



International Labour Organization

iTrack
Evaluation

ILO EVALUATION

Evaluation Title:	Support to Trading Partners including GSP+ Beneficiary Countries to effectively implement International Labour Standards and comply with Reporting Obligations
ILO TC/SYMBOL:	GLO/15/27/EUR
Type of Evaluation :	Independent Final Evaluation
Country(ies) :	Global: Cabo Verde, Mongolia, Pakistan, Thailand, Panama, Paraguay
Date of the evaluation:	26 November 2019 – 20 February 2020
Name of evaluation consultant(s):	Dwight Ordonez
ILO Administrative Office:	NORMES
ILO Technical Backstopping Office:	NORMES
Other agencies involved in joint evaluation:	
Date project ends:	31 January 2019
Donor: country and budget US\$	European Commission (DEVCO), USD 1,176,126
Evaluation Manager:	Bobur Nazarmuhamedov
Evaluation Office Oversight	Peter E. Wichmand
Key Words:	GSP+, Fundamental Conventions, ILS and their supervisory mechanisms

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

Independent Final Evaluation

**Project GLO/15/27/EUR: Support to Trading Partners
including GSP+ Beneficiary Countries to effectively
implement International Labour Standards and comply with
Reporting Obligations**

**Final
February 7, 2020**



ILO/EVAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	2
ACRONYMS.....	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
I. PROJECT CONTEXT AND DESCRIPTION.....	1
1.1 Project Context.....	1
1.2 Project Description	2
II. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY	4
2.1 Purpose.....	4
2.2 Scope	4
2.3 Clients	5
2.4 Evaluation Criteria and Questions.....	5
2.5 Methodology	5
2.6 Limitations	8
III. FINDINGS	9
3.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit	9
3.2 Validity of Design.....	15
3.3 Project Results and Effectiveness.....	20
3.4 Efficiency of Resource Use	28
3.5 Sustainability	36
IV. LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES.....	43
4.1 Lessons Learned	43
4.2 Good Practices.....	43
V. CONCLUSIONS	45
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	46
ANNEXES	48
Annex 1: Master List of Evaluation Questions	48
Annex 2: List of Interviewees	49
Annex 3: List of Documents Reviewed	51
Annex 4: Lessons Learned and Good Practices Templates	53
Annex 5: Evaluation Terms of Reference	58

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Final Evaluation of ILO's EC Project GLO/15/27/EUR was conducted by an independent Evaluator, Dr. Dwight Ordóñez, under the overall supervision of Mr. Bobur Nazarmuhamedov, Evaluation Manager. The evaluation was overseen by the ILO Evaluation Office (EVAL) at ILO Headquarters (ILO HQ).

The Evaluator would like to thank the support of the ILO staff who arranged in interviews in a short time with various tripartite constituents and other stakeholders and who contributed their valuable time and insight to the outcome of the evaluation.

ACRONYMS

ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
CBA	Collective Bargaining Agreement
CEACR	ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations
CO	ILO Country Office
CPO	ILO Country Programme Outcome
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DEVCO	EC Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development
DFAT	Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
DG TRADE	Department for Trade at the European Commission
DW	Domestic Worker
DWCP	ILO Decent Work Country Programme
EC	European Commission
ER	Expected Result
EU	European Union
EVAL	ILO Evaluation Office
FAO	UN Food and Agriculture Organization
FPRW	Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work
GR	Global Results Area
GSP	Generalized Scheme of Tariff Preferences
GSP+	Special Incentive Arrangement for Sustainable Development and Good Governance
HBW	Home-Based Worker
HQ	ILO Headquarters
IE	Informal Economy
IEC	Information Education and Communication
ILO	International Labour Organization
ILS	International Labour Standards
IPS	ILO International Technical Specialist
ITC-ILO	International Training Centre of the ILO
KII	Key Informant Interview
LOP	Life-of-Project
NORMES	ILO International Labour Standards Department
OECD/DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
P&B	ILO Project and Budget Office
PO	Policy Outcome
RBSA	ILO Regular Budget Supplementary Account

RO	ILO Regional Office
ROM	Results-Oriented Monitoring
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SME	Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	UN Development Assistance Framework
UNEG	UN Evaluation Group
UNFPA	UN Population Fund
UNIDO	UN Industrial Development Organization
UNODC	UN Office on Drugs and Crime
UNPAF	UN Partnership Framework

Cabo Verde

DG	MJT General Directorate of Labour
MJT	Ministry of Justice and Labour

Mongolia

CMTU	Confederation of Mongolian Trade Unions
GOM	Government of Mongolia
MBA	Mongolian Bar Association
MLSP	Ministry of Labour and Social Protection
MONEF	Mongolian Employers' Federation
NHRCM	National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia

Pakistan

APWA	All Women Pakistan Association
BOS	Bureau of Statistics
EFP	Employers' Federation of Pakistan
MOPHRD	Ministry of Overseas Pakistanis and Human Resource Development
SAFWU	Sindh Agriculture and Fishing Workers Union

Panama

MITRADEL	Ministry of Work and Labour Development (MITRADEL)
----------	----------------------------------------------------

Thailand

RTG	Royal Thai Government
-----	-----------------------

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

In 2016, the European Commission (EC) agreed to fund a two-year initiative implemented by the International Labour Organization (ILO) that focused on providing support to European Union trading partners¹, including the Special Incentive Arrangement for Sustainable Development and Good Governance (GSP+) beneficiary countries, to effectively implement international labour standards (ILS) and comply with reporting obligations. The project aimed to improve the application of the eight Fundamental ILO Conventions in six beneficiary countries of the GSP+ scheme (Cabo Verde, Mongolia, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay and Thailand), with a view toward reducing and progressively eliminating discrimination, forced labour, child labour, and violations of freedom of association.

The GLO/15/27/EUR project ran between August 2016 and January 2019, and had five areas of Expected Results (ER), common to all implementing countries:

- ER1: Enhance the capacity of the selected countries to increase their compliance with their reporting obligations regarding the ILO's Fundamental Conventions
- ER2: Improve or enrich the output of the country-level reporting process through active and effective tripartite participation
- ER3: Increase tripartite institutional capacity through replicable ILS training
- ER4: National curricula on ILS are available and taught at national training institutions
- ER5: Application of fundamental ILS is strengthened through initiatives and action by tripartite constituents, parliamentarians and judges (at the central and local level)

Independently of the common set of ERs at the global level and the similarity among some general type of activities, the project allowed enough flexibility for countries to focus on specific issues/ILO Conventions that were of particular interest for each country.

Evaluation Purpose and Scope

The evaluation of the GLO/15/27/EUR project was designed to serve three main purposes: accountability, organizational learning and contributing to strategic planning. The goal of this independent evaluation was to assess: the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the project across the major outcomes; project performance as per the foreseen targets and indicators of achievement at output and outcome levels; strategies and implementation modalities chosen; partnership arrangements; constraints and opportunities; and to provide lessons to improve the performance and delivery of future project results.

To perform the duties above, the Evaluator carried out a thorough desk review of relevant documents related to the GLO/15/27/EUR project as well as a series of Skype interviews with ILO staff in Geneva, Brussels and the relevant Regional or Country Offices in charge of project

¹ Trading partner: A country that another country does business with, usually on a regular basis. In the case of the European Union, all countries that do business with EU members. In the case of the GSP+ beneficiary countries: Cabo Verde, Mongolia, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay and Thailand.

implementation, as well as with representatives of the donor, tripartite constituents and other stakeholders in the project target countries.

The evaluation sought to determine how well the project and the target member-countries of Cabo Verde, Mongolia, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay and Thailand achieved the **outcomes** planned in their respective project log frames, as well as **how** they were achieved and **under what** conditions.

Conclusions

- A. The project was successful in achieving its main objective: Improving the timeliness and quality of target countries' reporting on the Fundamental Conventions to the ILO supervisory bodies. By 2019, all countries addressed by the project had submitted all requested reports to the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR). Linking trade benefits to compliance with ILO Fundamental Conventions, as proposed in GSP+, is a promising path to help tripartite constituents² address the implementation of their obligations and reporting to ILO supervisory bodies.
- B. The project was relevant to the needs of ILO constituents in each country and other local stakeholder and coordinated, where possible, its actions with other ILO projects and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in each country. The project model was a flexible, multi-country intervention that was managed in a decentralized manner, in which outcomes were tailored to specific country needs.
- C. The project design was ambitious, as it tried to articulate ILO's mandate with limited resources available from the donor and varied priorities and needs of an increasing array of stakeholders in six countries around the world, in some of which the ILO had no local office. Given these constraints, the project's timeframe and resources were insufficient with regards to constituents' needs and the requests for technical assistance received by the ILO from local stakeholders.
- D. Notwithstanding the above, the project was very efficient in mobilizing additional resources and achieving most of its outcomes on the basis of rather modest resources. Moving the project forward under these conditions was only possible due to the support provided by ILO's Regional and Country Offices, the synergy established with other ILO projects, and the recognition of ILO's unique role by all countries' tripartite stakeholders.
- E. The project was very relevant and offered an interesting vehicle for the application of both ILO's social dialogue and normative mandates³. Social dialogue work was at the core of the

² The ILO is a UN agency devoted to promoting social justice and labour rights. It is the only tripartite UN agency with representatives of governments, employers and workers in its governance structure. These are known as ILO "tripartite constituents". This tripartite structure makes the ILO a unique forum in which the governments and social partners (e.g. employers' associations, trade unions) of its 187 member states can freely and openly debate to stimulate decent employment growth through sustainable enterprises; promote rights at work; enhance social protection; and strengthen social dialogue.

³ ILO normative and social dialogue mandates are an expression of the institution's identity and are part of the four strategic objectives at the heart of the Decent Work Agenda. ILO normative mandate is "to

project design and theory of change, and it was consistently applied in all countries, promoting ownership among stakeholders. Involving other stakeholders in a “tripartite +” scheme was a useful strategy to strengthen the case for countries to comply with the implementation and reporting on ILS. Normative integration work focused on promoting labour law reform and regulations and policy development in various countries, as well as on the harmonization of federal and provincial regulations. Normative implementation work was mainly addressed through the capacity building of key stakeholders (labour inspectors, judges, union members, middle management in enterprises) and the establishment of tripartite and/or inter-ministerial mechanisms to follow up on the implementation of ILS.

