand there was no coordination with the EO on the Social Security Law revised in 2012. Generally, the Social Protection Floor (SPF) is discussed through the NTDF, organized by ILO-LO, which met 10 times in the past two years.

Also concerning OSH, the participation of EO/WO differs:

- The EO and WO were involved in developing the OSH Law from the beginning;
- However, the EO/WO have not yet been involved in the accident-reporting activities of the FGLLID (although these activities were discussed in the NTDF); on the other hand, the WO were deeply involved in the OSH awareness campaign of the FGLLID.
- The EO participate in the Occupational Health and Safety Standards Committee (OHSSC) under MoHS (which is by the way not generally working in a tripartite way as MOLIP).

On the whole, tripartite participation is an area for improvement, while one WO (the Myanmar Industries, Craft and Services, MICS), as an emerging union, felt sometimes somewhat neglected and left out from activities of the ILO Myanmar, although the Liaison Office makes sure that it always treats all WO's equally.

According to the MOLSW in *Lao PDR* there is a strong commitment among the tripartite constituents, and the EO and WO are involved in many activities, like workshops, curricula, meetings, and particularly the National Advisory Chamber for TVET and Skill Development is a tripartite body chaired by the Ministry of Education and Sports.

7) How effectively have the projects delivered core services to project counterparts and relevant stakeholders, and how effective were, hereby, the contributions of the lead specialists, the Korean experts on secondment/loan, the Korean institutions, the ILO and KOICA Country Offices (CO), and the ILO DWT Experts?

Generally, the delivery of core services was considered effective by the main stakeholders. In *Cambodia* communication with ILO CO was judged to be very good, and ILO also comes with a good and appropriate approach, i.e. alignment to national and regional policies. The contributions of the lead specialists and the ILO DWT Experts were considered of good quality. The two Korean experts on loan from the Korean Partner Institutions, COMWEL and KOSHA, were involved especially in different capacity building activities. In particular, the NSSF has been working directly with COMWEL on the basis of a MoU since 2010 (NSSF's comment is illustrative in this respect: "We learned a lot from COMWEL since we first went to Korea in 2005."). Under the ILO-Korea Project, NSSF sends at least two staff every year to attend a week-long training course in Korea, and in total over 20 NSSF staff have already attended. There are also exchange visits of delegates between Cambodian stakeholders (e.g. NSSF) and Korean Partner Institutions (e.g. KEIS, COMWEL and Korea National Health Operation). From the side of the Korean Partner Institutes an interest has been expressed to become more deeply involved in the ILO-Korea Partnership programme, and for example KEIS would like to develop an Employment Policy Development Course on job creation, ALMP's, etc. There is no sharing of information between the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme and the KOICA Country Office.

In **Myanmar** the communication with ILO-LO was also judged by stakeholders to be effective. The contributions of the lead specialists and the ILO DWT Experts were considered of good quality in the MRS/Skills component. In the MRS project national stakeholders had more contact with the lead specialists in Bangkok than with the LO in Yangon. The two Korean experts on loan from the Korean Partner Institutions, COMWEL and KOSHA, were also in Myanmar involved in different capacity building activities, for example the industrial hygiene training at the MoHS in cooperation with KOSHA, and the FGLID expressed its satisfaction in working on OSH with the Korean expert on loan from KOSHA. There is hardly any sharing of information between the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme and the KOICA Country Office despite sustained efforts by the ILO Liaison Office in Yangon.

In **Lao PDR** close relations were maintained with ILO DWT staff from Bangkok (there is no separate ILO country office in Lao PDR), and the technical and financial inputs from ILO were much appreciated. Staff at the MOLSW are satisfied about the training provided by HRD Korea and would like to expand this training programme. In **Vietnam** the relations with ILO DWT staff from Bangkok were much appreciated although there was a gap of over one year between the two experts, and the inputs of national consultants resulting in the operational guidelines and a manual were also considered effective.

3.3 Efficiency of Resource Use

8) To what extent has the project delivered value for money?

All stakeholders interviewed agreed that the ILO/Korea projects clearly delivered value for money, and that the resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) have been allocated strategically and efficiently to achieve the intended results. The resource use has been judged as quite efficient especially also compared to a relatively limited budget per project per country. In addition, cost-sharing with other projects has been considered as positive, for example, with AFD, EU, and other development partners in Cambodia, and with Luxemburg in Myanmar, as well as with ASEC and ILO (RBSA, VZF) in both countries. In fact, one activity is so in demand that participant organisations are offering to pay for their staff's logistical costs as long as they can participate in the Regional Training held yearly in Korea, in that sense, efficiency could be enhanced by increasing the maximum number of participants.

On the whole, therefore, the key stakeholders are positive on the delivery of value for money, and they indicated that *more resources* are indeed needed, for example, in **Cambodia**:

- for MRS to expand to more occupations and to set up the National Coordination Committee (NCC) to collect info on AQRF, MRS and MRA! (While ADB is supporting the broader area of skills training, ILO has been initiating and supporting MRS);
- to support the Policy Plan for Tourism 2017-2025 aiming to certify all tourism workers (“one employee, one skill”), and for training on tourism in remote areas; and
- for pension schemes, etc.

And more resources are needed in **Myanmar** too:

- for MRS/Skills, to expand MRS to more occupations. While skills assessment is already provided by the government, there is conflict of interest on skills training. A few GO stakeholders request for a greater focus on this topic, and it is also a priority of some of

the WO (since it is relevant e.g. for the 'grassroots people'). However, MRS is closer to the project's objectives, and the ILO is better positioned to support MRS (e.g. vis-à-vis ASEAN), while skills training is much more an area already covered broadly by the ADB (e.g. in Cambodia and Lao).

- for Social protection, to support the priority of the IT-System on MIS (cf. SSB and DWT), and to support SSB's legal reform (since they could not find a proper donor yet); more resources are also needed because social protection is a main priority of the EO.
- for OSH: in order to have more focus on the accident reporting mechanism per se, while the MoHS would like to shift the attention more to the health of workers (instead of the focus on safety); in contrast, the EO puts a lot of importance to OSH awareness raising, and one of their members, the Construction Association, already has its own OSH-Regulation.

Also, in *Lao PDR*, there is a need for more resources especially for the revision and comparison between Lao and Thai standards which is the first priority of the MOLSW. Lastly, more resources have also been requested by the Ministry of Labour in *Thailand*, i.e. in order to innovate the training methodology with inputs and best practices from abroad (including ITC Turin), to conduct tracer studies of the staff in Cambodia and Myanmar trained in Thailand by the MoL, and to provide for the insurance of the trainees while they are staying in Thailand.

9) Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically and efficiently to achieve expected results?

Financial Expenditures

The total budget for the three projects was US\$ 2 million for three years 2015-2017. The MOEL/ROK has agreed to a no-cost extension until 31 May 2018, with final reporting due by 15 August 2018. For the three projects the budgets were initially US\$ 800,000, 800,000 and 400,000 (cf. Section 1.1), but due to exchange rate fluctuations this was reduced somewhat to US\$ 764,607, 764,607 and 389,157. Table 3.1 below shows the state of affairs as of 7 June 2018 at which time the actual spending showed still a balance of over US\$ 97,000 (i.e. about 5% of the budget); the majority of this balance is in Project 3, and overall this balance concerns committed expenses to be disbursed in the coming few months.

Regarding expenditure categories, activities such as seminars, subcontracts, training and grants, accounted together for 38.5% of actual spending. International and national consultants accounted for 24.6 %, while the spending on National Professional Staff and Local Support Staff amounted to 20.6 %. The latter concerns in large majority the staff costs of the ILO/Korea Management Team in Bangkok which was divided over and charged from the three projects. It also included an exceptional approval by MOEL/ROK to fund two staff in Myanmar and Cambodia for Project 2 on Social Protection, which is why the amount for national professional staff in this project is higher (i.e. 18.8%) than for the other projects. Travel and operating expenses amount only to about 5%, while the standard ILO Programme Support Costs (11.5%) completes the picture.

The differences between the three projects are, in fact, quite moderate. There is more use of international consultants in Projects 1 and 2, while Project 3 uses much more often national consultants. Costs for seminars were substantial for all three, while subcontracts and grants were more often used by Project 1.

Table 3.1: Expenditure categories of the Total Actual Spending for all three Projects (in %).

Total for all three projects: Expenditure Category	Project 1 MRS	Project 2 Social Protection	Project 3 OSH/PEP	TOTAL
International Consultants	19,3	24,8	9,7	19,8
Local Support Staff	6,4	7,0	4,8	6,3
National Professional Staff	12,0	18,8	9,5	14,3
National Consultants	0,0	2,0	21,6	4,8
Travel Project & Other Staff	0,1	5,0	6,5	3,3
Subcontracts	20,6	13,1	6,7	15,0
General Operating Expenses	2,1	0,8	1,8	1,5
Seminars incl. training	19,3	17,0	27,8	19,9
Grants	8,7	0,0	0,0	3,6
Programme Support Costs	11,5	11,5	11,5	11,5
Total in %	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
TOTAL Actuals In US\$	751.875	735.581	333.204	1.820.660
Row Percentage	39,9	39,9	20,3	100,0
BALANCE: Budget - Actuals	12.732	29.026	55.953	97.711
Total Budget in US\$	764.607	764.607	389.157	1.918.371

Table 3.2: Expenditure categories of the Actual Spending only for Project 3 on OSH and PEP (in %).

Project 3 (OSH/PEP): Expenditure Category	OSH- Myanmar	PEP- Vietnam	Other	TOTAL
International Consultants	0,0	18,5	11,2	9,7
Local Support Staff	0,0	0,0	15,5	4,8
National Professional Staff	0,0	0,0	30,5	9,5
National Consultants	6,7	56,7	0,0	21,6
Travel Project & Other Staff	14,8	4,1	0,0	6,5
Subcontracts	19,1	0,0	0,0	6,7
General Operating Expenses	0,0	0,0	5,8	1,8
Seminars incl. training	59,3	20,7	0,0	27,8
Grants	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Programme Support Costs	0,0	0,0	37,0	11,5
Total %	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
TOTAL Actuals In US\$	116.501	113.108	103.594	333.204
Row Percentage	35,0	33,9	31,1	100,0
BALANCE: Budget - Actuals	8.002	15.556	32.396	55.953
Total Budget in US\$	124.503	128.664	135.990	389.157

With respect to Project 3 on Labour Law Reform, the division of expenditure categories is given separately for OSH, PEP and other costs in Table 3.2 above. In the OSH sub-project in Myanmar almost 60% was spent on seminars, and another 20% on subcontracts. The spending for

staff/consultants has been particularly low in this sub-project. The sub-project on PEP in Vietnam, in contrast, spend almost 57% on national consultants, and another 18% on international consultants, showing a complete different approach than in the OSH sub-project. These data are somewhat skewed because the staff cost of the ILO/Korea management team (as explained in the above), ILO's Programme Support Costs, the costs for the evaluation (under international consultants) as well as the operational costs are all accounted for in the column 'Other'.

10) Could they have been allocated more effectively (e.g. change from annual to three-year budget process), and if so, how?

The allocation of resources requires important modifications in particular in the area of the management arrangements, which can be summarized as follows:

- The Programme is executed by the ILO ROAP in Bangkok under the guidance of the ILO Deputy Regional Director.
- The Programme Manager is also located in Bangkok and is an officer on secondment from MoEL/ROK. He coordinates Programme implementation and reporting and liaises with the donor organisation. The funding for this position comes *on top of* the total amount of funding for the programme.
- A full-time Programme Officer and an Administrative Secretary support this work in Bangkok. The programme officer maintains the relations with the country offices which is working out better than in the previous phase although financial information is not always available (see further Table 3.3 in Section 3.5).
- A lead specialist was designated among the DWT-experts to support the implementation of each of the (de facto four) projects.
- Further support is provided by selected Korean Partner Institutions who sometimes provide officers on loan. These institutions also contributed about US\$ 800,000 *from their own budget* to the programme (2015-2017).

However, there were no provisions made for national professional and for support staff. It has been shown to be imperative to have a full-time national professional staff in the ILO CO/LO who can coordinate the activities in the different projects in the country in question. In addition, allocations need to be made for *part-time* support for the administrative and financial tasks in each country, while cost-sharing with other projects needs to continue to be investigated. As a result of such allocations, project implementation would become much more effective! Lastly, the budget and the remaining allocations need to be made more transparent towards the ILO Country/Liaison Offices as they are often unsure how much funding remains exactly available for activities in their respective countries.

11) Where possible, analyse intervention benefits and related costs of integrated gender equality (or not).

Most stakeholders are very much aware of the importance of including gender mainstreaming in project implementation, and are making efforts to have women included among participants in workshops, training courses and even master trainers. However, in Myanmar several stakeholders did not consider gender inequality as an important issue, partly because they stress the fact that government staff is in majority female. Concerning costs involved to enhance gender equality, this does not seem a major issue, as most of the efforts involved persuading women to join in project activities which they mainly seem to have done without hesitation. In addition, an important gender issue was the composition of the membership of the NSSF in Cambodia and

the SSB in Myanmar; in both cases, the majority of the 1.4 million and 1.15 million respectively were women, which is the more important since international research studies have indicated that women spend much of their income on the immediate needs of the entire family than men tend to do.

3.4 Impact Orientation and Sustainability

12) What strategies have the three projects put in place to ensure continuation of mechanisms/tools/practices provided, if the support from the ILO/Korea Programme ends ('exit strategy')?