- F. Building the capacity of stakeholders is an effective means to empower them into further autonomous action, but it is a process that takes time before results may become sustainable. Given the short timeframe of the project, most of its normative implementation work may not be sustainable in the long run. Tripartite constituents would need additional support from ILO to institutionalize project achievements and to scale-up or replicate its results. Countries’ reporting to ILO supervisory bodies would need periodic technical support from the ILO in order to make project results more sustainable.

Lessons Learned

The evaluation identified some lessons learned, which were drawn from some of the challenges as well as the positive results obtained by the project.

- a. Projects focusing on social dialogue and normative work (e.g. integrating norms into the institutional environment) need longer timeframes to see sustainable results. Legal reform and the institutionalization of cooperation mechanisms among stakeholders need longer periods of time to bear fruit. In the case of the project under evaluation, two years was too short to complete the complexity of tasks and results originally expected from the project. While countries’ reporting to ILO supervisory bodies greatly improved, the short duration of the project does not guarantee the sustainability of these results.
- b. Human resources are a key input for projects promoting social dialogue and aiming to increase countries’ compliance with ILS. Project staffing should be commensurate to the wide spectrum of tasks and responsibilities implied in this kind of project. The project would have greatly benefitted from having at least one full-time local coordinator in each country. Likewise, the services of a full-time project manager would

set and promote standards and fundamental principles and rights at work”. ILO social dialogue mandate is “to strengthen tripartism and social dialogue”. Social dialogue is defined as all types of negotiation, consultation or simply the exchange of information between representatives of governments, employers and workers on issues of common interest. It covers tripartite processes and institutions of social dialogue, such as social and economic councils; institutions, such as trade unions and employers’ organizations; and processes such as collective bargaining. Source: a. The 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization (Social Justice Declaration). b. The ILO resolution on Advancing Social Justice through Decent Work, adopted by the International Labour Conference in 2016,

have benefitted the project, allowing for closer support from ILO HQ and going beyond the task of ensuring timely reporting to the donor.

Good Practices

The evaluation identified several good practices, which contributed to advancing the project's normative work.

- a. **The use of research to create awareness on ILS among tripartite stakeholders and promote change (Mongolia):** The findings of a study on the situation of ILS in small and medium enterprises carried out by the National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia (NHRCM) served as catalyser for the participation of workers' and employers' organizations and raised the awareness of policy makers about decent work deficits.
- b. **Build the capacity of local consultants and social partners through their active involvement in the process of preparing reports to the ILO supervisory bodies (Cabo Verde):** The training and use of local professionals (instead of foreign specialists) and members of government, workers' and employers' associations, so that all activities and outputs are delivered by national partners, is a good way to promote ownership among stakeholders and contributes to the sustainability of project results.
- c. **Establish synergies with other ILO projects (Mongolia, Pakistan Thailand):** Coordinating project activities with those of other ILO projects and partners helps to link the project to long-term strategic frameworks, increase the resources available to implement activities, and enhance project results and sustainability.
- d. **Mainstream the promotion of ILS within stakeholders' institutional action plans (Mongolia):** In the case of Mongolia, the Confederation of Mongolian Trade Unions' (CMTU) Action Plan on the Informal Economy should contribute to promote the sustainability of project achievements after the end of the life-of-project (LOP).

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the findings of this evaluation and follow from both the lessons learned and the conclusions.

Recommendation 1: Sustainability – Implement a follow-up programme to support the sustainability of results in selected target countries (e.g. establish follow-up visits to some of the project target countries at least twice per year, during the following two years).

Recommendation 2: Project Design - Consider a longer timeframe for project implementation (e.g. four years should be the minimal timeframe for implementing this kind of project).

Recommendation 3: Project Design – Allocate human resources according to project implementation needs (e.g. consider including at least a full-time coordinator in each target country where the project works and a full-time project manager).

Recommendation 4: Project Design – Make the allocation of financial resources commensurate with the project's complexity and operational needs (e.g. allow for a greater amount of funds in support of tripartite partners' initiatives on ILS in each country).

Recommendation 5: Project Design – Consider focusing on projects of regional scope (e.g. addressing the situation of ILS in two or three countries in one specific region of the world).

Recommendation 6: Project Design – Consider developing projects with a more focused thematic scope (e.g. addressing the situation of compliance with one or two Fundamental Conventions in a limited number of countries).⁴

⁴ Comment from ILO NORMES: *“This recommendation might be difficult to implement, given that the unit in charge of the promotion of fundamental principles and rights at work has adopted an integrated approach promoting FPRWs as a package rather than focusing on individual subjects. The need for policy coherence among ILO units needs to be taken into consideration, especially in order to foster synergies among ILO projects many of which will often be managed by FUNDAMENTALS.”*

I. PROJECT CONTEXT AND DESCRIPTION

1.1 Project Context

The International Labour Organization's (ILO) eight Fundamental Conventions set the necessary conditions for a healthy labour market to be developed without discrimination, forced labour, child labour and with conditions of democracy and freedom of association. **The eight Fundamental Conventions are:**

1. Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87);
2. Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98);
3. Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29) and its 2014 Protocol;
4. Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105);
5. Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138);
6. Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182);
7. Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100);
8. Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111).

Apart from setting and supervising the application of standards, the ILO also provides technical support to countries in order to promote compliance and effective implementation of the above Conventions. ILO's technical support is provided to ILO tripartite constituents (government, workers' and employers' associations) in each country. Tripartism and social dialogue are central to the adoption, supervision and the planning and implementation of a coherent and integrated ILO programme of assistance to constituents in member States. The outcome is presented to the ILO's supervisory bodies that verify compliance with voluntarily ratified Fundamental Conventions. The Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR) receives countries' periodic reports detailing the steps they have taken, in both law and practice, to apply the Conventions. CEACR monitors the actions and identifies in its annual report relevant problems and gaps in the national implementation processes by making comments, conclusions and recommendations. Their aim is to strengthen the implementation and impact of ILO Conventions.

The same fundamental motivation to promote social development through the observance of international conventions and democracy lies behind innovative instruments such as the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, which is a financing instrument aimed at enhancing respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms in line with international and regional human rights standards, conventions and instruments, mainly through support to relevant civil society organizations (CSOs), human rights defenders and victims of repression and abuse. On the other hand, the European Union (EU) Generalized Scheme of Tariff Preferences (GSP) is a mechanism designed to assist developing countries in their efforts to reduce poverty and promote good governance and sustainable development, by helping them generate employment, industrialization and additional revenue through international trade. Within the above framework, there is a Special Incentive Arrangement for Sustainable Development and Good Governance (GSP+) aimed to contribute toward poverty eradication by expanding exports from countries most in need, promoting sustainable

development and good governance, and ensuring better safeguards for the EU's financial and economic interests. GSP+ grants full removal of tariffs on over 66% of EU tariff lines for vulnerable low and lower-middle income countries that implement 27 international conventions related to human rights, labour rights, protection of the environment and good governance. Among the latter are the ILO's Fundamental Conventions.

1.2 Project Description

In 2016, the European Commission (EC) agreed to fund a two-year initiative implemented by the ILO that focused on providing support to trading partners, including GSP+ beneficiary countries, to effectively implement international labour standards (ILS) and comply with reporting obligations. The project aimed to improve the application of the eight Fundamental ILO Conventions in six beneficiary countries of the GSP+ scheme (Cabo Verde, Mongolia, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay and Thailand), with a view toward reducing and progressively eliminating discrimination, forced labour, child labour, and violations of freedom of association. The action focused on improving compliance among the countries selected for the project with regard to the eight Fundamental Conventions and their reporting obligations. Compliance includes legal action (e.g. regulatory adjustments) as well as action aimed at effective implementation of laws and regulations, as monitored through the CEACR annual reports and the EU GSP+ monitoring mechanism. Countries were also supported in order to fulfil their obligation to report to the ILO supervisory bodies, an issue for which several countries originally showed noncompliance or delays. Project start and end dates were, respectively, August 1, 2016 and July 31, 2018. In May 2018, the ILO requested and was granted by the EC a no-cost extension until January 2019.

While the project focused on ILO's normative mandates at both integration and implementation levels, the project's theory of change assumed that tripartism and social dialogue were the main tools to attain sustainable compliance with ILS. Thus, the project focused on both ILO's social dialogue and normative mandates.

Out of the six project target countries (Cabo Verde, Mongolia, Pakistan, Thailand, Panama and Paraguay), four received the GSP+ status in 2016 (Cabo Verde, Mongolia, Pakistan and Paraguay).

The GLO/15/27/EUR project had five areas of Expected Results (ER), common to all implementing countries:

- ER 1: Enhance the capacity of the selected countries to increase their compliance with their reporting obligations regarding the ILO's Fundamental Conventions
- ER 2: Improve or enrich the output of the country-level reporting process through active and effective tripartite participation
- ER 3: Increase tripartite institutional capacity through replicable ILS training
- ER 4: National curricula on ILS are available and taught at national training institutions
- ER 5: Application of fundamental ILS is strengthened through initiatives and action by tripartite constituents, parliamentarians and judges (at the central and local level)

The general types of activities conducive to the above ER include: In-country training on different topics, consultations, technical advice on the preparation of regulations, conferences/seminars,

studies, publications, research, translation, and training of trainers at the International Training Centre of the ILO (ITC-ILO) in Turin, Italy. The diverse types of activities above were addressed to specific audiences in each country, which varied and were more or less comprehensive from one country to the other depending on their particular needs (e.g. ILO constituents' representatives, members of tripartite bodies, representatives of diverse public institutions, judges, parliamentarians, members of the media) at national (and sometimes, provincial) level.

Independently of the common set of ERs at global level and the similarity among some general types of activities, the project allowed enough flexibility for countries to focus on specific issues/ILO Conventions that were of particular interest for each country according to the reality of their labour markets and to issues previously highlighted in CEACR annual reports. For example, the issue of improving regulatory tools and enforcing actions against forced labour was of particular interest in Paraguay and Thailand, while the issue of migration was of specific interest in Thailand. Tripartite constituents' attention in Mongolia was focused on the issue of improving the organization and representation of informal workers and employers in social dialogue and collective bargaining. In Pakistan, project efforts were directed towards mainstreaming the Equal Remuneration (C-100) and Discrimination in Employment and Occupation (C-111) Conventions into domestic legislation, and on developing related policy and legal actions, including a gender-sensitive approach regarding equal opportunity and treatment in employment and discrimination in the world of work. Finally, in Panama particular attention was given to promoting compliance with Conventions 87 (on Freedom of Association) and 98 (on Collective Bargaining), as suggested in CEACR reports.

Thus, while the global purpose of the project remained similar for all target countries, the specific focus and scope of the actions (consultations, trainings, studies, other) were adapted to each country's status with regards to their compliance with ILS. In this sense, in most countries, the specific thematic focus of the project was consistent with the priorities established within their Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP)⁵ and the issues highlighted in CEACR annual reports.

Otherwise, the project aimed to contribute toward some cross-cutting issues, such as: Strengthening good governance, public sector reform, sustainable development and human rights, including gender equality, equal opportunity, and addressing the needs of persons with disabilities and other most vulnerable groups. These issues were intended to be mainstreamed, where possible, within project implementation processes.

Project implementation was managed by a Project Coordinator at ILO Headquarters (ILO HQ) in Geneva, who is an ILS expert based in the ILO International Labour Standards Department (**NORMES**) (NORMES). The activities in the six target countries were managed by the respective Regional Office (RO) or Country Office (CO) of the ILO. During its lifetime, the GLO/15/27/EUR

⁵ Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) have been established as the main vehicle for delivery of ILO support to Member States. DWCPs have two basic objectives: They promote decent work as a key component of national development strategies, and at the same time, they organise ILO knowledge, instruments, advocacy and cooperation at the service of tripartite constituents in a results-based framework to advance the Decent Work Agenda within the fields of comparative advantage of the Organization. Project consistence and contribution to Policy Outcomes and Country Programme Outcomes will be considered and assessed by the evaluation.

project implementation was concurrent and complementary with other relevant ILO and EC-funded initiatives on the same topic, such as:

- A project funded by the Department for Trade of the European Commission (DG TRADE): *Sustaining GSP+ Status by strengthened national capacities to improve ILS compliance and reporting* (SI2.712024 - Mongolia and Pakistan);
- *Support to Employment Creation in Mongolia Project* (SECIIM, funded under MIP 2014-2020);
- *International Labour & Environment Standards from compliance to competitiveness in textile and leather SMEs in Pakistan*;
- EU-funded *Combatting unacceptable forms of work in the fishing and seafood industry* (Thailand); and
- Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)-funded *TRIANGLE Project: Tripartite Action to Enhance the Contribution of Labour Migration to Growth and Development in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)* (Thailand).

ILO staff at Headquarters (NORMES), regional and country levels promoted synergies among GLO/15/27/EUR and these other projects' actions and sought to avoid duplication of activities.

II. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Purpose

The evaluation of the GLO/15/27/EUR project was designed to serve three main purposes: **accountability**, **organizational learning** and **contributing to strategic planning**. The goal of this independent evaluation was to assess: the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the project across the major outcomes; project performance as per the foreseen targets and indicators of achievement at output and outcome levels; strategies and implementation modalities chosen; partnership arrangements; constraints and opportunities; and to provide lessons to improve the performance and delivery of future project results. The evaluation covered the project's various components, including outcomes, outputs and activities, as reflected in the project document as well as subsequent modifications and alterations made during its implementation.

2.2 Scope

The evaluation sought to determine how well the project and the target member-countries of Cabo Verde, Mongolia, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay and Thailand achieved the **outcomes** planned in their respective project log frames, **how** these results were achieved, and **under what** conditions. This evaluation report provides an overall appreciation of project effectiveness as well as insight related to the positive drivers and specific challenges faced by project implementers in the various target countries.

The gender dimension was considered to be a cross-cutting concern throughout the evaluation methodology. The Evaluator reviewed, where available, data and information disaggregated by sex and gender.

The evaluation report also highlights lessons, good practices and recommendations that may lead to:

- Strengthening synergies among the ILO's technical advice and technical cooperation activities;
- Appraising the project's flexibility in approach and the potential that this intervention modality may offer for replication;
- Applying lessons in future programmes and projects; and
- Identifying approaches to better support the achievement of outcomes and objectives identified as a priority by the national tripartite constituents of target Member States.

The above information may be used by ILO, ILO Constituents and the EC Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development (DEVCO) to formulate future strategies and design new projects to advance compliance with ILS.

2.3 Clients

Findings and recommendations from the evaluation are specifically directed to:

- ILO Project Management Department (NORMES);
- ILO Country Offices in Bangkok, Beijing, Dakar, Islamabad, San Jose and Santiago;
- ILO Evaluation Office (EVAL) for the knowledge on findings from evaluations; and
- European Commission (DEVCO).

2.4 Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The evaluation addressed the evaluation criteria and specific questions as per the Terms of Reference (TOR): Relevance and Strategic Fit; Validity of Design; Project Results and Effectiveness; Efficiency of Resource Use; and Sustainability. Please refer to Annex 1 for a copy of the TOR.

In line with ILO's results-based framework approach and using data from the project indicators, the evaluation focused on identifying and analysing project results (at strategic country levels) by addressing key questions related to the evaluation criteria and the achievement of the outcomes planned in the specific country log frames linked to DWCP, Country Programme Outcomes (CPO), Policy Outcomes (PO) and other relevant national priorities.

2.5 Methodology

The Evaluator followed the ILO's evaluation policy, which adheres to international standards and best practices, articulated in the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD/DAC) Principles and the Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the United Nations System, approved by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). More specifically, the consultant conducted the evaluation in accordance with the relevant aspects of the ILO Evaluation Policy and Strategy; ILO Policy Guidelines for Evaluation:

Principles, Rationale, Planning and Managing for Evaluations (3rd ed. August 2017); and associated guidance notes and templates⁶.

The evaluation used mixed methods (e.g. document review, key informant interviews carried out by Skype or telephone calls, verification of specific project outputs at country level) to ensure the triangulation of information and the validity and reliability of the evaluation findings. An evaluation matrix served as the main framework for organizing and clarifying the focus of data collection efforts. It consisted of a double-entry table in which the sources of relevant information were identified for each evaluation category and question.

The evaluation used a result-based approach to examine the GLO/15/27/EUR project outcome achievements, and a systemic approach to review outcome and output achievements at global and country levels. The Evaluator followed a participatory approach and interviewed key ILO stakeholders such as ILO HQ staff and ILO staff in each region/target country, as well as ILO strategic partners including DEVCO (at Brussels and one of the EU Delegations) and ILO tripartite constituents (at least one tripartite constituent per country)⁷.

While most project target countries were sufficiently covered by the evaluation, except for Panama and Thailand (please see footnote), the Evaluator also managed to carry out additional interviews with tripartite constituents, representatives of governmental and other institutions of interest at country level, and direct beneficiaries for Mongolia and Pakistan.

2.5.1 Evaluation Framework

The evaluation methodology considered:

- a. the need for identifying **country-specific** issues, needs and constraints;
- b. the need to evaluate both **country and project level** achievements, lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations, taking into account the different stages of progress in participating countries;
- c. the project's contribution to countries' progress **toward achieving improved reporting on ILS**;
- d. the need to formulate **conclusions and recommendations** as an input into future ILO and DEVCO strategy and follow-up; and
- e. the specific country-based logical frameworks and indicators (where available), used as a basis for addressing key questions.

⁶ E.g. [Adapting evaluation methods to the ILO's normative and tripartite mandate](https://www.ilo.org/wcmstp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_721381.pdf) (https://www.ilo.org/wcmstp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_721381.pdf)

⁷ Unfortunately, two countries, Panama and Thailand, were not responsive to ILO-EVAL and the Evaluator's requests for interview. In the case of Panama this was due to the fact that there was a change in government by July 2019 and the new staff was not knowledgeable of the actions implemented in previous years by the project. Thus, no tripartite stakeholder could be interviewed in those two countries, and data collection focused on document review. Additional information on Panama was obtained through comments from ILO Costa Rica SRO staff to the draft version of this report.

Additionally, the evaluation addressed the ILO's **cross-cutting policy drivers**: Social dialogue, environmental sustainability, and, especially, gender equality and non-discrimination.

2.5.2 Methods and Techniques

To strengthen the credibility and usefulness of evaluation results, as well as to ensure data accuracy and facilitate its interpretation, the Evaluator used a mix of data sources through multiple methods and techniques. The use of mixed methods and data from mixed sources, or “triangulation”, aimed to overcome the bias that may arise from using single information sources, single methods or single observations.

Evaluation methods and techniques collected primary and secondary data. Primary data consisted of information the Evaluator collected directly from stakeholders about their first-hand experience with the interventions. This data was collected through Skype-based key informant interviews (KII) or conference calls with selected respondents. Project informants included: The project's International Technical Specialist (IPS) or project Global Coordinator, National Project Coordinators, members of backstopping units at RO level, including ILS Regional Specialists, tripartite constituents at country level, other persons of interest at country level, DEVCO representatives at HQ and country level, and others as relevant.

Secondary data included documentation that had direct relevance for the purposes of the evaluation and that had been produced by the ILO or other agencies. Within this framework, the Evaluator reviewed key NORMES strategic documents, as well as relevant documents produced by/in relation to project implementation at regional and target-country levels. Likewise, the Evaluator reviewed target countries' specific information in CEACR annual reports, and particularly the supervisory body report of 2019.

Evaluation methods and techniques included:

a. Comprehensive Desk Review

The Evaluator reviewed a variety of documents during the evaluation process. Examples include: Project document, work plans, project monitoring plans, progress reports, previous project reviews completed by ILO and/or DEVCO, report on project budget and expenditures, government documents such as drafts of country or provincial regulations on ILS, country policy frameworks, training curricula, minutes of meetings among tripartite stakeholders, workshop reports, research reports, ITC or direct beneficiaries' reports on trainings, samples of information education and communication (IEC) materials, and other relevant documents that were produced through the project or by relevant stakeholders. Please see a complete list of documents reviewed in Annex 3.

b. Key Informant Interviews

A total of twenty-two stakeholders were successfully contacted by the Evaluator. Please see the list of interviewees in Annex 2. Twenty people were interviewed through Skype or phone calls lasting about one and a half hours each, and two additional persons were addressed through questionnaires. Interviews were guided by the UNEG Norms and Standards.