Various strategies have been put in place in *Cambodia* and in *Myanmar* to ensure the continuation of mechanisms/tools/practices provided by the projects, once the support from the project ends ('exit strategy'), including:

- At ASEAN level: The MRS activities are solidly embedded in the SLOM process (MRS/Skills is one of their priorities!), as well as in the activities of ASEC.
- Generally, GO prefer support that is directed at building a system that lasts; the government is moving ahead and will appreciate support that comes from donors in selected areas.
- The national mechanisms (e.g. the National Coordination Committee in Cambodia and the NTDF in Myanmar) are in place to continue working through tripartism. MRS in Myanmar is however less embedded in tripartism than in Cambodia.
- Although there are not enough funds for workshops at the regional level and in Korea, at the same time some countries are willing to pay for logistical costs of their own staff so that they would also receive the training provided.
- The different capacity building efforts implemented by the project and analysed in the above concern a long-term commitment, and for example the trained Master Trainers and Assessors continue to spread their knowledge.
- In Myanmar, the OSH awareness raising campaign was successfully undertaken in five regions and states and has made a lasting impression.
- In Cambodia some GO stakeholders have the impression that ILO support is decreasing since an international expert was cooperating with them for some time but is no longer present; to be sure, this perception was wrongly made since this international staff was not funded from the ILO/Korea partnership to begin with. Nevertheless, the GO's impression is considered as important because ILO is the one donor who is interested in the overall social protection sector (SPF).
- It is rather difficult to assess how much impact the ILO/Korea project had *directly* in the area of social protection, and especially on the rapidly increasing numbers of insured persons: in Cambodia the NSSF has reached 1.4 million clients since 2008, and in Myanmar the SSB has 1.15 million clients (up from 600,000 in 2012). However, since both organisations tend to attribute part of this achievement to the ILO/Korea project, we may consider this to be an important area of impact!
- The mechanisms are in place to continue the implementation of the national social protection framework, for example, in Cambodia NSSF has contracts with 1,300 hospitals and health clinics in the country on health insurance, and in Myanmar the SSB is beginning to take on this role as well.
- In Cambodia NSSF is accountable to the government as well as to the public (reporting, external auditing, etc.). The Government of Cambodia is planning to expand the NSSF's

service coverage to the informal sector as well; the current draft law on social security 2018 proposed a voluntary contribution.

In **Lao**, which was only involved in the MRS project, much less activities were implemented systematically than in Cambodia and Myanmar. On the other hand, **Vietnam** could be considered as a case in point of sustainability; as soon as ILO terminated the PEP project here, MOLISA just continued on their own and is in the process of integrating PEP into the NTP-SPR program, and concretely introducing the operational guidelines and the manual into the government's programme this year.

13) To what extent are these strategies likely to be effective?

On the whole, the strategies discussed under the previous evaluation question are generally expected to be effective for the purpose for which it was intended. In general, the ILO/Korea projects do concern a Partnership Approach, in the sense that the multi-country approach enhances working together and learning together, with a focus on knowledge sharing. Central to the activities are the reform agendas in MRS, in social protection and in OSH. In building up the momentum, priorities should not change (too) quickly in order to genuinely make progress in processes that are by nature long-term, and attention should be paid to expanding the coverage. At country level, there are lots of challenges, while additional focus may be needed for activities in Lao PDR.

14) How effective have the three projects been in establishing and fostering national/local ownership?

The three projects are considered by many stakeholders as relevant and very timely in the current state of development of their respective countries. The overall impression acquired during the interviews is that the Government Organisations, in particular but not exclusively the ministries of labour, have taken clear ownership of the activities implemented under the ILO/Korea partnership. With respect to the employers' and workers' organisations, this is generally much less the case, although especially the EO have shown ownership in selected activities as discussed in the above. In conclusion, therefore, the three projects have been very effective in establishing and fostering national ownership among GO but much less so among EO and especially among WO.

3.5 Findings measured against the Recommendations of the 2013 Evaluation

The Findings/Recommendations of the 2013 Evaluation of the ILO/Korea Partnership 2009-2013 are analysed below in Table 3.3 against the findings presented in the present chapter.

Table 3.3: The findings of the 2013 Evaluation compared to the findings of the 2018 Evaluation.

Findings of the 2013 Evaluation	Findings in 2018
1) The basic setting for the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme is right.	Still valid, although the republic of Korea would prefer that more training would take place in Korea itself for visibility purposes. This needs to be included in the design of the next phase

	since it concerns the legitimacy of the support by the ROK vis-à-vis the Korean people.
2) The ILO/Korea Partnership Programme is highly appreciated in the countries visited (Cambodia, Laos, Sri Lanka) and some impact has been achieved.	Still valid.
3) Korea's knowledge sharing efforts are highly important in a global ODA context.	Still valid.
4) There is a general impression by stakeholders that the programme is scattered over many countries ("water can principle").	Despite a significant reduction in countries, this is also valid for the present set-up, as it concerns four different projects in changing combinations of four countries.
5) The ILO/Korea Partnership Programme is significantly larger in volume than it appears from the project documents.	Still valid; in particular, the costs for the Korean Project Manager and the two Korean experts on loan are paid respectively by the MoEL/ROK and by the Korean partner institutes on top of the regular project budget. In addition, these institutes also fund certain costs for the training they provide.
6) Planning is dominated by annual budget processes.	This has been changed to a three-year cycle which has worked much better with planning being possible for the three-year period.
7) Indicators are not sufficiently specified to measure success.	This differs according to projects, but generally have been specified in the three different PRODOCS (see Section 3.2 under RBM).
8) Reporting formats are not conducive to proper follow-up.	This remains partly true, as there is currently no progress report on 2017 which would have been better for proper monitoring and follow-up.
9) There are indications that the amount of expert (and occasionally administrative) input required to achieve an output in the field is occasionally underestimated.	In the current phase MOEL/ROK did not allow for staff costs to be included in the budget, but after a series of consultations it has now been approved for the next phase 2018-2021 to spend a maximum of 35% on local staff costs by employing national coordinators thereby also enhancing the inputs of local knowledge. However, no provision has been made by MOEL/ROK for the financing of support staff in administration or finance, which has also been shown in the present evaluation to be a serious problem.
10) Agreed actions at times appear to stand or fall with the availability of ILO specialists.	This was the case in the PEP-Vietnam project where it took one year for the new DWT expert to be appointed after the previous one had left. However, in the current phase no such issue was reported by the stakeholders.
11) There were cases where coordination with ILO country offices was not perfect	The issue of coordination came up again but not in terms of fellowships, but in terms of limited

<p>when invitations to fellowships were being issued.</p>	<p>communication from Bangkok to ILO Country/Liaison Offices on the management set-up, on the Korean partner institutes, as well as on the amounts of remaining funds for in-country activities.</p>
<p>12) Korea's experts are rooted in their respective Korean organizations.</p>	<p>Still valid.</p>
<p>13) There is no sharing of information between the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme and KOICA offices in the countries concerned (Sri Lanka, Laos).</p>	<p>This is still valid, despite efforts for example by the ILO Liaison Office in Yangon to make contacts with the KOICA office in Yangon.</p>
<p>14) Highly qualified technical experts do not always come with sufficiently strong language capabilities.</p>	<p>Still valid, while some improvements have been noted.</p>

4 Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

The conclusions drawn have been categorized according to the four evaluation criteria distinguished throughout this report.

Intervention progress and effectiveness

On the whole, it can be concluded that the three projects made solid progress towards their planned results as these are specified in the three different Results-Based Management (RBM) systems in the Project Documents (PRODOC). For an overview of the main achievements in each of the three projects reference is made to Section 3.1. The intervention progress went very much according to schedule and there are only a few cases in which progress diverged from the RBM's, e.g. in the case of the Public Employment Programme (PEP) in Vietnam which was stopped by ILO because staff costs were weighing too heavily on the country office budget in Hanoi, and the Single Window Service (SWS) in social protection was dropped in particular because it is not a government priority at this time. An important challenge faced in the skills development area is the delay in Thailand for translating their standards into English, which may be caused by different factors (e.g. Thailand prefers to revise its own standards first, and/or political reasons related to migration issues). In Myanmar a specific challenge occurring in all projects is the relatively large number of donors that is operating in this country (including the German Development Agency GIZ, the Danish Embassy and the Asian Development Bank ADB), resulting sometimes in adjustments to the programme. Nevertheless, the large number of important achievements provided in Section 3.1 leads to the conclusion that the intervention progress has been very substantial, with the exception of progress made in Lao PDR where much less activities took place than in Cambodia and Myanmar.

Overall, gender mainstreaming has received clear attention in the ILO/Korea projects, but has not always been actively addressed, and it is sometimes underdeveloped in tripartite organisations. On the one hand, the majority of beneficiaries of the social security funds are female, specific social security measures are directed at women only, and in the tourism sector a substantial 30% of Master Trainers/Assessors is female, while overall the participation of women in the workforce especially in government organisations is quite widespread. On the other hand, more explicit attention is needed for gender issues, as was shown in several examples: five out of the six occupations selected for Mutual Recognition of Skills (MRS) in three countries, Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar (CLM), are male-dominated and regional trainings mostly involve men; gender mainstreaming is not very explicit in MRS, more specific gender indicators and gender provisions are needed in social protection, while in Myanmar gender mainstreaming has often not been acknowledged as an important issue by the stakeholders interviewed. Regarding the other cross-cutting issues, the attention differed substantially, whereby tripartite processes and capacity development received the most attention (see below).

The ILO/Korea project contributed substantially to policy formulation in Cambodia especially through its support to the National Employment Policy (NEP), but less so in Myanmar although the setting up of the National Tripartite Dialogue Forum (NTDF) by the ILO Liaison Office (LO) is an important step towards this goal. In all countries there are clear connections between the three projects and the respective Decent Work Country Programme's, DWCP (see Annex 7). The ILO/Korea project also contributed substantially to capacity building in Cambodia and to a lesser

extent in Myanmar, while it was in particular appreciated by many stakeholders to learn-while-working together with experts, consultants, staff, etc. Policy formulation and capacity building were much less explicit in Lao PDR and in Vietnam.

The Government Organisations (GO) interviewed in the different CLM countries plus Vietnam (CLMV) are generally very satisfied with the quality of the specific outputs in the projects and have clearly used the tools and practices developed, and this applies even to Vietnam where the project was terminated in late 2017. The ILO/Korea projects have generally more focussed on the GO than on Employers' Organisations (EO) or Workers' Organisations (WO), although they have clearly participated in selected activities, and sometimes even took the lead in certain activities under the ILO/Korea projects.

Effectiveness of management arrangement

In view of the substantial number of achievements made by the three projects, it is not surprising that the main project counterparts are generally very satisfied with the support received by ILO and the Republic of Korea (ROK). The long-standing partnership contributes to this feeling of satisfaction as does the continuity in the activities undertaken over several partnership periods. For the CLMV countries and/or the region of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) the support provided through this partnership is quite important, not only for the countries involved and for the region, but also for the progress made in the different areas supported. The Government Organisations in all four countries are generally satisfied with the Management Arrangements. A major challenge, however, was that the donor did not allow for staff costs, and ILO tried various strategies to deal with this condition, such as leveraged its own resources (Regular Budget Supplementary Account, RBSA, and Vision Zero Fund, VZF), cost sharing with other projects, and even to succeed in getting exceptional approval by MOEL/ROK to fund two national staff in Myanmar and Cambodia for the work on social protection. However, combined with the lack of funding for administrative/financial support staff this remained an important bottleneck.

The Programme Framework was revised following the 2013 evaluation of the partnership and this led to a more efficient allocation of resources in the current phase by changing from an annual to a three-year budget cycle, and by a more focussed approach (i.e. less geographically scattered and more thematically focused) which was appreciated by most stakeholders. Compared to the previous phase of the partnership, the Results-Based Management (RBM) of the three ILO-Korea projects has clearly improved, but still requires substantial further improvements in the areas of coordination between the three RBMs, of an officially verifiable Log Frame for each project, and of the formulation of proper assumptions and Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI). The three Log Frames should be more systematically developed along similar and comparable lines.

The workers' and employers' organizations (WO/EO) in the three CLM countries face many challenges, such as limited resources, a low level of public-private partnership and a general lack of information (Ruttiya Bhula-or 2018). Regarding WO specifically, their focus is on strengthening labour unions by increasing union membership and by regularly campaigning for workers' fundamental rights at work, and as a result, concerns about e.g. skills development are found to be often secondary and limited. The involvement of the EO and WO in the activities of the ILO/Korea partnership has differed between the three projects, but generally they have been involved in the implementation of projects through tripartite fora, for example the Regional Skills Technical Working Group (RSTWG), based in Bangkok, the National Social Security Fund

(NSSF) in Cambodia, the National Skills Standards Authority (NSSA), the Social Security Board (SSB) and the National Tripartite Dialogue Forum (NTDF) all in Myanmar, as well as the Lao National Advisory Chamber for TVET and Skill Development; and sometimes they have been involved also more directly, such as their participation in Myanmar in developing the Law on Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) from the beginning, the cooperation between the Myanmar Engineering Society and the Asian Welding Federation (AWF), and the involvement of WO in the OSH awareness campaign of the Factories and General Labour Laws Inspection Department (FGLLID) in Myanmar.

In skills development, EO are usually more involved than WO, but the participation of employers is considered to be crucial and needs to be further enhanced. A challenge is that sometimes only selected unions are being invited while sharing among unions has been limited. On the whole, ensuring tripartite participation across all the intervention fields is an area for improvement, while one WO (the Myanmar Industries, Craft and Services, MICS), as an emerging union, felt sometimes somewhat neglected and left out from activities of the ILO Myanmar, although the Liaison Office makes sure that it always treats all WO's equally.

Generally, the delivery of core services and the communication with ILO were considered effective by the main stakeholders. The contributions of the lead specialists and the experts of the ILO Decent Work Technical Support Team (DWT) were considered of good quality. In the MRS project national stakeholders had more contact with the lead specialists in Bangkok than with the LO in Yangon. The two Korean experts on loan from the Korean Partner Institutions, COMWEL and KOSHA, were involved in particular in different capacity building activities which have been appreciated very much by the stakeholders. There is no sharing of information between the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme and the KOICA Country Offices.

Efficiency of resource use

All stakeholders interviewed agreed that the ILO/Korea projects clearly delivered value for money, and that the resources have been allocated strategically and efficiently to achieve the intended results. The resource use has been judged as quite efficient especially also compared to a relatively limited budget per project per country. In addition, cost-sharing with other projects has been considered as positive. On the whole, therefore, the key stakeholders are positive on the delivery of value for money, and they indicated that more resources are indeed needed, and specific proposals have been made by the respective counterparts in the three projects (see Section 3.3).