Key informants included:

- ILO Project Manager (IPS) at NORMES

- HQ and backstopping and technical officials at ILO HQ (for ILO Dakar) and ILO Offices in Brussels, Beijing, Islamabad and Santiago
- A representative from DEVCO, Brussels, in charge of project follow-up
- Ministries of Labour (or similar relevant entities) in Cabo Verde, Mongolia, Pakistan and Paraguay
- Employers' and Workers' Organizations in Cabo Verde, Mongolia, Pakistan and Paraguay
- Other Government Agencies in Mongolia and Pakistan
- EU Delegation representative in Cabo Verde
- A researcher in charge of collecting data and preparing the reports for ILO supervisory bodies in Pakistan, who also received training at ITC-ILO
- A lawyer/Labour Court Judge in charge of organizing/implementing a Tripartite Diploma on ILS in Paraguay

Despite successive communications, ILO Offices in San José and Bangkok were not responsive to this evaluation. The original number of people considered for the interview was around 30 stakeholders. The evaluation fieldwork dates corresponded to the end-of-year holiday period (December 9-30), a fact that may explain the difficulty of contacting some stakeholders. One interview and a questionnaire were completed in the first week of January.

The intersection of qualitative data (from interviews) and quantitative data (primarily obtained through document analysis) allowed for external validation of the different subjective perceptions received during the evaluation process. To ensure accurate recall, the Evaluator retained detailed notes from key informant interviews and used these notes, along with the results of the document review, to identify evaluation themes and respond to the evaluation questions.

2.6 Limitations

Overall, the evaluation findings are based on information collected from background documents and key informant interviews. The accuracy of the evaluation findings depends on the integrity of the information provided to the Evaluator from these sources, and on whether the information could be triangulated by the Evaluator.

The fact that two countries, Panama and Thailand, did not respond to the Evaluator's request for interviews affected the quality and amount of information that could be collected on the same and limited the data collection to document sources.

Other challenges related to the evaluation methodology included the time of year in which data collection had to be conducted (end of year holidays), and the limited timeframe available for contacting stakeholders and collecting data.

Notwithstanding the above, the Evaluator believes that the interviews conducted during this evaluation do accurately represent the views of the key stakeholders.

III. FINDINGS

This section analyses the findings of the evaluation, following the categories indicated in the evaluation TOR: Relevance and Strategic fit; Validity of Design; Project Results and Effectiveness; Efficiency of Resource Use; and Sustainability. The responses to the evaluation questions have been organized accordingly. For each question/topic, there is an opening analysis/assessment for the overall project, followed in most cases by specific information on each country, as relevant.

3.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit

1) To what extent was the project aligned to national priorities and complemented other on-going ILO and wider United Nations (UN) initiatives on labour rights and ILS in the participating countries?

Overall Project
<p>The project was aligned with Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) # 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), #5 (Gender Equality), #10 (Reduced Inequalities) and #16 (Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions). The project was also consistent with countries' obligation to report to ILO supervisory bodies and to implement the ratified Fundamental Conventions.</p>
<p>The project was very relevant to both ILO's social dialogue and normative mandates, placing social dialogue and international labour standards at its core. Linkages to countries' United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and DWCP were also established, where the latter were available. At minimum, where DWCP were non-existent, the project aligned its priorities to the national agendas and ILO work plans in these countries.</p>
<p>The country-specific approach followed by the project was organized around country-based logical frameworks. Likewise, the project's flexibility to translate general objectives into country-specific outcomes took into account the needs of local target groups. The project's thematic focus/emphasis on particular Conventions varied accordingly to national priorities and the comments and observations formulated by the ILO supervisory bodies.</p>
<p>In some countries (Mongolia, Pakistan, Thailand) the project may be conceived more as a contribution toward a long-term framework or predefined set of priorities agreed among ILO and constituents (e.g. DWCP, or country work plan in the absence of a DWCP), rather than as a separate entity on its own (e.g. "project"). In this framework, where relevant, synergies were established between the GLO/15/27/EUR project and other ILO EC-funded initiatives, as well as with other projects implemented by the ILO in the same countries. Likewise, additional financial support in support of project costs and activities was sought in some countries from ILO Regular Budget Supplementary Account (RBSA) funds (various countries), One UN Funds (Cabo Verde) and government trust funds (Paraguay).</p>
<p>Regarding ILO's normative mandate, the normative integration and normative implementation work carried out by the project aimed to improve the effective application of ILS, by addressing, for example, the discrepancies between the principles enshrined in the Conventions and some of the national laws and the intricacies of other country regulations, labour practices and cultural traditions that contradicted the former. Even if the project dealt directly with these issues in some</p>

countries, addressing the barriers to the effective implementation of ILS (e.g. contradictory regulations, inconsistent and lengthy procedures, and cultural traditions) is a long-term endeavour that goes well beyond the life of the project.

Cabo Verde

The project contributed to Objectives 3 and 4 of the Government of Cabo Verde's Strategic Plan for Sustainable Development, which aimed at ensuring social inclusion and reducing social and regional inequalities and asymmetries. During the project's lifetime, a new UNDAF (2018-2022) was formulated for the country and it was possible to embed the priorities of the project within the same, notably in relation to Outcomes 4.1 (democratic governance, transparency and gender sensitivity) and 4.2 (human rights, social cohesion, responsiveness of the justice system). Thus, the project helped leverage a broader framework for promoting decent work in Cabo Verde.

Cabo Verde does not have a DWCP. However, the project was aligned with ILO country priorities. Specifically, the project contributed to Outcome 2 (Ratification and application of ILS) and CPO 826. ILO had other projects in the country related to social protection (Outcome 3) and youth employment/promoting sustainable enterprises (Outcome 4). Synergies were sought among the diverse projects: Every year GLO/1/27/EUR hosted a workshop on reporting, which was attended by social partners, government staff and UN bodies. During its second year of reporting on ILS, the project also focused on other reports that were pending in the country (e.g. social security conventions). The project brought experts to these workshops to highlight the reporting needs on social security. Likewise, it included experts from UN Women and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) in the discussion on forced labour conventions.

The fact that the project complemented other UN initiatives was further evidenced by the fact that the One UN Fund provided additional funding (50%) to cover the salary of a full-time National Coordinator for the project.

Mongolia

For the past two decades, the country has been in the process of transitioning from a socialist economy to a market economy, and it is still adapting its legal framework and labour relations practices to those of a modern economy. The number of workers and enterprises belonging to the informal sector and not duly protected by labour and social protection laws is growing. The GLO/15/27/EUR project was aligned with Mongolia's priorities. Promoting decent work and aligning national laws to ILS are part of Mongolia's Sustainable Development Vision 2030. UNDAF highlights the need to enhance government capacity, extend labour protection and increase the productivity and quality of employment.

The project falls within one of the four prioritized ILO Project and Budget (P&B) outcomes for Mongolia (on ratification and application of ILS) and has an indirect impact on other prioritized outcomes, such as extending social protection floors, formalizing the informal economy and promoting sustainable enterprises. The project contributes directly to a specific CPO (MNG 826).

Mongolia is a good example of the logic by which project activities may be considered more as a contribution to a medium-term "national programme" or even to a "country work plan" rather than as a separate entity in and of itself. In 2014, there was an official request from the Government of Mongolia (GOM) asking the ILO to provide technical support in the revision of the

country's labour law, and a memorandum was signed between the ILO and the GOM. The GLO/15/27/EUR project (locally known as "GSP+2") fell within a sequence of three EC-funded projects (e.g. "GSP+1, GSP+2, GSP+3"), the other two funded by DG TRADE, which all aimed at improving Mongolia's compliance and reporting on ILS. While activities to improve reporting on ILS began with GSP+1, the GLO/15/27/EUR project (GSP+2) focused on carrying out the tripartite review of a draft labour law that had been under discussion for several years. The more recent EC-funded project, GSP+3, focuses on Mongolia's adoption of P29 (on forced labour).

Thus, while contributing toward improved reporting on ILS, the support provided by the GLO/15/27/EUR project was used to advance social dialogue and propel the national objective of passing the new labour code, which will close several relevant gaps with regards to ILS. For example, gender and non-discrimination provisions have been included in the draft labour law, such as the principles of equal pay for work of equal value and the prohibition of workplace harassment (including sexual harassment). Likewise, extending rights and protection to the excluded part of the population has become a priority of the country. Indeed, according to 2018 Labour Force Survey of the National Statistic Office, 18 percent of the workforce is in the informal sector (excluding agricultural employment) and 27 percent of the workforce in the agriculture (mainly self-employed herders and household farming). These two groups together represent 45 percent of the total workforce. In addition, 85 percent of all active enterprises in Mongolia are small enterprises with less than 10 employees (2017, NSO).

Pakistan

The GLO/15/27/EUR project is aligned with Pakistan's priorities, namely with its commitment to SDG Goal #5 (achieve gender equality and empower all women) and Goal # 10 (reduce inequality within and among countries). The project is also consistent with Pakistan's Vision 2025 which aims to provide an enabling environment and equal opportunities to women for the development of their full potential to enjoy the benefits of economic growth, prosperity, and social development.

The project also contributed towards Outcome 2 of the One UN Programme-III (on decent work: *"People in Pakistan, especially women and youth, have improved access to productive livelihoods, income opportunities and decent work"*). The project worked closely with other UN agencies such as UN Women, UN Population Fund (UNFPA), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), social partners as well as with CSOs such as All Pakistan Women Association (APWA) and Care International, in providing support to the country's commitments.

The project objectives were consistent with the Decent Work Country Programme-III (2016-2020), in particular with one of the DWCP-III priorities which seek to *"strengthen compliance with International Labour Standards through Social Dialogue"*. Extensive consultations with social partners were held in 2016 during the preparation of the DWCP as well as before the start of the GLO/15/27/EUR project.

The project was implemented in close collaboration with the DG TRADE-funded project, which focuses on child labour and forced labour as well as on enhancing collective bargaining and freedom of association within the context of GSP+. The GLO/15/27/EUR project also complemented the work being implemented under the *International Labour and Environment Standards from compliance to competitiveness (ILES-CC)* project, as well as the *Strengthening*

Labour Inspection System for Promoting Labour Standards and Ensuring Workplace Compliance in Pakistan (SLIPS) project.

The project falls within one of three prioritized ILO P&B outcomes in Pakistan (Outcome 3.1, on ratification and application of ILS), and has an impact on other prioritized outcomes such as the formalization of the informal economy (Outcome 1.1) and the protection of vulnerable workers from unacceptable forms of work (Outcome 3.3) by extending social protection floors, formalizing the informal economy and promoting sustainable enterprises. The project contributes directly to a specific CPO (PAK 201) aimed at improving the capacity of stakeholders to comply and report on ILS, as well as to CPO PAK 203 which is related to the protection of vulnerable workers in sectoral value chains. The ratification and application of ILS is an important target for investment within ILO's programme for Pakistan. Between 2016 and 2018, 38% of total funds were concentrated on this outcome, among the eight P&B outcomes that were prioritized for the country.

The GLO/15/27/EUR project was particularly sensitive to the local context and to the fact that, with Pakistan being a federal state, competency in labour matters is primarily the responsibility of Provincial authorities. The latter implies relevant differences among the four provinces regarding the content of labour law, stakeholders' capacity for implementation and reporting, and variable levels of noncompliance with regards to ILS.

Panama

Project objectives were aligned to Panama's DWCP, agreed by the tripartite constituents and the ILO for 2015-2019. No explicit reference was made to the UNDAF for Panama.

Paraguay

Paraguay has some relevant institutional and legal gaps which frame the reality of industrial relations in this country. Paraguay has ratified a low number of ILO Conventions in comparison with the rest of the American region. The Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security of Paraguay was created in 2014, and its supervisory and labour inspection bodies are weak. There is a high number of unions and a climate of divisiveness among the same, along with a limited knowledge and response from employers' associations regarding the application of ILS. The GLO/15/27/EUR project was aligned with ILO P&B priority outcomes for Paraguay, particularly on strengthening the ability of member states to ratify and apply international work law and to comply with their obligations to present reports and promote the fundamental principles and rights at work (FPRW) (including labour code reform and the eradication of forced labour). The project contributed directly to a specific CPO (PRY 826) aimed at improving the capacity of stakeholders to comply and report on ILS, as well as to CPO PRY 151, related to labour law reform. There was evidence of the project's synergy with the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security in organizing activities with additional support from the Ministry's trust fund.

Thailand

The project was consistent with the United Nations Partnership Framework (UNPAF) (2017-2021) objective: *"By 2021, inclusive systems, structures and processes advance sustainable people-centred, equitable development for all people in Thailand."*

The GLO/15/27/EUR project was aligned with the following ILO P&B priority outcome for Thailand (one out of five priority outcomes): *“More effective development, implementation and impact of national policies, and their alignment with international labour standards, as a result of effective tripartite engagement.”* It also contributed directly to CPO THA151.

The project also reinforced other ILO interventions in Thailand, such as the EU-funded project on *Combating Unacceptable Forms of Work in the Thai Fishing and Seafood Industry (Ship to Shore Rights)* and the *Development in ASEAN (TRIANGLE in ASEAN Programme)* project, funded by DFAT. However, Thailand CO ILO staff felt that in some way the project *“duplicated activities of another, much better endowed, EU project, with similar objectives, targeting similar beneficiaries”*.

2) To what extent were the needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders taken into account in project design?

Overall Project
<p>The project design was primarily based on the information provided by ILO ILS experts at RO and ILO country office staff. Project design took into consideration both the content of CEACR reports and the status of countries’ response to the same, as well as RO’s in-depth knowledge of constituents’ needs and of the institutional framework prevailing in each country. In countries where DWCP were available, the project design took into consideration the information obtained from prioritization exercises carried out in these countries. The list of target institutions per country was tailored according to the relevance of the roles played and the relationship among diverse stakeholders at a national and provincial level in each country.</p>
Cabo Verde
<p>A representative from the Ministry of Justice and Labour (MJT) highlighted that the project was very relevant to the needs of the Ministry: <i>“The project has helped us a lot in updating our reporting obligations with the ILO. Involving other institutions in the project helped us receive information from them on time in order to finish our reports on time. Since last year, all reports have been timely submitted to the ILO supervisory bodies. Before, the information was not sent on time. Sensitizing all these institutions has helped us improve and also helped the Ministry to structure policies (on child labour, discrimination) and prepare regulations when needed (these regulations are elaborated with knowledge/participation of unions).”</i></p>
Mongolia
<p>The representative of the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection (MLSP) indicated that the project had been very useful for the GOM because <i>“it was time-sensitive, falling at moment when it was needed”</i>. Discussions on a new draft labour law had been ongoing for almost a decade in Mongolia; the project helped close a gap and propel discussions and consensus among stakeholders in order to speed up the submission of the draft to Parliament.</p> <p>A representative from the Mongolian Employers’ Federation (MONEF) highlighted that <i>“our member organizations want to export their goods, and they received information from the</i></p>

project on how to comply with international obligations - the Fundamental Conventions - so now they know how to follow these to successfully export their products”.

The representative of the Confederation of Mongolian Trade Unions (CMTU) highlighted that the project’s focus on *“extending labour rights to the informal sector is really important, because informal workers comprise 20% of total workers and we face challenges when trying to organize them”*. Evidence of the CMTU’s commitment to the project’s activities includes the establishment of a two-year action plan to support informal workers and increase their membership by 7% every year.

Pakistan

A representative of the Ministry of Overseas Pakistanis and Human Resource Development (MOPHRD) highlighted that *“the project was a very good contribution to our Ministry. Online training to Ministry staff and sensitization to the Provincial Labour Department has helped greatly to improve our annual reporting to ILO and address CEACR comments”*.

A representative from the Punjab Labour Department stated: *“The project was completely relevant to the Punjab Labour Department, who monitors what is done by the private sector.”*

The Pakistan Workers’ Federation representative stressed that: *“the project is very relevant to the country context and to the Decent Work Country Programme-III. It helped move towards policy initiatives such as a home-based workers’ policy and domestic workers’ policy and legislation. (...) A number of sister organizations (such as Home Net, APWA, SAFWU, Domestic Workers’ Union) were supported under this project to promote work around C-100 and C-111. There is a lack of knowledge in Pakistan about ILS. The project helped sensitize workers. A number of publications were distributed among workers including the Urdu translations of the Conventions, etc.”*

The Sindh Agriculture and Fishing Workers Union (SAFWU) representatives highlighted that the project had helped unions learn about collective bargaining conventions and prepare to introduce gender equality in collective bargaining agreements (CBA): *“In Pakistan, there are many issues for women in the workplace: there are cultural barriers, women earn 70% of men’s salary, there is a need for separate washing facilities, also sexual harassment committees. The ILO project addressed many unions. We need to use these tools to do something for the women in CB. This is very relevant for us, particularly in the informal and garment sectors, and also to introduce women as Officers in the unions. The unions have understood this.”*

The Employers’ Federation of Pakistan (EFP) representative stated: *“The project was much in connection with our role. EFP is the first body to raise awareness among employers; we do advocacy and host the UN Global Compact that stands for ten principles on human rights, governance and anti-corruption. (...) We are progressing toward promoting principles and attracting employers to use standards to improve their competitiveness.”*

Panama

Insufficient information was available to the Evaluator on this issue/country.

Paraguay
A representative of the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security highlighted that: <i>“the project took into account the Ministry’s needs. We still have shortcomings, but the training was very relevant. The issue is that some people and institutions do not apply the norms enough; the Judiciary, for example, is more an internal, country-related issue. But the project achieved its objective of sensitizing about and strengthening the application of ILS. Reporting, which depends on the Ministry, has improved significantly, but our labour inspectors still need to learn more about ILS. The labour code with articles harmonized to ILS is a good contribution, but given that it is mostly accessible in digital version, not everybody can ‘touch’ it.”</i>
Thailand
Insufficient information was available to the Evaluator on this issue and country. According to project reports, government authorities showed a lack of responsiveness/political will and shifting priorities with regards to the project, particularly on issues related to forced labour.

3.2 Validity of Design

3) Were the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground? Did they need to be adapted to specific national needs or conditions?

Overall Project
<p>The Project Objective (<i>“improved reporting and application of ILS in target countries”</i>), and its five outcomes or “Global Results Areas” (GR)⁸ were formulated in sufficiently generic terms as to accommodate each target country’s specific context and needs, and to allow implementers at national level to focus their attention on particular Conventions and problem issues relevant to each country. Likewise, not all countries developed activities in all global results areas, and the variety of stakeholders involved as implementers and/or beneficiaries of project activities varied widely according to each country’s institutional framework. This allowed the project to work under the same conceptual umbrella of “global results areas” in a wide range of settings and conditions.</p> <p>This country-specific approach, within an otherwise “global project”, was reflected in country-specific logical frameworks which ensured that the outcomes and activities were tailored to the needs of the target groups in each country.</p> <p>Likewise, based on the above, each country adopted a separate work plan. Work plans were updated by the midterm point of the life-of-project (LOP) in order to address the recommendations from the EU Results-Oriented Monitoring (ROM) exercise and to update</p>

⁸ E.g. GR1: Increased compliance with reporting obligations. GR2: Improvements in reporting process at country level. GR3: Increased institutional capacity. GR4: National curricula on ILS available. GR5: Strengthening of ILS through initiatives and action at central and local level.

activities for the remaining implementation period. A final update was done after the approval of a six-month extension.

While initial expectations were later revealed as unrealistic (as in the case of the timing for approval of the draft labour law), ILO staff made the necessary changes in strategy to adapt the work plan to the new conditions. Although the project had conducted a risk analysis per country, as reflected in the original PRODOC, diverse factors – such as shortage of staff, lack of political will, lengthy consensus build-up processes, and slow pace for submission to and approval of laws by Parliament – challenged the project’s normative integration work in various target countries.

Cabo Verde

Cabo Verde focused on the issues of forced labour, child labour, and equal remuneration between men and women in response both to CEACR comments and constituents’ priorities.

The project’s objectives and outcomes were relevant and realistic to the country and did not undergo major changes during implementation. However, while the project had been designed in coordination with the previous administration, a change in the government/ruling party in 2016 necessitated the accommodation of new government priorities with those of the project. While the project objectives and key strategies remained unchanged (capacity building of government institutions on reporting, capacity building of social partners, awareness-raising among other actors that may support the process), some activities had to be revised. The participation of Cabo Verde’s representatives in the International Labour Conference helped gain their support, and the project was able to adapt to and mitigate the risk of political change.

Likewise, high turnover of staff at the MJT, including the change of the Director-General of Labour in 2018, led to further discussions/sensitization of authorities regarding the project objectives, expected outcomes and strategy. Originally, a greater participation of international consultants had been foreseen during project implementation, but given language barriers and the limited availability of funding, the project opted for developing the capacity of national consultants.

Mongolia

The project focused on the issues of freedom of association and collective bargaining in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), particularly among workers working informally, as well as equal remuneration and trafficking in persons. This responded to both CEACR comments and constituents’ perceptions on the most relevant issues to be addressed.