The total budget for the three projects was US\$ 2 million for three years 2015-2017. The MOEL/ROK has agreed to a no-cost extension until 31 May 2018, with final reporting due by 15 August 2018. Tables 3.1 provide the financial data for the three projects. Regarding actual expenditure categories, activities such as seminars, subcontracts, training and grants, accounted together for 38.5%, followed by international and national consultants (24.6 %) and National Professional Staff and Local Support Staff (20.6 %), whereby the latter concerns in large majority the staff costs of the ILO/Korea Management Team in Bangkok. The differences between the three projects are, in fact, quite moderate. In Project 1 on employment and labour policy (including MRS), and in Project 2 on social protection there is more use of international consultants, while Project 3 on labour law reform uses much more often national consultants. Costs for seminars were substantial for all three, while subcontracts and grants were more often used by Project 1. Table 3.2 provides details for Project 3 separately and shows that for OSH in Myanmar almost

60% was spent on seminars and another 20% on subcontracts. In contrast, for PEP in Vietnam almost 57% was spent on national consultants, and another 18% on international consultants, showing a completely different approach than in the OSH sub-project.

The allocation of resources requires important modifications in particular in the area of the management arrangements since there were no provisions made for national professional and for support staff. It has been shown to be imperative to have a full-time national professional staff in the ILO local office who can coordinate the activities in the three projects in the country in question. In addition, allocations need to be made for part-time support for the administrative and financial tasks in each country. As a result of such allocations, project implementation would become much more effective.

Concerning costs involved to enhance gender equality, this does not seem a major issue, as most of the efforts involved persuading women to join in project activities which they mainly seem to have done without hesitation. In addition, an important gender issue was the composition of the membership of the NSSF in Cambodia and the SSB in Myanmar; in both cases, the majority of the 1.4 million and 1.15 million respectively were women, which is the more important since international research studies have indicated that women spend much of their income on the immediate needs of the entire family than men tend to do.

Impact orientation and Sustainability

Various strategies have been put in place in Cambodia and Myanmar to ensure the continuation of mechanisms/tools/practices provided by the projects once the support from the project ends ('exit strategy'). These include, among various others, the embedding of MRS activities in the ASEAN Senior Labour Officials Meeting (ASEAN-SLOM) process and in the ASEAN Secretariat (ASEC), the established national tripartite mechanisms, the capacity building efforts in particular the trained master trainers and assessors and the trainings in Korea by the Korean Partner Institutes, the lasting impression left by the OSH awareness raising campaign, and the contribution to the increase in the number of beneficiaries of the NSSF and SSB. While in Lao much less activities were implemented systematically, it contrasts with Vietnam which can be considered as a case in point of sustainability as the government is in the process of integrating the products of the partnership after the ILO exited. These strategies are generally expected to be effective for the purpose for which they were intended, not specifically for a broader form of sustainability. On the whole, the ILO/Korea projects do concern a real Partnership Approach in the sense that the multi-country approach enhances working together and learning together, with a focus on knowledge sharing.

The three projects are considered by many stakeholders as relevant and very timely in the current state of development of their respective countries. The overall impression acquired during the interviews is that the Government Organisations, in particular but not exclusively the ministries of labour, have taken clear ownership of the activities implemented under the ILO/Korea partnership. With respect to the employers' and workers' organisations, this is generally much less the case, although especially the EO have shown ownership in selected activities as discussed in the above. In conclusion, therefore, the three projects have been very effective in establishing and fostering national ownership among GO, but much less so among EO and in particular among WO.

The findings and recommendations of the 2013 Evaluation of the ILO/Korea Partnership 2009-2013 have been analysed against the findings of the present evaluation study in Section 5.3 and for a summary of this analysis reference is made to Table 3.3.

4.2 Recommendations

The recommendations will be presented in this section according to the four Evaluation Criteria distinguished throughout this report.

Intervention progress and effectiveness

- 1) **Design more activities in the next phase that can (also) be implemented in Lao PDR** as it has the greatest need for support and was left out in several cases in the current phase; in addition, **make sure that the next evaluation mission also includes a visit to Lao PDR.**

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO, Management Team, MOEL/ROK and National Stakeholders	High	During the design phase of the follow-up phase	Depends on the scope of the interventions decided upon between, ILO, Korea and the national stakeholders

- 2) **Enhance visibility of the donor organisation** by making sure that logos and acknowledgements are properly used and by having more activities such as workshops and training courses in Korea itself. The latter is also so attractive that countries are willing to pay the logistics costs for their own staff members attending such events.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO Management Team, MOEL/ROK, Korean Partner Institutes and National Constituents	Medium	Include in the drafting of the Project Documents for the next phase	To be included in the budget lines in the follow-up phase.

- 3) **Maintain a high level of attention for Gender Mainstreaming in the country interventions** as this attention was found to be widely varying and did not come automatically, and **include it in all the M&E tools**, such as Log Frame (including assumptions and OVI), Theory of Change and Risk Analysis.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO, Management Team, Lead Specialists and National Constituents	Medium to High	Include in the drafting of the Project Document for the next phase	To be included in the budget lines in the follow-up phase.

Effectiveness of management arrangement

- 4) **Reach out more to the employers' and especially also to workers' organisations and make in the new phase substantial allocations for capacity building** of these organisations and enhance the role of the private sector through the employers' organisations. It could also pay attention to the formalisation of the informal economy, laid down in ILO's landmark Recommendation 204 adopted by the ILO in 2015, which has so far received limited attention in the Partnership.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO, Management Team, Lead Specialists and Social Partners	Medium	This is likely to be done throughout the entire follow-up phase 2018-2021	Resources need to be allocated for this activity in the follow-up phase

5) Make provisions for costs of national professional staff as well as for (part-time) financial and administrative support staff.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO, Management Team, MOEL/ROK and National Constituents	High	During the design of the follow-up phase	To be decided between ILO and MOEL/ROK; already 35% national staff costs has been allowed.

6) Design three coordinated and comprehensive M&E systems with complete Log Frames with clear assumptions, OVIs and milestones, and an appropriate Theory of Change and a solid Risk Analysis.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO Management Team and Lead Specialists	Medium to High	During the project design with necessary adjustments throughout the project tenure	M&E budget allocation is mandatory in each and every ILO project

Efficiency of resource use

7) Make sure that the new phase of the ILO-Korea Partnership is even further focused by leaving out the PEP programme and focusing on three topics only. From the viewpoint of more focus in the partnership, the termination of the PEP programme is supported by the evaluation, and as shown in the above the Government of Vietnam is itself capable of owning this programme and the valued products that came out of it. In addition, more efficiency could further be reached by reducing the time between budget-cycles (before the actual release of the funds in the new cycle).

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO, Management Team and National Stakeholders	Medium	During the design phase of the follow-up phase	Re-allocation of funds is implied.

8) Enhance the efficiency of the involvement of the Korean Partner Institutes and of the Korean experts on loan from these institutes. This is a repeat of the recommendations of the previous evaluation in 2013, and focuses partly on **the profile of the Korean experts** seconded from these institutes (not only technical expertise, but also soft skills and communication abilities including in the English language), and partly on **the communication in particular towards the ILO Country/Liaison Offices** where a broadly felt demand was found for more information on these institutes, on the management set-up in Bangkok and on information on regarding financial monitoring.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
Korean Partner Institutes, ILO Management Team, MOEL/ROK	Medium	Throughout the project lifetime	Funds are provided by the Korean Partner Institutes on top of project budget.

Impact orientation and Sustainability

- 9) In the area of MRS: **Move from** the preparation of MRS in the current phase **to completing the process for the six occupations with certification and assessment, and then to the actual implementation and piloting of MRS** in the next phase. **Maintain thereby close relations with the ASEAN Secretariat (ASEC)** on the workplan of the ASEAN Labour Ministers including AQRV-TVET and maintain/expand the training programme in Korea of HRD Korea.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO Management Team, Lead Specialists, National Constituents, ASEC & HRD Korea	Medium to High	2018-2021	Resources need to be allocated for this activity

- 10) In the area of Social Protection: **Continue the support for the different priorities in different countries:** in Myanmar SSB's first priority is the MIS/IT reform; in Cambodia support is needed for the NSSF and the new National Social Protection Policy Framework (NSPPF 2016-2025); while also the training courses of COMWEL and KEIS are mentioned as priority in this area.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO Management Team, Lead Specialists, National Constituents, COMWEL & KEIS	Medium to High	2018-2021	Resources need to be allocated for this activity

- 11) In the area of OSH in Myanmar: **Continue the work as soon as the OSH Law has been enacted (expected within several months) with the following priorities of different organizations:** Improve the accident-reporting system of the FGLLID including another study tour (only for FGLLID staff) and continue to conduct the KOSHA training courses and the OSH awareness raising campaigns in all regions and states. Undertake OSH training in all the industrial zones with the EO (UMFCCI) which plans to do this with the coordination of FGLLID and with a private company called "Workplace Safety Health Myanmar". The MoHS prefers a greater focus on health than on safety (in OSH), and it plans to update the list of all the occupational diseases (it was recorded in 1923 cf. the workman's compensation act); at the same time, they need to develop diagnosis criteria.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO Management Team, Lead Specialists, National Constituents and KOSHA	Medium to High	2018-2021	Resources need to be allocated for this activity

- 12) **Develop a proper exit strategy at the outset for all the three projects** in case the donor funding might end in 2021.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO Management Team, Lead Specialists and National Constituents	Medium	Have exit strategy in place and implemented before completion of the next phase	Resources might have to be allocated for this activity

5 Lessons Learned and Good Practices

This chapter compiles three lessons learned (LL) and three good practices (GP) from the experience gained by evaluating the ILO-Korea Partnership in the present report, namely:

Lessons learned

- LL1: Make sure that each and every project has a proper Results Framework, Log Frame, Theory of Change and Risk Analysis.*
- LL2 A three-year project cycle has proven to work out much better for longer-term planning than annual budget processes.*
- LL3: In case of a multi-country initiative it is important to have joint activities so that the different countries can learn from each other.*

Good practices:

- GP1: The management set-up of the ILO/Korea projects is a good practice with a Management Team, lead specialists and Korean experts on loan from Korean partner institutes.*
- GP2: The joint work of the project with the Myanmar Engineering Society and the Asian Welding Federation (AWF) in Singapore on the standards for the welding occupation is a good practice in the area of cooperation with employers' organisations and the private sector.*
- GP3: The setting up in Myanmar of the National Tripartite Dialogue Forum (NTDF) by the ILO Liaison Office (LO) as a forum to discuss Decent Work issues with the national constituents is an important step towards the goal of supporting policy development.*

These lessons learned and good practices will be discussed in detail in the following two sections (7.1 and 7.2).

5.1 Lessons Learned

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

LL1: Make sure that each and every project has a proper Results Framework, Log Frame, Theory of Change and Risk Analysis.

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Independent Final Evaluation of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2015 – 2017 funded projects in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam

Project TC/SYMBOL: RAS/15/50/ROK; RAS/15/51/ROK; and RAS/15/54/ROK

Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop

Date: 11 July 2018

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<i>Each and every project must have a comprehensive Results-Based Monitoring system which must be coordinated among the three projects. It must include complete Log Frames with clear assumptions, OVIs and milestones, as well as a Theory of Change and a Risk Analysis.</i>
Context and any related preconditions	<i>A comprehensive Results Framework, Log Frame, Theory of Change and Risk Analysis are important to monitor the progress of the projects and to maintain a relation of trust with donors.</i>
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	<i>ILO ROAP/DWT, ILO Management Team, HQ Geneva and ILO Country/Liaison Offices.</i>
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	<i>The lack of proper indicators and assumptions makes monitoring of progress quire difficult.</i>
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	<i>It will become possible to monitor the projects more closely and make changes as they become needed.</i>
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	<i>ILO Management Team in cooperation with the Lead Specialists need to take the lead in this, and make available experts from HQ, DWT/ROAP with inputs from the ILO Country/Liaison Offices.</i>

LL2: A three-year project cycle has proven to work out much better for longer-term planning than annual budget processes.

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Independent Final Evaluation of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2015 – 2017 funded projects in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam

Project TC/SYMBOL: RAS/15/50/ROK; RAS/15/51/ROK; and RAS/15/54/ROK

Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop

Date: 11 July 2018

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<i>In the previous phase of the ILO/Korea partnership planning was dominated by annual budget processes and the 2013 evaluation found that this was inefficient, and therefore it has been changed for the current phase into a three-year budget cycle. It was now found that this works indeed much more effectively with planning being possible for the three-year period, and eliminating the annual delays in actual disbursement of funds.</i>
Context and any related preconditions	<i>Planning was previously dominated by annual budget processes, which has been changed to a three-year budget.</i>
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	<i>Ministry of Employment and Labour of the Republic of Korea (MOEL/ROK), ILO Management Team, ILO ROAP and Lead Specialists.</i>
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	<i>The negative lesson is that there were annual delays in disbursing funds.</i>
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	<i>The positive issue is that planning can now be undertaken for the full three-year period without gaps.</i>
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	<i>MOEL/ROK in cooperation with ILO ROAP and the ILO Management Team.</i>

LL3: In case of a multi-country initiative it is important to have joint activities so that the different countries can learn from each other.

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Independent Final Evaluation of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2015 – 2017 funded projects in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam

Project TC/SYMBOL: RAS/15/50/ROK; RAS/15/51/ROK; and RAS/15/54/ROK

Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop

Date: 11 July 2018

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<i>In case of a multi-country initiative it is important to have joint activities so that the different countries can learn from each other, for example, the progress of the Regional Skills technical Working Group (RSTWG) was considered very successful in this respect.</i>
Context and any related preconditions	<i>Possibilities should be explored for one or two international workshops per year e.g. in Bangkok bringing together the main stakeholders of the country interventions to exchange and further document experiences and to learn from each other.</i>
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	<i>MOEL/ROK and ILO ROAP and management team.</i>
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	<i>This applies only to the MRS and Social Protection projects, because the OSH project is implemented in only one country.</i>
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	<i>This will include the responsibility for collecting lessons learned in all projects, for the coordination among countries by initiating cross-country exchanges (including international workshops), and for the technical work (e.g. Training package, training workshops in Turin, etc.).</i>
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	<i>For this to be possible it should be explicitly included in the Log Frames and in the task descriptions of staff involved.</i>

5.2 Good Practices

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

GP1: The management set-up of the ILO/Korea projects is a good practice with a Management Team, lead specialists and Korean experts on loan from Korean partner institutes.

ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

Project Title: Independent Final Evaluation of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2015 – 2017 funded projects in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam

Project TC/SYMBOL:RAS/15/50/ROK; RAS/15/51/ROK and RAS/15/54/ROK

Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop

Date: 11 July 2018

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

GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	<i>The management set-up of the ILO/Korea projects is a good practice with a Management Team, lead specialists and Korean experts on loan from Korean partner institutes. Leading the Management team is a seconded Korean MOEL staff maintaining communication between donor and ILO, including the yearly meeting. The costs for all the Korean experts (seconded from the government or on loan from Korean partner institutes) come on top of the project budget. The capacity building in Korea coordinated by the Korean Partner Institutes (HRD Korea, COMWEL and KOSHA) are much appreciated by the key stakeholders.</i>
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	<i>The tasks of the Management team include the responsibility for collecting the lessons learned in all components, for the coordination among countries by initiating cross-country exchanges (including international workshops), and for the coordination of the technical work led by the Lead Specialists. Information provision on this set-up and on financial monitoring needs to be enhanced towards the national project staff in the respective countries.</i>
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	<i>This set-up allowed to maintain close relationships with the donor and facilitated coordination among all stakeholders involved.</i>
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	<i>See above.</i>
Potential for replication and by whom	<i>There is potential for replication of this management set-up in many of ILO's multi-country initiatives (partly depending on budgetary issues, in particular the special provision in this partnership that the budget for seconded expert staff is additional to the project budget).</i>
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Program Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Program Framework)	<i>This Good Practice (GP) is linked to ILO's Strategic Plan for 2018–21, in particular related to "Strengthening effective and efficient use of ILO resources".</i>
Other documents or relevant comments	<i>See the Progress Reports on the projects and the minutes of the ILO/KOREA Annual Meeting on the Partnership Programme.</i>

GP2: The joint work of the project with the Myanmar Engineering Society and the Asian Welding Federation (AWF) in Singapore on the standards for the welding occupation is a good practice in the area of cooperation with employers' organizations and the private sector.

ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

Project Title: Independent Final Evaluation of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2015 – 2017 funded projects in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam

Project TC/SYMBOL:RAS/15/50/ROK; RAS/15/51/ROK and RAS/15/54/ROK

Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop

Date: 11 July 2018

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

GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	<i>The joint work of the project with the Myanmar Engineering Society and the Asian Welding Federation (AWF) in Singapore on the standards for the welding occupation is a good practice in the area of cooperation with employers' organizations and the private sector.</i>
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	<i>The participation of the private sector in skills development is considered crucial but is often difficult to implement.</i>
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	<i>The Myanmar Engineering Society and the Asian Welding Federation (AWF) in Singapore really 'own the project' in the sense that they take the lead in activities and clearly show responsibility for the results.</i>
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	<i>One measurable impact is that the employers of the welders involved have been willing to pay for the certification fees.</i>
Potential for replication and by whom	<i>This type of private sector participation is an interesting case to be studied further and to be replicated in other countries where there is a capable employers' organization with support from an expert organization like the AWF. The potential for replication can be enhanced if this specific cooperation gets well-documented by the project in the final progress report of the present phase of the ILO/Korea Partnership.</i>
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Program Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Program Framework)	<i>This Good Practice (GP) is linked to ILO's strategy on "jobs and skills for youth" endorsed by the Governing Board in March 2014. The GP also is aligned with SDG Goal 8, as well as with processes in ASEAN. The GP is also aligned to the Myanmar DWCP Priority 1: Employment and decent work and sustainable entrepreneurship opportunities are available and accessible to all, including for vulnerable populations affected by conflict and disaster. One of the sub-priorities is technical and vocational training and skills development to meet changing labour market needs.</i>
Other documents or relevant comments	<i>See the Progress Reports on the projects and the minutes of the ILO/KOREA Annual Meeting on the Partnership Programme.</i>

GP3: The setting up in Myanmar of the National Tripartite Dialogue Forum (NTDF) by the ILO Liaison Office (LO) as a forum to discuss Decent Work issues with the national constituents is an important step towards the goal of supporting policy development.

ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

Project Title: Independent Final Evaluation of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2015 – 2017 funded projects in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam

Project TC/SYMBOL:RAS/15/50/ROK; RAS/15/51/ROK and RAS/15/54/ROK

Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop

Date: 11 July 2018

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

GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	<i>The setting up in Myanmar of the National Tripartite Dialogue Forum (NTDF) by the ILO Liaison Office (LO) as a forum to discuss Decent Work issues with the national constituents is an important step towards the goal of supporting policy development.</i>
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	<i>Set up to discuss the Decent Work agenda the NTDF has already proven to provide a forum to discuss a wide range of topics that would otherwise not have come to the attention of one or more constituents (e.g. the accident-reporting system being developed by the Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population).</i>
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	<i>See above.</i>
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	<i>The workers' organizations in Myanmar are very satisfied with the NTDF and some have already indicated that it should be extended to the regional and/or state levels.</i>
Potential for replication and by whom	<i>The setting up of such a forum could be done in any country where it does not yet exist as such.</i>
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Program Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Program Framework)	<i>This Good Practice (GP) is linked to ILO's mandate for tripartism and for the development of multi-year Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP).</i>
Other documents or relevant comments	<i>See the Progress Reports on the projects and the minutes of the ILO/KOREA Annual Meeting on the Partnership Programme.</i>

Annex 1 Terms of Reference (TOR)

I. Background and Justification

ILO/Korea Partnership Programme

1. In 2003, the Ministry of Employment and Labour of the Republic of Korea (MoEL/ROK) signed a memorandum of understanding with the ILO to formalize their partnership for development. A year later, the Government of Korea provided funding to institutionalize the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme, which focuses on realizing the objectives set out in the Asian Decent Work Decade. The Programme's support was directed into three thematic areas: competitiveness, productivity and job; labour market governance and social protection; and labour migration management.
2. In October 2013, the ILO undertook an independent final evaluation of the USD 5 million, five-year framework of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme towards the realization of the Asian decent work (June 2009 – May 2014). The evaluation found that the Programme have been effective in delivering its planned outputs and could enhance effectiveness, sustainability and impact by becoming more selective and focused in its approach and deepening the assistance provided to specific processes.
3. The ILO/Korea Partnership Programme framework for 2015 – 2017 was therefore revised with a view to enhance efficiency and achieve more profound impacts for the Programme. The Programme framework for 2015 – 2017 focused on three major areas: employment and labour policy, social protection, and occupational safety and health in the following selected countries: Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam. The Programme for 2015 – 2017 also changed the projects' funding period from one-year to three-year cycle.
4. In May 2015, the MoEL/ROK and the ILO signed a Letter of Agreement to implement the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for 2015-2017. With the total budget of US\$ 3,000,000, the MOEL/ROK and the ILO agreed that the budget allocation was made to the following priority areas/projects:

Priority Areas/Projects	Budget (USD)
Global projects (Geneva HQ)	
Modernizing international networking in occupational safety and health (OSH) knowledge and information (GLO/15/50/ROK)	400,000
New forms of work and income security: global and country-specific perspectives (GLO/15/51/ROK)	600,000
Asia-Pacific Regional Projects (ROAP-Bangkok)	
Skill development –Mutual recognition of skills in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar towards the ASEAN Economic Community 2015 and beyond (RAS/15/50/ROK)	800,000
Supporting the implementation of social protection floors for workers and their families in ASEAN (RAS/15/51/ROK)	800,000
Supporting implementation of labour law reform in Viet Nam and Myanmar (RAS/15/54/ROK)	400,000
Total	3,000,000

5. During an annual ILO-Korea meeting in February 2018, the MoEL/ROK indicated an interest to have the three Asia –Pacific Regional projects managed by ROAP-Bangkok to be collectively and independently evaluated in order to assess: satisfactory of tripartite constituents and the project counterparts on process and procedure of the revised Programme framework for 2015 – 2017; effectiveness of the three-funded Asia-Pacific Regional projects; and overall performance of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for 2015 – 2017.

Programme Management

6. The Programme is executed by the ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) under the guidance of the Deputy Regional Director. The Programme Manager and Coordinator of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme (an officer on secondment from MoEL/ROK) coordinates and monitors the Programme implementation and reporting requirements, provides administrative and programme support, and liaises with the donor and the ILO relevant departments on related matters. A Programme Officer and an Administrative Secretary support the work of the Programme Manager and Coordinator.
7. For implementation of the Programme’s priority areas/projects, the ILO designates a lead specialist per priority area of the Programme to ensure that activities planned and outputs delivered under different projects are inter-related and well-coordinated with other initiatives at the country and regional levels, and support the achievements of regional outcomes and Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs). The lead specialists coordinate and mobilize support of other specialists in related disciplines (development economist, employment, OSH, working conditions, social security, industrial relations, gender, migration, labour market information, skills etc.) for smooth delivery. Partner Institutions are advised on their counterparts for specific Programme areas and fully participate in planning and design of project activities. The lead specialists also coordinate with Decent Work Technical Support teams (DWTs), country offices and headquarters technical units for effective delivery of the Programmes.

Background of the three Asia-Pacific Regional Projects

8. *Skill development –Mutual recognition of skills in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar towards the ASEAN Economic Community 2015 and beyond (RAS/15/50/ROK)*. The development objective of the project is to continue the implementation of existing efforts in promoting the mobility of skilled labour through the mutual recognition of skills (MRS) in an incremental approach to accelerate the economic integration of the Cambodia, La PDR and Myanmar (CLM) countries towards AEC 2015 and beyond. Within three years, the project aims to achieve the following three immediate objectives: 1) Benchmarking of skills standards in priority sectors/occupations enhanced (or increased/improved) among ASEAN member states for improved mutual recognition of skills of migrant workers; 2) A social dialogue mechanism at national and/or sectoral level established and promoted for a more demand driven Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) and to guide MRS.
9. *Supporting the implementation of social protection floors for workers and their families in ASEAN (RAS/15/51/ROK)*. The long term impact of the project will be a better social

protection system by securing income, increasing access to social services, and enhancing employability of female and male workers in ASEAN, with a specific focus on Cambodia and Myanmar. The project has planned to contribute to the long term achievement through the following three immediate objective: 1) Social security schemes created & strengthened with the view to facilitate access to social protection for uncovered groups; 2) Access to social protection services enhanced through the progressive expansion of effective delivery mechanisms; and 3) ASEAN countries are knowledgeable about relevant practices to extend social protection to all, including vulnerable and unprotected groups.

10. Supporting implementation of labour law reform in Viet Nam and Myanmar (RAS/15/54/ROK). This project composes of two parts. Part one aims to support improvement of the legal and institutional framework on occupational safety and health (OSH) in Myanmar. The immediate objective of the project's part one is by 2017, the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security (MOLES) and the Factories and General Labour Law Inspection Department (FGLLID) in consultation with the social partners have increased capacity to formulate, implement, monitor, review and/or enforce a modern OSH policy and legal framework. For the other part of project (part two), it aims to further support the Government of Vietnam with the development and operationalization of a Public Employment Policy. The immediate objective of the project's part two is by 2017, Vietnam will have an effective Public Employment Programme that provides income earning opportunities for income-poor and disadvantage groups.

II. Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation

11. The two main purposes of the independent final evaluation are for promoting accountability and enhancing learning within the ILO, the MoEL/ROK and other key stakeholders.
12. Specific objectives of the independent final evaluation are to:
 - (i) Assess satisfactory of tripartite constituents and the project counterparts on processes and procedures of the revised Programme framework for 2015 – 2017;
 - (ii) Assess effectiveness and efficiency of the three-funded Asia-Pacific Regional projects, including the progress in achieving results (including intended and unintended, positive and negative results), the challenges affecting the achievement of the results, factors that hindered or facilitated achievement so far, and effectiveness of management arrangements;
 - (iii) Assess effectiveness and efficiency of overall performance of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for 2015 – 2017;
 - (iv) Identify factors that influenced (positively or negatively) the sustainability of the interventions of the three -funded Asia-Pacific Regional projects;
 - (v) Identify good practices at the Programme and project levels that can and should be replicated; and
 - (vi) Identify lessons learned that should be reflected in the design and implementation of similar projects and programmes in the future.

III. Evaluation Scope

13. This independent final evaluation is in line with the ILO evaluation policy guidelines and MoEL/ROK's interest. The evaluation is scheduled for implementation from April – July 2018.
14. The evaluation will cover the three priority areas administered by ROAP and implementation of all three-funded Asia-Pacific Regional projects. The evaluation will cover all geographic coverage of the three projects.
15. The final evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations will be primarily addressed to the primary clients of this evaluation as follows: the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme team, ROAP, DWT-Bangkok, and MoEL/ROK. Secondary clients are tripartite constituents, the project counterparts, and partner institutions in Korea.

IV. Evaluation Criteria and Questions

16. The evaluation should address the following ILO evaluation criteria: intervention progress and effectiveness; efficiency of resource use; and effectiveness of management arrangements; as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 3rd ed. (Aug. 2017) (Annex 1).
17. The core ILO cross-cutting priorities, such as gender equality and non-discrimination, promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes, and constituent capacity development should be considered in this evaluation. In particular, gender dimension will be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. To the extent possible, data collection and analysis should be disaggregated by sex as described in the ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines and relevant Guidance Notes (Annex 1).
18. It is expected that the evaluation address all of the questions detailed below to the extent possible. The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions, but any fundamental changes should be agreed upon between the ILO team and the evaluator. The evaluation instruments (to be summarized in the inception report) should identify the general areas of focus listed here as well as other priority aspects to be addressed in the evaluation.
19. Suggested evaluation criteria and evaluation questions are summarized below:

Intervention progress and effectiveness

- To what extent have the three projects and the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for 2015 – 2017 been making sufficient progress towards its planned results (including intended and unintended, positive and negative)? And the extent to which has gender mainstreaming been addressed by the design and implementation of the three projects and the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for 2015 – 2017?