When designing the project, ILO staff assumed that the draft labour law would be approved by the Parliament in the following three months, and that the project would focus on supporting its implementation. However, this did not occur and it led to a partial change in strategy/activities. Thus, the project-funded research on the situation of FPRW in Mongolian SMEs, carried out by the National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia (NHRCM), was used to disseminate information (on the situation of freedom of association, collective bargaining, child labour, forced labour, gender equality and non-discrimination) among social partners and diverse other stakeholders. The objective was to make them more knowledgeable about

the situation and inform the actions that could be jointly carried out to better implement ILS. Initially, the level of understanding among most partners was very low, but the mobilization of partnerships led to increased awareness of the issues. This also led to the establishment and mobilization of a network on youth labour rights () through the CMTU, which brought together eight organizations including employers' and workers' organizations, the government agency for youth development/counselling in each province and the district in the city. The ILO trained facilitators who later organized campaigns on youth labour rights. Likewise, the CMTU's two-year Plan of Action on the Informal Economy, strengthened the representation of informal workers in the CMTU structure, while promoting freedom of association among informal economy workers and addressing the challenges these workers face, through social dialogue and CMTU services. Thus, while waiting for the Parliament's approval on the draft labour law, which would greatly improve the situation of labour rights in Mongolia (), the Project supported different interest groups and strengthened the capacity of tripartite partner organizations to improve labour rights protection in practice through social dialogue and in the design of national policies.

Pakistan

The project objective and outcomes were relevant and realistic to the situation of labour relations in the country, following some of the priorities highlighted in the DWCP 2016-2020. The implementation strategy was sound, operating at both national and provincial levels. The project focused on the issues of equal remuneration (C-100) and discrimination (C-111, Employment and Occupation), following the comments and observations of the CEACR. Particular attention was given to inter-institutional coordination, capacity building, technical assistance for fulfilling reporting obligations, and facilitation of tripartite social dialogue. Expanded social dialogue was a key element in the project strategy for Pakistan. The project aimed to strengthen the capacity of the members of both the federal and provincial tripartite consultative committees, as well as the institutional capacity and understanding of other relevant stakeholders to address the application of ILS (including human rights bodies, academic institutions, civil society organizations, and other government agencies).

Notwithstanding the above, effective coordination among stakeholders was weak and institutional mechanisms had a limited capacity to respond. It took much more time to organize some activities due to the need to develop ownership among stakeholders and the limited resources that were allocated by partners. The legislative response also varied from one province to another, with some provinces adopting new legislation and others incorporating new provisions into existing regulations. The idea of a home-based workers (HBW) union (Expected Result 4.2) could not materialize due to the difficulties in identifying a specific employer. The project adapted to the above limitations by working closely with tripartite stakeholders. Likewise, the project was not able to integrate FPRW in the training curricula for judges, lawyers, labour inspectors and media professionals (Expected Result 5). Advancing the work with the Judiciary would have needed intensive actions that were beyond the project's available resources and staff.

Panama

Project outputs and activities were implemented in agreement and in coordination of the tripartite constituents, a fact that allowed to achieve the revision and submission to the

National Assembly of a draft-law on Freedom of Association in the Public Sector which would regulate labour relations in the same.

Paraguay

The project objective and outcomes were **mostly** realistic (improved reporting to supervisory bodies; increased understanding of ILS and capacity building of tripartite stakeholders; develop a tripartite action plan on FL; implement a tripartite action plan on child labour; develop curricula on FPRW for judges and lawyers). However, the project's Expected Result 3 could not be achieved due to limited political will and significant lags in the Paraguayan legal and institutional framework. Thus, no *"amendments were done to the Labour Code as recommended by the ILO Supervisory bodies"* nor *"the decisions of tribunals referred to the Freedom of Association, Collective Bargaining, Forced Labour or Child Labour Conventions"*, as expected in the project document. Notwithstanding the above, with the support of a consultant the project edited an annotated version of the Paraguayan Labour Code, which highlighted the concordance of its articles (or standing observations to the same), not only with regards to ILS Conventions but also with Human Rights Treaties ratified by the country, as well as the relationship between the articles of the Labour Code and other national regulations.

Thailand

The project objective and outcomes were relevant and realistic to the situation of labour relations in the country, focusing on the issue of forced labour (C-29, P29). Both an increase in the timeliness and quality of reporting to ILO supervisory bodies were achieved with ILO's technical assistance. A P29 Ratification Committee was established to encourage ratification of the Protocol. Within this framework, technical consultations were held and attended by ministry officials, workers' and employers' organizations, the judiciary, and civil society. The Royal Thai Government (RTG) ratified the Protocol 29 in May 2018, and in April 2019 it amended the Anti-Human Trafficking Act, B.E. 2551 (2008) to include the ILO's comments in line with the Protocol 29.

However, due to the government's administrative process and the sensitivity raised by the subject, the completion of a P29 Case Study, one of the key project activities, was delayed. Given that P29 had already been ratified by the country, additional consultations and the training of judges were cancelled.

4) Did the project design establish a clear strategy to solve the problems and needs detected?

Overall Project

While having a central manager at ILO HQ, the project operated in a variety of countries which in turn offered a wide spectrum of cultural, political, institutional, social and economic issues to be addressed. This led the project to be highly decentralized in its implementation and meant that both strategic decisions and day-to-day management of problem-issues were left to the discretion of each ILO Regional Office or Country Office staff. In turn, the staff in charge

of each country faced a variety of challenges to address as they arose. This made it difficult for the project to have a clear, univocal response to issues.

In some countries, some project activities (e.g. collaboration with the academics or judiciary, training of judges) had to be changed by the midterm implementation. Likewise, a six-month extension was requested from the EU in order to implement some remaining/upcoming activities in each country. The original project implementation period of 24 months was considered as insufficient by most ILO interviewees. It was stressed that, given the turnover in government staff and the time it takes to generate government political will on certain issues and consensus among constituents, a longer implementation period is needed for this kind of project.

Notwithstanding the above, some general traits may be highlighted as the project's "general strategy" to address the problems and needs detected:

- In each country, stakeholders that were likely to bring about positive change regarding labour standards were selected to receive technical assistance and training, and were made aware of the issues that affected the country.
- In all countries, the social dialogue was used as a basis to craft a tripartite consensus, decide on project-related initiatives, and move forward.
- The need for countries to comply with their obligations on ratified Conventions was highlighted, as well as the benefits to be obtained from the GSP+ scheme if countries remain compliant with ILS.
- The scope of project stakeholders was expanded to engage other relevant actors, such as members of the judiciary, other government agencies (human rights commissions, statistical bureaus, etc.), academia, media, CSOs and workers and employers in the informal sector.
- Regarding its normative integration and normative implementation work, the project acted on several fronts in each country (e.g. research, technical support to formulate draft regulations, awareness-raising on specific topics/country-sensitive conventions, capacity building of stakeholder institutions, and training). This allowed for the project to adjust each country's work plan and advance in some activities following constituents' priorities, while assuming that others may take more time to implement.
- Where available resources allowed for it, the project provided tripartite and other stakeholders with opportunities to carry out specific actions to promote awareness on and application of ILS.
- The project engaged stakeholders at both national and provincial level (Pakistan), raised awareness among the general public (e.g. workers and employers in the informal economy) and carried out a visibility strategy on project achievements.

- Taking into account the budget and language constraints, the project used the services of ILO experts on ILS (or local resource persons, if/as available) to support the implementation of project activities.

5) To what extent was the monitoring and evaluation framework appropriate and useful in assessing the project's progress?

Overall Project

The project's monitoring and evaluation framework was relatively simple. The original project document included a separate logical framework for each country, on the basis of which a separate work plan (a timeline of specific activities) was prepared for each target country.

Monitoring of activities in the field was implemented directly by ILS Specialists/RO staff in charge of the project, or by National Project Coordinators where available (Cabo Verde, Mongolia, Pakistan). Project implementation was tracked against the outcomes and activities included in the countries' logical frameworks and work plans. Project work plans were revised by the midterm implementation. Short one- or two-page updates on project implementation were sent quarterly to NORMES.

Every six months, an integral progress report was prepared by staff at each RO or CO in charge of a target country and sent to the Project Manager in Geneva. The Project Manager integrated the countries' monitoring information into a Project Progress Report which was submitted to the EU every year. A first Progress Report on the Project was issued in October 2017. At the time of data collection for this evaluation, the final, consolidated project report was pending completion.

In February 2018, the project underwent a ROM review, organized by the donor. The results of this exercise had a mostly positive outcome, and the recommendations formulated in the ROM report were adopted by the project.

In summary, it may be said that the monitoring and evaluation framework, which reported information based on detailed and separate sections for each country, was appropriate and useful in assessing the project's progress.

3.3 Project Results and Effectiveness

6) To what extent has the project achieved planned objectives? Has the quantity and quality of the outputs produced been satisfactory?

Overall Project

While not all countries developed actions regarding all project outcomes, it may be said that in general terms **the project achieved most of its planned objectives in the majority of countries, with the quantity and quality of outputs being satisfactory. The latter is to be**

highlighted, given the short amount of time that most countries had for the effective implementation of activities and the limited amount of project funds invested in the same.

Regarding the project's Global Result Area 1, the project target countries increased their compliance with their reporting obligations with respect to the ILO's Fundamental Conventions: In 2018, all countries had fulfilled their submission requirements to CEACR (Paraguay and Thailand with delays). **In 2019 (ILC's 108th session), CEACR reported receiving all of the reports it had requested from all project target countries:** Eight from Cabo Verde (on Convention Nos. 17, 19, 81, 100, 111, 118, 138, MLC 2006); five from Mongolia (on Convention Nos. 29, 105, 138, 144, 182); eleven from Pakistan (on Convention Nos. 27, 32, 81, 87, 90, 98, 100, 107, 111, 144, 185); seven from Panama (on Convention Nos. 87, 98, 107, 110, 117, 122, 189); seven from Paraguay (on Convention Nos. 87, 98, 117, 122, 123, 169, 189); and three from Thailand (on Convention Nos. 122, 187, MLC, 2006). Observations were received from workers' organizations in Pakistan (on C-87, C-98), Panama (on C-87, C-98, C-110, C-117, C-122) and Paraguay (on C-87, C-98). The Committee **expressed its satisfaction** on the measures taken by Cabo Verde regarding C-182 and, with interest, on C-29. However, in the same report, the CEACR highlighted Pakistan's failure to submit to the competent authorities the Conventions and Recommendations adopted by the International Labour Conference (Article 19 of the Constitution).

Regarding the project's Global Result Area 2, the reporting process at the country level was improved (or enriched) thanks to the active and effective participation of tripartite partners. In all countries, the project contributed to active and effective tripartite participation in the reporting process through a scope of awareness-raising and training activities. In the case of Cabo Verde and Panama, tripartite stakeholder workshops were held to improve data collection and drafting of CEACR reports. Experts from NORMES, Geneva visited the country and participated in meetings with the tripartite constituents to address CEACR observations and clarify procedures related to ILS: In Pakistan, the project helped build capacities at both federal and provincial levels to improve the quality and timeliness of reporting. In the case of Thailand, six technical consultations were held on the requirements under Convention No. 29 and the Protocol.

In Mongolia and Paraguay, where labour law reform is deemed as the path forward to improve the country's compliance with FPRW, **relevant processes aimed at mainstreaming ILS into current labour law were conducted.** In the case of Mongolia, tripartite discussions led to the submission of a draft labour law to the Mongolian Parliament, addressing ILO comments and extending FPRW to the informal economy. In the case of Paraguay, an annotated version of the labour code was edited, highlighting the compatibility and inconsistencies of its articles with regards to ILS and other national regulations.

Regarding the project's Global Result Area 3, tripartite constituents in most countries were **able to increase their institutional capacity** through training on ILS and their supervisory mechanisms, and they were prepared to disseminate and replicate this knowledge among their members. Depending on each country's context, the training covered a variety of modalities, including: tripartite stakeholders' participation at in-country workshops on FPRW and/or reporting on ILS; participation in online courses organized by ITC-ILO; attendance of government staff at training courses in Turin; training of statisticians in mainstreaming gender into data collection and analysis; national seminars and meetings for tripartite constituents,

human rights institutions and CSOs to analyse conventions and other relevant topics of interest for specific countries; training of facilitators to mobilize youth; etc.

Regarding the projects' Global Result Area 4, two countries (Mongolia and Paraguay) developed a **national curriculum on ILS and implemented training courses and materials for use by professional or academic institutions** (see descriptions per country below).

Regarding the project's Global Result Area 5, several **initiatives and actions aimed at strengthening fundamental ILS were developed in the six project target countries** by tripartite constituents, parliamentarians and judges at central and/or local levels (see most relevant outputs per country below).

In general terms, it may be said that the project contributed to strengthening good governance, public sector reform, sustainable development and human rights in all target countries. Regarding ILO's cross-cutting policy drivers, the project focused heavily on strengthening ILS and promoting tripartism and social dialogue in all target countries, and contributed to advancing the causes of gender equality and non-discrimination, particularly with regards to the most vulnerable groups, such as women and youth (Pakistan) and workers in the informal economy (Pakistan and Mongolia). The project had no relevant impact/relation with environmental issues.

In the opinion of the representative from DEVCO B1, Brussels:

"The project was the most successful in Cabo Verde, Panama, and Paraguay. In Pakistan, it was successful at local levels, which can be considered as an added value. In Thailand, the lack of political will proved to be an obstacle. Special attention ought to be paid to Mongolia, where despite external circumstances the project could be considered a success."

7) To what extent did the project coordinate and collaborate with other ongoing ILO, UN and/or other partners' programmes/projects/initiatives to increase its effectiveness and impact?

Overall Project

In order to increase its effectiveness and maximize the use of resources, the GLO/15/27/EUR project coordinated its activities and collaborated as much as possible with those of other ILO programmes, other UN and/or other partners' initiatives.

The project's coordination with other ongoing ILO programmes in each country was addressed above. Please see the relevant information under evaluation question 1.

Cabo Verde

ILO staff managed to embed the priorities of the project within Cabo Verde's UNDAF 2018-2022. Articles on project activities and their results were published in the UN newsletter *Morabeza* in Cabo Verde. Close collaboration and coordination with UN Joint Programmes allowed for maximization of results and enticed the UN delegation to provide additional

funding (50% of the salary) for a full-time National Project Coordinator from June 2018 onward.

The Government of Cabo Verde established an inter-ministerial committee to report to UN bodies. ILO shared this information with the committee in order to be included in the reports to other relevant UN bodies on human rights.

Mongolia

Almost half of Mongolia's economically active population works informally and is therefore vulnerable to the rights violations. The GLO/15/27/EUR project helped increase the capacities of government organizations and social partners to advocate for more and better jobs, particularly within SMEs and the informal sector. This is consistent with the UNDAF - Mongolia, which highlights the need to enhance government capacity to extend labour protection and develop services that help increase productivity and boost the quality of employment. The project backed a Mongolian network to promote decent work for youth and in November 2018 it collaborated with the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung to organize a forum on Decent Work for Youth. By helping to organize (young) workers and employers, the project contributed to the promotion of decent work and international labour standards, which are core to the Mongolian Sustainable Development Vision 2030.

Pakistan

The project worked closely with other UN agencies and the interagency network on gender equality. It worked closely with UN Women, UNIDO and CSOs such as APWA and Care International in supporting the implementation of national legislation and actions under national and international commitments. This included the provision of collective support towards the application of existing legislation such as a 10% employment quota for women, the implementation of anti-harassment legislation and a review of the gender policies.

Likewise, ILO contributed recommendations to the Government of Pakistan on mainstreaming non-discrimination in national development and, together with other stakeholders (government departments, academia, **UN**, CSOs), the project organized a seminar to enhance the capacity of the Provincial Bureaus of Statistics (BOS), Pakistan BOS and other relevant stakeholders to mainstream gender into data collection and analysis processes. UN agency representatives were also present during a national seminar organized by the project to present the analysis of the status of C-100 and C-111 in the country.

Panama

The information available does not indicate the existence of any linkages/ collaboration between the project and other UN or ILO initiatives in the country in order to increase its effectiveness/ impact.

Paraguay

The Project had a limited interaction with other UN and ILO initiatives. During the first years of the project (2016-2017) all activities were funded through ILO regular budget for cooperation (RTBC) and other projects' funds in Paraguay.

Thailand
Project activities were consistent with UNPAF (2017-2021), which states that <i>“By 2021, inclusive systems, structures and processes advance sustainable people-centred, equitable development for all people in Thailand”</i> .

8) What are the main factors -internal to the project and external- that have hindered the project capacity to reach the objectives? Are there alternative strategies that would have increased the perspectives of achieving the project objectives?

Overall Project
<p>The project had very ambitious targets, given its short timeframe (two years), the limited funds it managed (a total of EUR 998,618.21 distributed among six countries), the number of “Global Results Areas” it worked on (five) and the fact that social dialogue is a political process that requires a great deal of time and political will to reach consensus.</p> <p>The main external challenges faced by the project in several countries dealt with issues of political or social instability, such as: Changes of government; high turnover of authorities and/or staff in relevant institutions, including social partners; weak capacity of ministries of labour and other stakeholders to fulfil their mandate; lack of political will among authorities or constituents (mainly employers) to move on with the changes needed to implement ILS; existence of competitive agendas within government; divisiveness among trade unions; lack of willingness among relevant institutions to coordinate and cooperate among themselves; and limited representativeness/size of employers’ associations.</p> <p>Depending on the country, internal challenges included the absence of dedicated staff to implement the project (ILO having to work on the basis of part-time coordinators and, in some cases, using RO and/or CO staff dedicated to other activities as well as frequent travel to target countries from abroad). For all countries, the financial resources availed by the project to implement activities were insufficient given the growing expectations/requests on the part of constituents. Project reports refer to internal challenges such as <i>“a mismatch between available resources and expectations”</i>.</p> <p>The combination of the issues above led to delays in implementation or to the cancellation of a limited number of activities in certain countries (see specific challenges per country below), as well as long decision-making/consensus processes that delayed the approval of labour laws or changes in regulations.</p> <p>The project addressed external challenges by intensifying contacts with government agencies and other stakeholders in order to explain to the new authorities the rationale of the project and raise their awareness on the benefits it would entail for the country to comply with its reporting obligations and progress in the implementation of ILS. In some cases, the project used stakeholders’ participation at the ILC or the visit of CEACR members to increase the</p>

awareness of stakeholders on ILS. Likewise, the project intensified its capacity-building efforts to address the weakness of diverse stakeholders, and engaged other stakeholders in social dialogue to strengthen the institutional framework in support of national commitments and ILS.

Internal challenges were addressed by using RO and CO experts responsible for other ILO work to implement project activities, using additional financial resources from ILO to fund certain project activities, promoting synergies with the DEVCO project and other EC-funded or other donor projects in the implementation of activities, and obtaining resources from other sources (government, One UN Fund) to co-fund specific activities or pay for part of the salary of dedicated staff.

Alternatively, the project could have used the following strategies to address these challenges:

- Carry out a stakeholder analysis at the beginning of the project in each country, in order to assess which stakeholders would be more in favour (“supporters”) and against (“opponents”) the achievement of project objectives as well as the level of influence of each of these “forces”. While continuing to work on the basis of tripartism and social dialogue, this would allow projects to design specific activities for each type of stakeholder, tailored to their position with regards to ILS.
- Reduce the scope of global results areas and/or activities per country, focusing on those activities/stakeholders that may be more directly linked to the main objectives of the project (e.g. improved reporting and compliance with ILS).

Cabo Verde

Challenges to project success included:

- The initial lack of staff dedicated to the project (specifically, a National Project Coordinator), whose salary had originally been funded for 50% of LOP. With additional support from One UN Fund, the project managed to engage a full-time Project Coordinator from July 2018 onward.
- High turnover of key staff in the labour administration (General Directorate of Labour [DGT] of the MJT), which resulted in increased capacity building needs.
- Weak institutional capacities in the country (e.g. only two staff in the MJT Employment and Labour Department) required full-time in-country project assistance and led the project to do additional fundraising in order to hire a **full-time** National Coordinator.
- Language barriers (the national language being Portuguese, with few stakeholders speaking English or French), which hindered technical exchange and knowledge transfers. This led to an increased need for ILO staff engagement and input in order to ensure the quality of outputs, as well as to engage/train local consultants. However, the limited availability of knowledgeable national consultants led to some delays in project delivery.

Mongolia

<p>Challenges to project success included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political instability, which led to a delayed project start, as well as delays in labour law revision and approval (e.g. due to the creation of a new Ministry of Labour and Social Protection in 2016, a cabinet reshuffle in 2017, and the withdrawal and resubmission of a revised draft of the Labour Law to Parliament in 2018). By the end of 2019, the draft labour law had not been yet approved by Parliament. • Language barriers: A limited level of English proficiency in government and partner organizations hindered technical exchange and knowledge transfers. ILO staff compensated for these difficulties directly. • Limited project resources (e.g. lack of funding for hiring dedicated staff for the project). However, the ILO was able to engage an international junior lawyer and a national lawyer to work alongside ILO experts in Beijing for an extended period of time.