- What evidences exist to demonstrate the three projects and the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for 2015 – 2017 contributed to policy formulation and capacity building in the target countries?
- To what extent are the tripartite constituents and the project counterparts satisfied with the quality of the outputs and are likely to, or have used the tools/practices developed?

Effectiveness of management arrangement

- To what extent are the tripartite constituents and the project counterparts satisfied with processes and procedures of the revised Programme framework for 2015 – 2017?
- To what extent have stakeholders, particularly workers' and employers' organizations been involved in projects implementation?
- How effectively has the projects delivered core services to project counterparts and relevant stakeholders?

Efficiency of resource use

- To what extent has the project delivered value for money? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically and efficiently to achieve expected results? Could they have been allocated more effectively and if so, how? Where possible, analyze intervention benefits and related costs of integrated gender equality (or not).

Impact orientation and Sustainability

- What strategies have the three projects put in place to ensure continuation of mechanisms/tools/practices provided, if the support from the ILO/Korea Programme ends? To what extent are there strategies likely to be effective?
- How effective have the three projects been in establishing and fostering national/local ownership?

V. Methodology

20. The evaluation will comply with evaluation norms, standards and follow ethical safeguards, as specified in the ILO's evaluation procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations system of evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.
21. A mix-method (both qualitative and quantitative evaluation approaches) should be considered for this evaluation. The evaluation fieldwork will be qualitative and participatory in nature. Qualitative information will be obtained through field visits, key informant interviews and focus group discussions as appropriate. Opinions coming from stakeholders will improve and clarify the quantitative data obtained from project documents. The participatory nature of the evaluation will contribute to the sense of ownership among stakeholders. Quantitative data will be drawn from project documents including the Technical Progress Reports (TPRs) and the projects' monitoring and evaluation plans/frameworks. A combination of sound quantitative and qualitative research methods (e.g. surveys, case studies, interview and focused group discussion with appropriate quantitative data analysis methods for each type of

data collected) should be developed for each evaluation question as deemed appropriate. However, different evaluation questions may be combined in one tool/method for specific targeted groups as appropriate. Attempts should be made to collect data from different sources by different methods for each evaluation question and findings be triangulated to draw valid and reliable conclusions. Data shall be disaggregated by sex where possible and appropriate.

22. A detailed methodology will be elaborated by the independent evaluator on the basis of this ToR. The detailed methodology should include key and sub-question(s), detailed methods, data collection instruments and data analysis plans to be presented as a key element in the inception report.
23. The methodology for collection of evidences should be implemented in three phases: The methodology for collection of evidences should be implemented in three phases:
 - (1) An inception phase based on a review of existing documents to produce inception report. The independent evaluator will review the project documents, progress reports, previous evaluations completed by the ILO, meeting minutes, training manuals, tools, technical guidelines, other publications used or developed by the three projects, and national policies on employment, labour, social protection, and occupational safety and health in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam.
 - (2) A fieldwork phase to collect and analyze primary data. Once the inception report is approved, the independent evaluator will travel to Bangkok to interview the programme management team in ROAP, the lead specialists and other relevant specialists and ILO officials. The independent evaluator will travel to Cambodia and Myanmar to conduct a field mission to interview (with support from a national consultant in each respective country, please see Annex 2 – National Consultant’s responsibilities) the following key stakeholders but not limited to: the ILO Country Director, program officer, government counterparts, employers’ and workers’ organizations, and project counterparts. For Lao PDR and Vietnam, the independent evaluator will conduct interviews (via Skype calls) with the ILO Country Director, program officer, government counterparts, employers’ and workers’ organizations, and project counterparts. At the conclusion of the field mission, the independent evaluator will conduct a stakeholder workshop in Cambodia and Myanmar to validate information and data collected through various methods and to share the preliminary findings with key stakeholders in each respective country. The evaluator will debrief the management team in ROAP on preliminary findings from the field missions before departing the region.
 - (3) A data analysis and reporting phase to produce the final evaluation report. Based on data collected during inception phase and the inputs from the key stakeholders’ discussions/interviews during the field mission and virtual interviews, the independent evaluator will draft the final evaluation report and directly send it to the evaluation manager. The evaluation manager will forward the report to stakeholders, including the project management team, the lead specialists and tripartite constituents, for their inputs/comments to the report. The evaluation manager will consolidate the comments and forward them to the independent evaluator for consideration in finalizing the draft report. The independent

evaluator will finalize the report, taking into consideration the stakeholder comments.

24. The gender dimension should be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation.

VI. Main Deliverables

25. The evaluators will provide the following deliverables and tasks:

Deliverable 1: Inception report. The inception report will include among other elements the evaluation questions and data collection methodologies and techniques, and the evaluation tools (interview, guides, questionnaires, etc.). The instrument needs to make provision for the triangulation of data where possible. The evaluators will prepare an inception report as per the ILO Checklist 3: Writing the inception report (Annex 1).

Deliverable 2: Stakeholder workshop. The evaluators will conduct a total of two stakeholder workshops, one in Cambodia and the other in Myanmar, to validate information and data collected through various methods and to share the preliminary findings with the ILO and local stakeholders at the end of each field mission. The relevant ILO officials in Cambodia and Myanmar will help organize the stakeholder workshops. Evaluation findings should be based on facts, evidence and data. This precludes relying exclusively upon anecdotes, hearsay and unverified opinions. Findings should be specific, concise and supported by triangulation of quantitative and qualitative information derived from various sources to ensure reliability, validity and generalizability.

Deliverable 3: First draft evaluation report. Evaluation report should include action-oriented, practical and specific recommendations assigning or designating audiences/implementers/users. The draft evaluation report should be prepared as per the ILO Checklist 5: Preparing the Evaluation Report which will be provided to the evaluators. The first draft evaluation report will be improved by incorporating evaluation manager's comments and inputs.

Deliverable 4: Final evaluation report with evaluation summary. The evaluators will incorporate comments received from ILO and other key stakeholders into the final report. The report should be finalized as per the ILO Checklist 5: Preparing the Evaluation Report which will be provided to the evaluators. The quality of the report and evaluation summary will be assessed against the ILO Checklists 5, 6, 7, and 8 (Annex 1).

26. The reports and all other outputs of the evaluation must be produced in English. All draft and final reports including other supporting documents, analytical reports, and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with WORD for windows. Ownership of the data from the evaluation rests jointly between ILO and ILO consultants. The copy rights of the evaluation report rests exclusively with the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

VII. Management Arrangements and Workplan

27. A designated ILO staff who has no prior involvement in the project will manage this independent evaluation with oversight provided by the ILO Evaluation Office. An international consultant will be commissioned to conduct this evaluation. The evaluation will be funded from the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme budget. A list of tasks of the evaluation manager is following:
- Draft and finalize the evaluation TOR upon receiving inputs from key stakeholders;
 - Reviewing CV and proposals of the proposed evaluators;
 - Providing project background documents to the evaluator;
 - Coordinate with the project team on the field visit agenda of the evaluators;
 - Briefing the evaluation consultant on ILO evaluation procedures;
 - Circulating the report to all concerned for their comments;
 - Reviewing and providing comments of the draft evaluation report; and
 - Consolidate comments and send them back to the evaluators.
28. The ILO/Korea programme management team and relevant ILO officials will handle administrative contractual arrangements with the evaluator and provide any logistical and other assistance as required. The ILO/Korea programme management team and relevant ILO officials will be responsible for the following tasks:
- Provide project background materials to the evaluator;
 - Prepare a list of recommended interviewees;
 - Schedule meetings for field visits and coordinating in-country logistical arrangements;
 - Be interviewed and provided inputs as requested by the evaluator during the evaluation process;
 - Review and provide comments on the draft evaluation reports;
 - Organize and participate in the stakeholder workshops; and
 - Provide logistical and administrative support to the evaluator, including travel arrangements (e.g. plane and hotel reservations, purchasing plane tickets, providing per diem) and all materials needed to provide all deliverables.
29. The evaluator reports to the evaluation manager. The evaluator will be selected through a competitive process from qualified international consultants. The consultant will lead the evaluation and will be responsible for delivering the above evaluation deliverables using a combination of methods as mentioned above.
30. Indicative time frame and responsibilities

No.	Task	Responsible person	Indicative Time frame (by end)
1	Preparation, sharing and finalization of the TOR	Evaluation Manager	2 April 2018

No.	Task	Responsible person	Indicative Time frame (by end)
2	Approval of the TOR	Regional Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Officer	3 April 2018
3	Issuance of EOI, advertisement of consultant, and selection of consultant	Evaluation Manager/ Regional M&E Officer	3-15 of April 2018 (EOI issuance); 18 April 2018 (consultant selection)
4	Issuance of contracts	ILO/Korea Programme Management Team	25 April 2018
5	Brief evaluators on ILO evaluation policy and the project	ILO/Korea Programme Management Team	26 April 2018
6	Draft mission itinerary for the evaluator and the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed	Evaluation Manager and ILO/Korea Programme Manager	27 April 2018
7	Document review and development of the inception report submitted to Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	30 April - 9 May 2018
8	Inception report approved	Evaluation Manager	14 May 2018
9	Skype interviews with constituents in Lao PDR and Vietnam. Evaluation Missions (Bangkok, Cambodia and Myanmar), including conducting two stakeholder workshops and debriefing with management team in Bangkok	Evaluator	14 May 2018 (Bangkok); 16-22 May 2018 (Cambodia); 23-25 May 2018 (Myanmar); 28 May 2018 (Bangkok); 29 May-1Jun 2018 (Skype interview).
10	Draft report submitted to Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	15 June 2018
11	Sharing the draft report with all concerned stakeholders for comments for three weeks	Evaluation Manager	18-28 June 2018
12	Consolidated comments on the draft report and send to the evaluator	Evaluation Manager	2 July 2018
13	Finalization of the report and submission to Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	9 July 2018
14	Review and approval of the final report	Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Office	Last week of July 2018

VIII. Required Qualifications and Duration

31. An international consultant with the relevant experience and qualifications are being sought.

Desired skills and competencies:

- No previous involvement in the delivery of the ILO/Korea programme funded activities;
- University Degree with minimum 10 years of strong and substantial experience in project /programme evaluation;
- An evaluation expert in development field with demonstrated technical expertise in evaluation methodologies and previous proven skills and experience in undertaking evaluations of similar projects;

- Strong background in organizational and institutional capacity building, Human Rights-Based Approach programming, and Results-Based Management and Monitoring;
- Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative research methodologies;
- Excellent analytical skills and communication skills;
- Demonstrated excellent report writing skills in English;
- Knowledge of ILO's roles and mandate and its tripartite structure as well as UN evaluation norms and its programming is desirable;
- Experience in at least one programme areas in which the ILO/Korea programme is currently supporting will be an advantage; and
- Working experience in Southeast Asia will be an advantage.

32. It is foreseen that the duration of this evaluation will fall within April – July 2018. The field missions in Bangkok, Cambodia and Myanmar are 14-28 May 2018.

33. Below are indicative inputs and tasks to be completed. Numbers of days foreseen for experts in one task can be reallocated to another task where justified and in consultation with the evaluation manager.

Tasks	Inputs	Proposed Timeline (by end)
Desk review of project related documents; Skype briefing with evaluation manager and the ILO/Korea Programme Manager; Prepare inception report	5 days	9 May 2018
Conduct Field visits (Bangkok, Cambodia and Myanmar) and interviews the ILO/Korea Programme Management Team, the lead specialists and relevant ILO official, constituents and project partners; conduct two stakeholder workshops, one in Cambodia and the other in Myanmar.	10 days	14-28 May 2018
Skype interviews with For Lao PDR and Vietnam, the independent evaluator will conduct interviews (via Skype calls) with the ILO Country Director, program officer, government counterparts, employers' and workers' organizations, and project counterparts	4 days	1 June 2018
Analysis of data based on desk review, field visit, interviews/questionnaires with stakeholders; draft report	7	15 June 2018
Finalize the report including explanations on why comments were not included.	2	9 July 2018
Total	28	

IX. Legal and Ethical Matters

34. The evaluation will comply with UN Norms and Standards. The ToR is accompanied by the code of conduct for carrying out the evaluations. UNEG ethical guidelines will be

followed. It is important that the evaluator has no links to project management or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of evaluation².

X. Annexes

Annex : National consultant TOR (for Cambodia and Myanmar)

The reference must be made to the main evaluation TOR for the independent final evaluation of ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2015 – 2017 funded projects in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam.

The national consultants will assist the International consultant (team leader) to provide interpretation and facilitate group meeting/discussions with all stakeholders, i.e. internal ILO staff, other key stakeholders including relevant partners.

Specifically, the national consultants will be responsible:

- To pro-actively provide relevant local knowledge and insights to the international consultant during the field mission.
- To take part in the interviews with key stakeholders, to make notes during interviews, and to write brief reports during the interview on main observations and conclusions.
- To contribute to the presentations at the stakeholder workshops to be responsible by the international consultant (team leader). The national consultant may be requested to contribute to the presentations as requested by the Team Leader (International Consultant).
- To participate and jointly facilitate the stakeholders workshop.
- Provide interpretation, where needed.

Qualification of the national consultants (one for Cambodia and the other for Myanmar):

- Cambodia nationality (for Cambodia) and Myanmar nationality (for Myanmar) with relevant qualifications in Law, Business Administration, International Development, Social Sciences or other relevant fields;
- Knowledge of local context and of target areas where the project operates;
- Knowledge of other related local programmes/projects, and of associated local institutions and government structures will be a great asset;
- Have 3 years of experience in conducting evaluation and/or expertise in related areas; and
- Experience in working with the UN agencies will be an advantage.

Management

The national consultant will report to the international evaluator and also to ILO evaluation manager.

² <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

Deliverable

The stakeholder workshops in Cambodia and Myanmar completed.

Contract dates and period

To join the team leader's evaluation mission in Cambodia during 16 – 22 May 2018 and Myanmar during 23 – 26 May 2018, the contract is for a total of 4 work days for a national consultant in Cambodia during the period of 16-18 May 2018. And a total of 4 working days for a national consultant in Myanmar during the period of 23-25 May 2018.

Payment schedule

First Payment: USD 3,154.00 [representing Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA), local transportation and air ticket of Amsterdam-Bangkok-Amsterdam] – will be paid upon signing the contract.

Second Payment: USD 8,400.00 [representing 50% of total lump sum fee] – will be made upon the submission of the inception report to the quality that is acceptable to the ILO.

Final Payment: USD 8,400.00 [representing 50% of total lump sum fee] – will be made upon the final submission of the final report with evaluation summary to the quality that is acceptable to the ILO.

Additional stipulations and remarks:

The ILO will arrange air tickets to Cambodia and Myanmar for the External Collaborator. The External Collaborator must inform the travel dates/details to Ms Chayanin Veerapong, email: chayanin@ilo.org so that security clearance can be requested and obtained prior air tickets issued for each mission. The security clearances will be submitted with the requests for payment.

The estimated total DSA, local transportation and air ticket are USD 2,270.00 for 4 days of DSA in Bangkok, 4 days of DSA in Phnom Penh, 2 days of DSA in Naypyitaw, 2 days of DSA in Yangon, and local transportation in Phnom Penh, Naypyitaw and Yangon including USD 884.00 for air ticket of Amsterdam-Bangkok-Amsterdam. Any excess paid to the external collaborator for DSA will be deducted from the final payment.

The External Collaborator shall submit the boarding passes and local transportation receipts to the ILO after the missions.

The External Collaborator is advised to obtain insurance coverage at his own expense, for sickness, accident, or temporary disability, death and third party risk covering the entire duration of the event, and the journey to and from the host country. The ILO cannot accept responsibility or liability for such contingencies.

Annex 2 Findings of the Previous Evaluation in 2013

The Findings/Recommendations of the 2013 Evaluation of the ILO/Korea Partnership 2009-2013 can be summarized as follows:

- 1) The basic setting for the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme is right.
- 2) The ILO/Korea Partnership Programme is highly appreciated in the countries visited (Cambodia, Laos, Sri Lanka) and some impact has been achieved.
- 3) Korea's knowledge sharing efforts are highly important in a global ODA context.
- 4) There is a general impression by stakeholders that the programme is scattered over many countries ("water can principle").
- 5) The ILO/Korea Partnership Programme is significantly larger in volume than it appears from the project documents.
- 6) Planning is dominated by annual budget processes.
- 7) Indicators are not sufficiently specified to measure success.
- 8) Reporting formats are not conducive to proper follow-up.
- 9) There are indications that the amount of expert (and occasionally administrative) input required to achieve an output in the field is occasionally underestimated.
- 10) Agreed actions at times appear to stand or fall with the availability of ILO specialists.
- 11) There were cases where coordination with ILO country offices was not perfect when invitations to fellowships were being issued.
- 12) Korea's experts are rooted in their respective Korean organizations.
- 13) There is no sharing of information between the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme and KOICA offices in the countries concerned (Sri Lanka, Laos).
- 14) Highly qualified technical experts do not always come with sufficiently strong language capabilities.

Annex 3 Inception Report for the Final Independent Evaluation

Background and Justification

In 2003, the Ministry of Employment and Labour of the Republic of Korea (MoEL/ROK) signed a memorandum of understanding with the ILO to formalize their partnership for development. A year later, the Government of Korea provided funding to institutionalize the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme, which focuses on realizing the objectives set out in the Asian Decent Work Decade.

In October 2013, the ILO commissioned an independent final evaluation of the USD 5 million, five-year framework of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme towards the realization of the Asian Decent Work Decade (June 2009 – May 2014). The evaluation found that the Programme have been effective in delivering its planned outputs and could enhance effectiveness, sustainability and impact by becoming more selective and focused in its approach and deepening the assistance provided to specific processes.

The ILO/Korea Partnership Programme framework for 2015 – 2017 was therefore revised with a view to enhance efficiency and achieve more profound impacts for the Programme. The Programme framework for 2015 – 2017 focused on three major areas: employment and labour policy, social protection, and occupational safety and health in the following selected countries: Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam. The Programme for 2015 – 2017 also changed the projects' funding period from one-year to three-year cycle.

In May 2015, the MoEL/ROK and the ILO signed a Letter of Agreement to implement the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for 2015-2017. While the total budget amounted to US\$ 3,000,000, one third thereof was intended for global projects to be managed by ILO Geneva, while 2 million was to be managed by ROAP-Bangkok. The MOEL/ROK and the ILO agreed on the following priority areas/projects, whereby selected Korean Partner Institutions were involved:

Priority Areas/Projects	Country	Budget (USD)	Korea Partner Institutions
4) Skill development – Mutual Recognition of Skills (MRS)	Cambodia, Lao PDR & Myanmar	800,000	HRD Korea
5) Social Protection Floors (SPF)	Cambodia, Myanmar & regional level	800,000	COMWEL & KEIS
6) Labour Law Reform	Viet Nam & Myanmar	400,000	KEIS & KOSHA
Total		2,000,000	

Goal and Objectives of the Programme

The ILO/Korea partnership programme, in fact, consists of three 'Asia-Pacific Regional Projects' as indicated in the above table. Therefore, the programme is not guided by one single, overall Project Document (PRODOC), but there are three different PRODOCS with different objectives as follows:

For skill development, two immediate objectives are specified:

3. Benchmarking of skills standards in priority sectors/occupations enhanced (or increased/improved) among ASEAN member states for improved mutual recognition of skills of migrant workers;
4. A social dialogue mechanism at national and/or sectoral level established and promoted for a more demand driven Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) and to guide MRS.

For social protection, there are three immediate objectives:

4. Social security schemes created & strengthened with the view to facilitate access to social protection for uncovered groups;
5. Access to social protection services enhanced through the progressive expansion of effective delivery mechanisms; and
6. ASEAN countries are knowledgeable about relevant practices to extend social protection to all, including vulnerable and unprotected groups

For labour law reform, two immediate objectives are specified:

3. By 2017, the Government in Myanmar (MOLES/FGLLID) in consultation with the social partners has increased capacity to formulate, implement, monitor, review and/or enforce a modern OSH policy and legal framework; and
4. For Vietnam to have an effective Public Employment Programme by the end of 2017 that provides income earning opportunities for income-poor and disadvantaged groups.

An overview of the programme management structure is given in the ToR (see Annex 1).

Contents of Inception Report

The present Inception Report will outline in the next section the Understanding of the ToR of the final evaluation by the evaluator by discussing its Purpose and Scope as well as the limitations identified in the inception phase. Section 3 provides an overview of the Conceptual Framework for the evaluation, while Section 4 details the methodology, work plan, deliverables and management arrangements.

Understanding of the ToR

Purpose and Objective of the Evaluation

The two *main purposes* of the independent final evaluation are:

- C. promoting accountability, and
- D. enhancing learning within the ILO, the MoEL/ROK and other key stakeholders.

The *specific objectives* of the independent final evaluation are to:

- (vii) Assess satisfactory involvement of tripartite constituents and the project counterparts in processes and procedures of the revised Programme framework for 2015 – 2017;
- (viii) Assess effectiveness and efficiency of the three-funded Asia-Pacific Regional projects, including the progress in achieving results (including intended and unintended, positive and negative results), the challenges affecting the achievement of the results, factors that hindered or facilitated achievement so far, and effectiveness of management arrangements;
- (ix) Assess effectiveness and efficiency of overall performance of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for 2015 – 2017;

- (x) Identify factors that influenced (positively or negatively) the sustainability of the interventions of the three -funded Asia-Pacific Regional projects;
- (xi) Identify good practices at the Programme and project levels that can and should be replicated; and
- (xii) Identify lessons learned that should be reflected in the design and implementation of similar projects and programmes in the future.

Scope and Clients of the Evaluation

This independent final evaluation is in line with the ILO evaluation policy guidelines and MoEL/ROK's interest. The evaluation is scheduled for implementation from April – July 2018. The evaluation will cover the three priority areas/projects administered by ROAP and implementation of all three-funded Asia-Pacific Regional projects. The evaluation will cover all geographic coverage of the three projects.

The final evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations will be primarily addressed to the primary clients of this evaluation as follows: the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme team, ROAP, DWT-Bangkok, and MoEL/ROK. Secondary clients are tripartite constituents, the project counterparts, and partner institutions in Korea.

Limitations

The independent final evaluation (IFE) of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2015-2017 is in fact the evaluation of three projects, each with their own specific PRODOC and more or less detailed Results-Based Management system. In fact, the third project consists in itself, again, of two different projects: one on OSH in Myanmar, and one on PEP in Vietnam. In addition, the IFE does not concern the evaluation of one project in one country, but four countries are involved as well as a regional component, whereby the project Management Team is located in a fifth country, i.e. in Bangkok, just as the experts from Korea on secondment/loan, the lead experts and the ILO DWT-experts. The evaluation is thus much more complex than a one project/one country evaluation, and poses limitations on timing and logistics, on the number of documents that can reasonably be studied, as well as on the depth of detail the evaluation can reach without resulting in a report that would become too voluminous. Such limitations will be mitigated by a number of measures, including in particular:

- by focusing on the main documents only (partly also indicated by the key stakeholders),
- by visiting only two out of the four countries,
- by selecting only the key stakeholders for interviews or skype calls,
- by focusing on the aspects that stand out during the interviews with key stakeholders during field missions and during skype interviews, and
- by trying to look for common factors when analysing the evaluation criteria instead of discussing each and every detail of individual projects in specific countries.

Conceptual Framework: Evaluation Criteria

The present independent final evaluation of the ILO/Korea Partnership will be based upon the ILO's evaluation policy and procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations system's evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

Following the ToR (see Annex 1), the evaluation will address four Evaluation Criteria: (1) Intervention progress and effectiveness; (2) Effectiveness of management arrangements; (3) Efficiency of resource use; and (4) Impact orientation and Sustainability. For each of these four

Evaluation Criteria a series of evaluation questions have been identified in the ToR, and these have now been adjusted on the basis of the documents review, in particular also based on the three PRODOCS and the report of the previous evaluation of the ILO-Korea Partnership (2009-2013) done in 2013 (see also below). Table 1 provides the complete list of questions; it also indicates sources of data, relevant stakeholder interviews and specific methods (further to be discussed in the next chapter on Methodology).

Table 1: Evaluation Criteria and Questions, and the sources of data, stakeholder interviews and specific methods used.

Evaluation Criteria and Questions	Sources of Data	Stakeholder Interviews	Specific Methods
A. Intervention progress and effectiveness			
1. To what extent have the three projects and the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for 2015 – 2017 been making sufficient progress towards its planned results in the different Results-Based Management (RBM) systems and Log Frames (including intended and unintended, positive and negative)?	DWCPs, CPOs; SPF/P&B; 3 ProDoc's; Technical Progress Reports (TPR)	Management Team BKK; Lead Specialists/Experts; Donor, and Tripartite & other stakeholders; NPCs in Myanmar and Cambodia; Specialised institutions e.g. NSSF/SSB/CARD/FGLLID/CEMA; Korean partner institutions	Document review; Interviews; FGD
2. To which extent has gender mainstreaming been addressed by the design and implementation of the three projects and the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme? In how far does this also apply to the other cross-cutting issues of non-discrimination, promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes, and constituent capacity development?	3 ProDoc's	Management Team; Lead Specialists/Experts; Tripartite stakeholders; Korean partner institutions; NPCs in Myanmar and Cambodia;	Document review; Interviews
3. What evidence exists to demonstrate that the three projects and the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme contributed to policy formulation and capacity building in the target countries?	Technical Progress Reports (TPR)	Management Team; Tripartite stakeholders; Lead Specialists/Experts; Specialised institutions: NSSF/SSB/CARD/FGLLID/CEMA;	Document review; Interviews
4. To what extent are the tripartite constituents and the project counterparts satisfied with the quality of the outputs and are likely to, or have used the tools/practices developed?		Tripartite and other stakeholders; Donor	Document review; Interviews; FGD
B. Effectiveness of management arrangements			
5. To what extent are the tripartite constituents and the project counterparts satisfied with processes and procedures of the revised Programme framework for 2015 – 2017, in particular less geographically scattered and more thematically focused?	2013 Evaluation study	Tripartite and other stakeholders; Donor; Lead Specialists/Experts; NPCs in Myanmar and Cambodia;	Document review; Interviews; FGD
6. To what extent have stakeholders, particularly workers' and employers' organizations been involved in projects implementation?		Tripartite stakeholders; Lead Specialists/Experts; NPCs in Myanmar and Cambodia;	Document review; Interviews; FGD

Evaluation Criteria and Questions	Sources of Data	Stakeholder Interviews	Specific Methods
7. How effectively have the projects delivered core services to project counterparts and relevant stakeholders, and how effective were, hereby, the contributions of the lead specialists, the Korean experts on secondment/loan, the Korean institutions, the ILO and KOICA Country Offices (CO), and the ILO DWT Experts?	TPR's; 2013 Evaluation study	Management Team; Tripartite stakeholders; Lead Specialists/Experts; CO's of ILO & KOICA; Specialised institutions: NSSF/SSB/CARD/FGLLID/CEMA; Korean partner institutions; NPCs in Myanmar and Cambodia;	Document review; Interviews
C. Efficiency of resource use			
8. To what extent has the project delivered value for money?	TPR's	Management Team; Tripartite stakeholders; Donor; Lead Specialists/Experts; Country offices/NPCs	Document review; Interviews; Financial reporting
9. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically and efficiently to achieve expected results?	TPR's	Management Team; Donor; and Tripartite stakeholders; Lead Specialists/Experts; Country offices/NPCs	Document review; Interviews; FGD; Financial reporting
10. Could they have been allocated more effectively (e.g. change from annual to three-year budget process), and if so, how?	TPR's; 2013 Evaluation study	Management Team; Tripartite stakeholders; Donor; Lead Specialists/Experts	Financial reporting; Interviews
11. Where possible, analyse intervention benefits and related costs of integrated gender equality (or not).	TPR's	Management Team; Lead Specialists/Experts; Tripartite stakeholders; Korean partner institutions	Document review; Interviews
D. Impact orientation and Sustainability			
12. What strategies have the three projects put in place to ensure continuation of mechanisms/tools/practices provided, if the support from the ILO/Korea Programme ends ('exit strategy')?	TPR's	Management Team; Lead Specialists/Experts; Country offices/NPCs	Document review; Interviews
13. To what extent are these strategies likely to be effective?	TPR's	Management Team; Lead Specialists/Experts; Country offices/NPCs	Document review; Interviews
14. How effective have the three projects been in establishing and fostering national/local ownership?	TPR's	Tripartite stakeholders; Management Team; Country offices/NPCs	Document review; Interviews; FGD

Cross-cutting issues

The evaluation will pay special attention to assessing the core ILO cross-cutting priorities of gender equality and non-discrimination. It will also assess promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes, and constituent capacity development. In particular, the gender dimension will be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. To the extent possible, data collection and analysis will be disaggregated by sex as described in the ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines and relevant Guidance Notes (see ToR in Annex 1).

Findings of the Previous Evaluation

Particular attention will also be given to the findings and recommendations of the Evaluation of the 2009-2013 ILO/Korea partnership phase. The evaluation report of December 2013 identified 14 main findings and formulated a recommendation for each one of them. These are summarized

in Annex 2, and a number of them have already been included in the evaluation questions in Table 1 above.

Methodology, Work Plan and Key Deliverables

Methodology

The methodology of the evaluation will be mixed, with both qualitative and quantitative methods employed. It includes a preparatory phase of documents review and discussions with the evaluation manager and the management team in Bangkok. The drafting and finalizing of the present Inception Report is also part of this phase.

This phase will be followed by the evaluation fieldwork which will be qualitative and participatory in nature. Qualitative information will be obtained through interviews with key informants and focus group discussions (for example with trade unions) as appropriate. Opinions coming from stakeholders will improve and clarify the quantitative data obtained from project documents including the Technical Progress Reports (TPRs) and the projects' monitoring and evaluation plans/frameworks. The added benefit of this approach is that the participatory nature of the evaluation will contribute to the sense of ownership among stakeholders.

A combination of sound quantitative and qualitative research methods has been developed for each evaluation question in Table 1 in Chapter 3 of this Inception Report. An attempt has been made there to collect data from different sources by different methods for each evaluation question, so that the findings can be triangulated to draw valid and reliable conclusions. Data will be disaggregated by sex where possible and appropriate.

The methodology for collection of evidences will be implemented in three phases:

- 4) An inception phase based on a review of existing documents to produce the Inception Report. This includes a review of the project documents, progress reports, previous evaluations completed by the ILO, meeting minutes, training manuals, tools, technical guidelines, other publications used or developed by the three projects, and national policies on employment, labour, social protection, and occupational safety and health in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam.
- 5) A fieldwork phase to collect and analyse primary data. Once the present Inception Report is approved, the independent evaluator will travel to Bangkok to interview the programme management team in ROAP, the lead specialists and other relevant specialists and ILO officials. The evaluator will then travel to Cambodia and Myanmar to conduct a field mission to interview with support from a national consultant/interpreter in each respective country the key stakeholders, including the ILO Country Director, program officer, government counterparts, employers' and workers' organizations, and project counterparts. At the conclusion of the field mission, the evaluator will conduct a stakeholder workshop in Cambodia and Myanmar to validate information and data collected through various methods and to share the preliminary findings with key stakeholders in each respective country. The evaluator will debrief the management team in ROAP in Bangkok on 28 May 2018 on preliminary findings from the field missions before departing the region.

Lao PDR and Vietnam are each only involved in one of the three projects (respectively the first on MRS and the third on PEP); for these countries the evaluator will conduct

skype interviews with the ILO Country Director, program officer, government counterparts, employers' and workers' organizations, and project counterparts.

- 6) A data analysis and reporting phase to produce the final evaluation report. Based on data collected during the inception phase and the inputs from the key stakeholders' discussions/interviews during the field mission and skype interviews, the evaluator will draft the final evaluation report and directly send it to the evaluation manager. The evaluation manager will forward the report to stakeholders, including the project management team, the lead specialists and tripartite constituents, for their inputs/comments to the report. The evaluation manager will consolidate the comments and forward them to the evaluator for consideration in finalizing the draft report. The evaluator will finalize the report, taking into consideration the stakeholder comments.

The gender dimension will be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation.

Key Deliverables

The evaluators will provide the following deliverables and tasks:

- 5) Deliverable 1: Inception report (the present report). This report includes among other elements the evaluation questions and data collection methodologies and techniques, and the evaluation tools (interview, guides, questionnaires, etc.). Triangulation of data have been proposed in Table 1 in Chapter 3 of the present Inception report.
- 6) Deliverable 2: Stakeholder workshops. The evaluators will conduct a total of two stakeholder workshops, one in Cambodia and the other in Myanmar, to validate information and data collected through various methods and to share the preliminary findings with the ILO and local stakeholders at the end of each field mission. The relevant ILO officials in Cambodia and Myanmar will help organize the stakeholder workshops. In addition, a debriefing will be held in Bangkok on 28 May 2018 for the Management Team at ROAP and the Evaluation Manager.
- 7) Deliverable 3: First draft evaluation report. The evaluation report will include action-oriented, practical and specific recommendations assigning or designating audiences/implementers/users, as well as good practices and lessons learned in the ILO Templates. The draft evaluation report will be prepared as per the ILO Checklist 5 (cf. ToR in Annex 1). The first draft evaluation report will be improved by incorporating evaluation manager's comments and inputs.
- 8) Deliverable 4: Final evaluation report with evaluation summary. The evaluator will incorporate comments received from ILO and other key stakeholders into the final report. The report should be finalized as per the ILO Checklist 5. The evaluation summary will be following the ILO Template.

Management and Responsibilities

A designated ILO staff who has no prior involvement in the project, Ms. Raviprapa Srisartsanarat, is managing this independent evaluation with oversight provided by the ILO Evaluation Office. An international consultant, Dr. Theo van der Loop, will be commissioned to conduct this evaluation. The evaluation will be funded from the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme budget. A list of tasks of the evaluation manager is detailed in the Tor in Annex 1.

The ILO/Korea programme management team and relevant ILO officials will handle administrative contractual arrangements with the evaluator and provide any logistical and other assistance as required. The ILO/Korea programme management team and relevant ILO officials will be responsible for the tasks detailed in the ToR (see Annex 1).

The independent evaluator reports to the evaluation manager. The consultant will lead the evaluation and will be responsible for delivering the above evaluation deliverables using a combination of methods as mentioned above. In Cambodia and Myanmar, the Country offices will assist in finding appropriate national consultants/interpreters (cf. ToR in Annex 1)

Work Plan

The draft Work Plan of the ToR (Annex 1) has been further detailed and is hereby proposed as follows:

No.	Task	Responsible person	Indicative Time frame (by end)
1	Preparation, sharing and finalization of the TOR	Evaluation Manager	2 April 2018
2	Approval of the TOR	Regional Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Officer	3 April 2018
3	Issuance of EOI, advertisement of consultant, and selection of consultant	Evaluation Manager/ Regional M&E Officer	3-15 of April 2018 (EOI issuance); 18 April 2018 (consultant selection)
4	Issuance of contracts	ILO/Korea Programme Management Team	25 April 2018
5	Brief evaluators on ILO evaluation policy and the project	ILO/Korea Programme Management Team	26 April 2018
6	Draft mission itinerary for the evaluator and the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed	Evaluation Manager and ILO/Korea Programme Manager	27 April 2018
7	Document review and development of the inception report submitted to Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	30 April - 9 May 2018
-	Flight from AMS to BKK	Evaluator	11/12 May
8	Inception report approved	Evaluation Manager	14 May 2018
9	Evaluation Missions (Bangkok, Cambodia and Myanmar), including conducting two stakeholder workshops and debriefing with management team in Bangkok	Evaluator	14 May 2018 (Bangkok); 16-22 May 2018 (Cambodia); 23-25 May 2018 (Myanmar); 28 May 2018 (Bangkok); (See Annex 3 for details)
-	Flight from BKK to AMS	Evaluator	29 May
10	Skype interviews with constituents in Lao PDR and Vietnam	Evaluator	30 May – 2 Jun 2018
11	Draft report submitted to Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	15 June 2018
12	Sharing the draft report with all concerned stakeholders for comments for three weeks	Evaluation Manager	18-28 June 2018
13	Consolidated comments on the draft report and send to the evaluator	Evaluation Manager	2 July 2018
14	Finalization of the report and submission to Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	9 July 2018
15	Review and approval of the final report	Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Office	Last week of July 2018

Annex 4 Program of Field Visits

The overall mission schedule can be summarized as follows:

<i>Dates (2018)</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Activity</i>
14-15 May	<i>Bangkok</i>	<i>Meetings.</i>
15 May	<i>Bangkok</i>	<i>Morning: Meetings. Afternoon: Travel from Bangkok to Phnom Penh.</i>
16 - 21 May	<i>Phnom Penh</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
22 May	--	<i>Travel from Phnom Penh to Nai Pyi Taw</i>
23 – 24 May	<i>Nai Pyi Taw</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
24 May	--	<i>Travel from Nai Pyi Taw to Yangon</i>
24-25 May	<i>Yangon</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
26 May	--	<i>Travel from Yangon to Bangkok</i>
28 May	<i>Bangkok</i>	<i>Meetings and Debriefing</i>

In more detail the tentative mission schedule is as follows:

Date/Time	Participants	Content	Remarks
Monday, 14 May 2018			
09.45 – 10.45	Meeting with ILO/Korea Partnership Programme Team Mr. Jungwoo Hong Project Manager and Coordinator of ILO-Korea Partnership Programme Ms. Aatcharaporn Chaowahem ILO/Korea Programme Officer	Room 1108 B, 11 th Floor, Block A, ILO ROAP Bangkok	
11.00 – 12.00	Briefing with Monitoring and Evaluation Team, Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific Ms. Raviprapa Srisartsanarat Monitoring and Evaluation Officer	Room 1107 D, 11 th Floor, Block A	
13.00 – 14.00	Meeting with project team “Supporting the implementation of sustainable social protection floors for the workers and their families in ASEAN” Mr. Nuno Meira Simoes de Cunha Senior Specialist on Social Protection Mr. Yung Nam Cho ILO Social Protection Expert (on loan from COMWEL)	ILO Meeting Room 11 th Floor	

14.10 – 15.10	Meeting with project team “Supporting implementation of labour law reform in Vietnam and Myanmar - Supporting the improvement of the legal and institutional framework on occupational safety and health in Myanmar” Mr. Francisco Santos-O’connor Senior Specialist on OSH Mr. Jungho Choi ILO OSH Expert (on loan from KOSHA)	ILO Meeting Room 11 th Floor	
15.20 – 16.20	Meeting with project team “Towards a Mutual Recognition of Skills in CLM Countries for AEC 2015 and Beyond” Ms. Sutida Srinopnikom Senior Programme Assistant Ms. Suttida Chaikitsakol Programme Officer	ILO Meeting Room 11 th Floor	
Tuesday, 15 May 2018: Field Visit – Thailand and Depart to Cambodia			
17.20	Depart to Phnom Penh	PG 935, BKK PNH 1720 1835	
	Stay at hotel the Plantation Urban Resort	#28 Street 184, Phnom Penh, Cambodia	
Wednesday, 16 May 2018: Field Visit – Cambodia			
07.45	Pick –up from the Plantation Hotel		
08.20 – 08.50	Meeting with ILO Team (Malika and Rim).	Introduction on project evaluation and discussion on social protection and skills, ILO Phnom Penh	
09.30 – 10.30	H.E. Mr. Laov Him Director General, Directorate General of Technical and Vocational Education, MOLVT Mr Sak Teang Director, Department of Standard and Curriculum, MOLVT Mr. Khoeun Chhoum Deputy Director, Department of Standard and Curriculum, MOLVT	Meeting with Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training MOLVT; National Coordination Committee: AQRF, MRA, MRS	Skills
11.00 – 12.00	Meeting with National Committee for Tourism Professionals Mr. Chhiv Try, Director of National Committee for Tourism Professionals (NCTP) Secretariat and Deputy Director MoT	Ministry of Tourism (MoT)	Skills

14.00 – 15.00	Mr. Tun Sophorn, National Coordinator of the ILO Projects in Cambodia	ILO Phnom Penh	Skills and Social Protection
15.00 – 16.00	Meeting with Ms. Malika Ok, National Programme Officer	ILO Phnom Penh	Social Protection
Thursday, 17 May 2018: Field Visit – Cambodia			
11.00 – 12.00	Meeting with Cambodian Federation of Employers and Business Associations (CAMFEBA) Mr. Van Sou Ieng, President of CAMFEBA	CAMFEBA Office No. 3, St. 528, Beoung Kak I, Khan Toul Kork (inside of Meng Ieng Garment Factory)	Social Protection (tbc)
14.00 – 15.00	Meeting with Ministry of Economy and Finance, Mr. Sambo Pheakdey , Deputy Director of Insurance and Pension Department	Discuss on the project contribution to the development of the National Social Protection Policy Framework - Meeting Venue: MEF Office	Social Protection
Friday, 18 May 2018: Field Visit – Cambodia			
09.00 – 10.30	H.E Ouk Samvithyea, Government Delegation in-charge of the Executive Director of the NSSF National Social Security Fund (NSSF), Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training (MOLVT)	Discussion on the identified issues with stakeholders including the project contribution to the development of the Social Health Insurance scheme for private and public employees and relevant legal frameworks.	Social Protection
12.00 – 14.00	Lunch Meeting with Workers' Organizations Mr. Ath Thorn President, Cambodian Labour Confederation (CLC) Mr. Chuom Momthol President, Cambodian Confederation Of Trade Unions (CCTU) Ms. Yang Sophorn President, Cambodia Confederation Of Unions (CCU) Mr. Sok Kin President, Building and Wood Workers Trade Union Federation of Cambodia (BWTUC) Mr. Heng Bunchhun President, Confederation of Union National Independence Cambodia (CUNIC) - tbc	Cambodiana Hotel (they all fully booked for the whole week and this is the only time available), they will cover their own lunch	tbc
14.30 – 16.30	Stakeholder Workshop -Employers -Government: MEF and NSSF	Stakeholder workshop • Presentation of tentative findings • Feedback from partners	

		Venue: ILO Phnom Penh Office	
Tuesday, 22 May 2018: Depart to Myanmar			
13.20	Depart to Bangkok	PG 930, PNH BKK 1320 1435	
17.00	Depart to Nay Pyi Taw	PG 721, BKK NYT 1700 1855	
	Stay at Hotel The Thingaha	Hotel The Thingaha	
Wednesday, 23 May 2018: Field Visit Myanmar			
9:30 – 10:30	Meeting with Department of Labour, Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population Mr. U Win Shein, Director General	MOLIP Office 51, Nay Pyi Taw +95-67-430088	Skills
11:00 – 12:00	Meeting with Factories and General Labour Law Inspection Department (FGLLD), Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population, Mr. U Nyunt Win, DG	MOLIP Office 51, Nay Pyi Taw mol.cif.fglld@gmail.com	OSH
13:30 – 14:30	Meeting with Social Security Board (SSB), Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population Mr. Maung Maung Aye, DG	SSB Head Office, Nay Pyi Taw ssbmyanmar51@gmail.com	Social Protection
20.00 – 20.30	Skype interview with Ms. Lourdes Kathleen Santos Macasil (Ms. LK) Former Head of Programme Officer ILO Yangon	Email: elkayemacasil@gmail.com Skype ID: elkaye.santos She used to manage the MRS in Myanmar	Skills
Thursday, 24 May 2018: Field Visit Myanmar			
9:30 – 11:00	Department of Environment and Occupational Health (DOEH), Ministry of Health and Sports Dr. Kay Khine Aye, Deputy Director	MOHS Office 47, Nay Pyi Taw Kaykhineaye276@gmail.com	OSH
13:00	Depart to Yangon	UB 112 NYT RGN 1300 1350	
14:30 – 15:30	Courtesy call with Mr. Rory Mungoven, Liaison Officer, ILO Yangon	Venue : ILO Office, upstairs	ILO Yangon
15:30 – 15:45	Meeting with Mr. Thein Than Htay National Project Coordinator	Venue : ILO Office	ILO Yangon
16:00 – 17:00	Meeting with Daw Khin Mar Aye Principal, Yankin Training Center Deputy Director, Department of Labour, MOLIP	Yankin Training Center, Yangon Khinmaraye61@gmail.com	Skills
	Meeting with Ms. Mariana Infante, Senior Technical Officer, Vision Zero Fund Project	Venue : ILO Office	tbc
	Stay at Hotel Inya Lake		
Friday, 25 May 2018: Field Visit Myanmar			
9:00 – 10:00	Consultants Meeting with Republic of the Union of Myanmar	Venue : UMFCCI Office	All projects

	Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry (UMFCCI)		
10:45 – 11:30	Meeting with Confederation of Trade Unions in Myanmar (CTUM)	Venue : CTUM Office	All projects
12:00 – 12:45	Meeting with Myanmar Industries, Craft and Services (MICS-TUsF)	Venue : ILO Office	
14:00 – 17:00	Stakeholder Workshop	Stakeholder workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of tentative findings • Feedback from partners Venue – ILO Large Meeting room	
Saturday, 26 May 2018			
10:30	Depart to Bangkok	PG 702 RGN BKK 1030 1230	
Monday, 28 May 2018: Debriefing			
09.00 – 10.00	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Suthi Sukosol Director-General (courtesy call around 5 minutes) 2. Mr. Sandod Themsawanglert Expert on Skill Development 3. Ms. Usa Sirisontiwana Skill Development Technical Officer, Office of Skill Standard & Testing Devt. 4. Mr. Santi Puchana Skill Development Technical Officer, Office of Skill Standard and Testing Devt. 5. Mr. Komtach Rattanakot Skill Development Technical Officer, Office of Instructor & Training Technology 6. Mr. Chinapop Kooramasuvan Foreign Relations Officer, International Cooperation Div. 7. Ms. Wanwisa Ouchareon Foreign Relations Officer, International Cooperation Division 	Department of Skill Development Ministry of Labour, Thailand Venue: Meeting room 9th floor, Department of Skill Development Building, Mitmaitri Road., Din Daeng, Bangkok Focal person: Ms. Wanwisa Ouchareon Phone: (+66) 02-2451829	Skills
11.00 – 12.00	Mr. Matthieu Cognac, Youth Employment Specialist		
13.00 – 15.00	Debriefing in Bangkok	ILO Meeting Room 11 th Floor	
15.10 – 16.10	Meeting with Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer		
16.30 – 17.30	Meeting with Mr. Bas Athmer Senior Specialist on Employment-Intensive Investments, on Support to VIET NAM's Public Employment Policy (PEP)	Email: athmer@ilo.org	Public Employment Policy

Annex 5 List of Skype Interviews

The following skype interviews were held:

Date (2018)	Time	Skype Call with:
23 May	20.00 – 20.30	Ms. Lourdes Kathleen Santos Macasil (Ms. LK) Former Head of Programme Officer in ILO Yangon
30 May	22.00 – 22.30	Ms. Irene Isaac, Technical Consultant
31 May	13.00 – 14.00	Ms. Hanh, Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs (MOLISA); Deputy Director Poverty Reduction Programme, MOLISA, Vietnam
31 May	14.00 – 15.00	Ms. Akiko Sakamoto, Specialist on Skills and Employability, ROAP/DWT, Bangkok
31 May	15.00 – 15.45	Mr. Sourisak Souphanthong, Deputy Director, Department of Skill Development and Employment, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, Lao PDR
1 June	14.00 – 15.00	Ms. Carmela I. Torres, former ILO Senior Skills and Employability Specialist, ROAP/DWT, Bangkok
1 June	15.00 - 16.00	Dr. Sang Hyon Lee, Korea Employment Information Service (KEIS), Seoul, Republic of Korea
1 June	16.00 – 16.45	Ms. Panudda Boonpala, Deputy Regional Director for ILO ROAP

Annex 6 Evaluation Questions and Criteria

Evaluation Criteria and Questions, and the sources of data, stakeholder interviews and specific methods used:

Evaluation Criteria and Questions	Sources of Data	Stakeholder Interviews	Specific Methods
E. Intervention progress and effectiveness			
15. To what extent have the three projects and the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for 2015 – 2017 been making sufficient progress towards its planned results in the different Results-Based Management (RBM) systems and Log Frames (including intended and unintended, positive and negative)?	DWCPs, CPOs; SPF/P&B; 3 ProDoc's; Technical Progress Reports (TPR)	Management Team BKK; Lead Specialists/Experts; Donor, and Tripartite & other stakeholders; NPCs in Myanmar and Cambodia; Specialised institutions e.g. NSSF/SSB/CARD/FGLLID/CEMA; Korean partner institutions	Document review; Interviews; FGD
16. To which extent has gender mainstreaming been addressed by the design and implementation of the three projects and the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme? In how far does this also apply to the other cross-cutting issues of non-discrimination, promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes, and constituent capacity development?	3 ProDoc's	Management Team; Lead Specialists/Experts; Tripartite stakeholders; Korean partner institutions; NPCs in Myanmar and Cambodia;	Document review; Interviews
17. What evidence exists to demonstrate that the three projects and the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme contributed to policy formulation and capacity building in the target countries?	Technical Progress Reports (TPR)	Management Team; Tripartite stakeholders; Lead Specialists/Experts; Specialised institutions: NSSF/SSB/CARD/FGLLID/CEMA;	Document review; Interviews
18. To what extent are the tripartite constituents and the project counterparts satisfied with the quality of the outputs and are likely to, or have used the tools/practices developed?		Tripartite and other stakeholders; Donor	Document review; Interviews; FGD
F. Effectiveness of management arrangements			
19. To what extent are the tripartite constituents and the project counterparts satisfied with processes and procedures of the revised Programme framework for 2015 – 2017, in particular less geographically scattered and more thematically focused?	2013 Evaluation study	Tripartite and other stakeholders; Donor; Lead Specialists/Experts; NPCs in Myanmar and Cambodia;	Document review; Interviews; FGD
20. To what extent have stakeholders, particularly workers' and employers' organizations been involved in projects implementation?		Tripartite stakeholders; Lead Specialists/Experts; NPCs in Myanmar and Cambodia;	Document review; Interviews; FGD

21. How effectively have the projects delivered core services to project counterparts and relevant stakeholders, and how effective were, hereby, the contributions of the lead specialists, the Korean experts on secondment/loan, the Korean institutions, the ILO and KOICA Country Offices (CO), and the ILO DWT Experts?	TPR's; 2013 Evaluation study	Management Team; Tripartite stakeholders; Lead Specialists/Experts; CO's of ILO & KOICA; Specialised institutions: NSSF/SSB/CARD/FGLLID/CEMA; Korean partner institutions; NPCs in Myanmar and Cambodia;	Document review; Interviews
G. Efficiency of resource use			
22. To what extent has the project delivered value for money?	TPR's	Management Team; Tripartite stakeholders; Donor; Lead Specialists/Experts; Country offices/NPCs	Document review; Interviews; Financial reporting
23. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically and efficiently to achieve expected results?	TPR's	Management Team; Donor, and Tripartite stakeholders; Lead Specialists/Experts; Country offices/NPCs	Document review; Interviews; FGD; Financial reporting
24. Could they have been allocated more effectively (e.g. change from annual to three-year budget process), and if so, how?	TPR's; 2013 Evaluation study	Management Team; Tripartite stakeholders; Donor; Lead Specialists/Experts	Financial reporting; Interviews
25. Where possible, analyse intervention benefits and related costs of integrated gender equality (or not).	TPR's	Management Team; Lead Specialists/Experts; Tripartite stakeholders; Korean partner institutions	Document review; Interviews
H. Impact orientation and Sustainability			
26. What strategies have the three projects put in place to ensure continuation of mechanisms/tools/practices provided, if the support from the ILO/Korea Programme ends ('exit strategy')?	TPR's	Management Team; Lead Specialists/Experts; Country offices/NPCs	Document review; Interviews
27. To what extent are these strategies likely to be effective?	TPR's	Management Team; Lead Specialists/Experts; Country offices/NPCs	Document review; Interviews
28. How effective have the three projects been in establishing and fostering national/local ownership?	TPR's	Tripartite stakeholders; Management Team; Country offices/NPCs	Document review; Interviews; FGD

Annex 7 DWCP Priorities of four countries

DWCP	Period	Country Priorities
Cambodia	2016-2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving Industrial Relations and Rights at Work.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting an Enabling Environment for Decent Employment Growth and Sustainable Enterprises, with a particular focus on young people.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving and Expanding Social Protection and OSH.
Lao PDR	2017-2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote employment and technical/vocational skills development in line with market demand.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote ratification and implementation of international labour standards.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen and expand social protection.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen tripartite cooperation and social dialogue.
Myanmar	2018-2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment and decent work and sustainable entrepreneurship opportunities are available and accessible to all, including for vulnerable populations affected by conflict and disaster.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application of Fundamental Principles and Rights at work is strengthened through improved labour market governance.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social protection coverage is extended to all especially for vulnerable workers and populations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <i>This includes: “By 2021, an integrated and unified OSH system is in place and implemented in all sectors.”</i>
Vietnam	2017-2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote decent employment and an enabling environment for sustainable entrepreneurship opportunities.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce poverty by extending social protection for all and reduce unacceptable forms of work, especially for the most vulnerable.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build effective labour market governance compliant with fundamental principles and rights and at work.

Annex 8 Selection of Documents Consulted

ILO/Korea Agreement (2015): Arrangement between the ILO and the Ministry of Employment and Labor of the Republic of Korea on Korea/ILO Partnership Programme. Geneva/Seoul: May 2015.

ILO (2013): Evaluation of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2009-2013. December 2013, by Christoph David Weinmann.

ILO (2013): Evaluation Summary 2013. Based on: Evaluation of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2009-2013. December 2013, by Christoph David Weinmann.

Three Project Documents (PRODOC):

- 1) Towards a Mutual Recognition of Skills in CLM countries for AEC 2015 and beyond; RAS/15/50/ROK 2015-2018; ILO Project Concept Note for Technical Cooperation Projects;
- 2) Supporting the implementation of sustainable social protection floors for the workers and their families in ASEAN (RAS/15/51/ROK); ILO Project Concept Note for Technical Cooperation Projects;
- 3) Supporting Implementation of Labour Law Reform in Viet Nam and Myanmar (RAS/15/54/ROK). ILO Project Concept Note for Technical Cooperation Projects.

Various Technical Progress Reports –TPR (partly received).

ILO-Korea Partnership Programme; Working in partnership to realize the Asian Decent Work Decade goals. Brochure. Bangkok: undated.

Republic of Korea-ILO Cooperation. Brochure. Geneva: September 2017.

PowerPoints for Programme Overview Annual Meeting on 30 Jan 2018:

- ILO/Korea Partnership Programme, by Mr. Jungwoo Hong.
- Development and operationalization of Public Employment Policy (PEP) for National Targeted Programmes (NTPs) in Viet Nam – as part of Social Protection Policy, by Mr. Bas Athmer.
- Supporting the Implementation of Sustainable Social Protection Floors for the Workers and their Families in ASEAN, by Mr. Nuno Meira Simoes da Cunha.
- Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) 2015-2018 and forward, by Dr Francisco Santos O'Connor and Mr Jungho Choi.
- Skills Development Component, by Ms. Akiko Sakamoto.

Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP):

- ILO (2016): Kingdom of Cambodia Decent Work Country Programme 2016–2018. Bangkok, May 2016.
- ILO (2017): Decent Work Country Programme for Lao People's Democratic Republic 2017–2021. Bangkok, May 2017.
- ILO (2018): Myanmar Decent Work Country Programme 2016–2018. Bangkok, draft January 2018.
- ILO (2017): Vietnam Decent Work Country Programme 2017–2021. Bangkok, 2017.

Lythe, David (2014) Assessment of the readiness of ASEAN Member States for implementation of the commitment to the free flow of skilled labour within the ASEAN Economic Community from 2015. ILO ASEAN TRIANGLE Project, Government of Canada; Bangkok.

Ruttiya Bhula-or (2018 *draft*): Sector by sector: Skills development in Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Myanmar; Employers' and workers' associations' practices in the automotive, construction, garment, tourism and domestic work sectors. ILO Bangkok: Draft report.