Pakistan

<p>Challenges to project success included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A high turnover of constituents’ staff (e.g. provincial government officials, autonomous human rights bodies, social partners). • Varying priorities among government authorities. • Weak coordination among stakeholders, partly due to varied mandates and internal competitiveness among the same. • Weak capacity of constituents, including limited resources to support trainings and activities under their plan of action as well as limited targeted interventions. • Unmatched expectations of stakeholders: The project budget was insufficient to carry out suggested training activities. <p>In order to address these challenges, the project held regular consultations with stakeholders as well as strong coordination and collaboration with other projects.</p>

Panama

<p>Challenges to project success included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak institutional capacities (e.g. a limited number of staff at the Ministry of Work and Labour Development (MITRADEL), with only two staff members working on ILS and few staff in general; weak supervisory and labour inspection bodies). • Lack of awareness on ILS: Labour courts do not ordinarily invoke ILS in their rulings.

- Divisiveness among the union movement.
- Limited project resources (e.g. lack of funding for assigning dedicated staff to the project).

Paraguay

Challenges to project success included:

- A high turnover of authorities in Paraguay (there was a Presidential election in 2018, which led to administrative changes in government).
- Weak social dialogue: The country has a limited tradition in social dialogue, with a limited participation from the employer's sector.
- Divisiveness among the union movement: While unions represent only 3% of the total workforce, there are nine union centrals/ confederations in the country.
- Temporary lack of resources for ILO technical backstopping of the project, a fact which resulted in the late implementation of the same: Between August 2015 and July 2016 the Santiago de Chile ILO Office did not have a technical counterpart (ILS Specialist; and there was no ILO CO in Paraguay).
- Likewise, some internal ILO administrative issues led to a late start/use of project funds by the end of 2017. However, given that the issues addressed by the project were already included in the Tripartite Memorandum of Understanding for Paraguay, the Santiago de Chile Office financed some of the activities with ILO funds during 2016 and 2017.
- Limited project resources (e.g. lack of funding for assigning dedicated staff to the project).

As a mitigation strategy, the Santiago de Chile Office used its own funds to implement some project-related activities, and in one case, it obtained financial support for some activities from the Paraguayan Ministry of Labour's TrustFund.

Thailand

Challenges to project success included:

- Non-responsiveness of authorities. Weak political willingness of relevant institutions (Ministry of Labour, Judiciary) to allocate resources, coordinate and cooperate regarding forced labour issues.
- Shifting priorities within government institutions.
- Limited project resources (e.g. lack of funding for assigning dedicated staff to the project).

As a mitigation strategy, resources from other ILO projects were used in support of project activities.

3.4 Efficiency of Resource Use

9) To what extent have material, human, and institutional resources been sufficient and adequate to meet project objectives?

Overall Project
<p>The financial and human resources available to the project were neither sufficient nor adequate to meet project objectives. Likewise, according to most of the sources consulted, the timeframe for implementing the project (24 months) was considered too short, moreover given the unpredictable duration entailed in the kind of legal and policy change processes sought by the project.</p> <p>The project's originally approved budget per country ranged from EUR 106,650 (Paraguay) to EUR 149,450 (Mongolia); amounts that, given the various tasks to be performed by the project, were inadequate. Additionally, being a labour-intensive project, the amounts allocated for human resources per country were particularly insufficient. Accordingly, project funds were supposed to cover only 50% of the salary/dedicated in-country technical staff costs in Mongolia, 25% of technical staff costs in Pakistan (e.g. 6 months), 37.5% of salary costs for a National Project Coordinator in Cabo Verde, and 25% of salary costs for a National Project Officer in Thailand. The project budget for Panama and Paraguay considered no salary costs for local or international staff. The lack of National Coordinators in all project target countries throughout LOP was highlighted by both ILO staff and constituents to be an issue to address in future actions.</p> <p>Facing this financially stressed implementation context, ILO staff did its best to obtain additional funds from third parties or ILO's own budget, to work in synergy with other projects with similar objectives/activities in order to share or distribute costs among the same, and to incorporate additional institutional resources by intensively using the expertise of ILO ILS Specialists and other staff at RO and CO level. This allowed the project to attain above 80% of its expected results in most target countries.</p> <p>By end of LOP, the project had spent 86% of its approved budget. Some of the activities foreseen for the 6-month extension could not be implemented in the end.</p>

10) What have been the amount, quality, and opportunity of the products supplied?

Cabo Verde
<p>The project had as a specific objective for Cabo Verde <i>"to support the application of ILO ILO Fundamental Conventions and human rights in Cabo Verde with a focus on forced labour, child labour, and equal remuneration between men and women"</i></p> <p>As highlighted before, by 2019 Cabo Verde remained in compliance with all requested reports submitted to the ILO and the supervisory bodies, and the CEACR noted with satisfaction or interest their progress in the application of C-29 on Forced Labour, and C-182 on Child Labour.</p>

The project raised awareness on the GSP+ system, strengthened inter-institutional cooperation, reinforced partners' capacity for reporting and developed tools to help report on ILS and human rights.

While the project helped bring Cabo Verde in line with reporting to ILO supervisory bodies, it went beyond the expected results and achieved significantly more awareness, from both tripartite constituents and other stakeholders, on the content of the standards and its relation to other conventions. Training provided to members of the labour administration, labour inspection and social partners increased their capacity to understand and respond to CEACR comments, while the media, members of the judiciary, national human rights institutions (the Comissão Nacional para os Direitos Humanos e a Cidadania and the Instituto Cabo-verdiano para a Igualdade e Equidade de Género), CSOs and parliamentarians became aware of ILS.

During and immediately after the life-of-project (LOP), significant advances were achieved regarding the institutionalization of mechanisms to follow up on ILS and human rights-related issues. In 2017, the government created the Inter-Ministerial Commission for the Elaboration of National Reports on Human Rights Treaties, which encouraged timely reporting on ILS to human rights treaty bodies covering labour rights. In March 2019, the Council of Ministers adopted a resolution to **ratify ILO Tripartite Consultation Convention, 1976 (No. 144)**, which institutionalizes tripartite dialogue on issues related to ILS. It is thought that this will facilitate future annual reviews of CEACR comments by government and social partners, as well as further follow-up on the effective implementation of ratified Conventions. Likewise, based on synergies with another ILO project, Cabo Verde ratified C-102 on Minimum Standards on Social Security.

Four members (three men, one woman) from national institutions participated in the Turin Centre ILS Academy courses for judges and in the Decent Work Academy's course on ILS and gender equality. There was a balanced participation of women and men in project implementation. Special attention was given to the role of collective bargaining in promoting gender equality and equal pay.

Mongolia

The project had as specific objectives for Mongolia: *"1. To improve legal and regulatory frameworks concerning the organization and representation of informal workers and employers in social dialogue and collective bargaining and their involvement in social dialogue and collective bargaining on working conditions, wages and occupational safety and health. 2. To support the NHRCM for a continued monitoring of observance of workers' rights to organize and other fundamental rights at work."*

As highlighted before, after project completion in 2019, Mongolia remained in compliance with all requested reports submitted to the ILO and the supervisory bodies. In 2017, with ILO assistance, the MLSP re-established a National Tripartite Sub-Committee on the Promotion of International Labour Standards in order to improve the country's capacity to meet implementation and reporting obligations arising from ratifying ILO Conventions.

In 2016, the MLSP had established a tripartite working group, comprised of representatives from government, CMTU and MONEF, to oversee the drafting and finalization of the revised

labour law. ILO provided technical assistance to tripartite constituents in the revision of the draft law, and with project support, a consensus was reached among the parties. After endorsement by the Ministries of Justice and Finance, the draft labour law was submitted to Parliament (the draft is expected to be voted on before March 2020). The approval of the draft law would bring Mongolian law into better compliance with ILS and would provide a national framework for implementation of FPRW in the country.

With the technical assistance of the ILO, the NHRCM carried out research on fundamental rights in Mongolian SMEs and released the findings in December 2017. This input served to promote tripartite dialogue on the issue of FRPW in Mongolia and sensitize the general public.

In 2017, a MLSP official attended an ILS course at ITC-ILO in Turin. The Project also supported training in 2018 for the Youth Network’s facilitators (which includes unions, government agencies, labour inspection and NGOs) on rights at work and ILS. As a result, constituents provided information regarding labour rights and union organizing to 770 workers, including 330 women.

By the end of the Project in January 2019, the CMTU adopted a Plan of Action on the Informal Economy , aimed at strengthening existing trade unions that represent workers in the informal economy, promoting freedom of association among IE workers, addressing their challenges through social dialogue, and improving CMTU services to this sector. While developing the action plan, CMTU provided training and organized discussions with the participation of 284 informal economy workers (60 women and 224 men). Workers with special needs took part in the activities.

The Mongolian Bar Association (MBA) developed learning materials on ILS (ILO Conventions on Forced Labour and Child Labour), for use in national bar examination readings. Training was held for 28 lawyers, including 23 women. MBA is seeking accreditation for these materials in order to use them in the training of legal professionals in the country.

With ILO support, the tripartite constituents, NHRCM and CSOs launched the Mongolian Network to Promote Decent Work for Youth. By end of LOP, the network had provided information to over 5,000 young workers.

Pakistan

The project had a specific objective for Pakistan to “support the application of ILO Fundamental Conventions and human rights in Pakistan by strengthening the institutional capacity of the Pakistan Government to effectively enforce labour laws, through ILO’s technical assistance to the current labour inspection reform agenda of the Government of Pakistan, guarantee fundamental rights at work and enhance social dialogue. The focus of the intervention will be on the implementation of the provisions of Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100) and the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111) with a view to addressing the comments made by the ILO supervisory bodies.”

As highlighted before, after project completion in 2019, Pakistan remained in compliance with all requested reports submitted to the ILO and the supervisory bodies.

During LOP and through tripartite consultations, ILO constituents were able to identify gaps in the implementation of C-100 and C-111 as well as identify areas for developing new labour law, integrating elements of C-100 and C-111 into existing labour law or elaborating specific regulations on the situation of women. At the regional level, through tripartite consultations, provincial labour authorities debated a draft model law on non-discrimination and revised their policies and laws in order to enhance their conformity with the ILO Core Conventions and other ILS. Various improved policies and regulations were issued during LOP, such as Provincial Labour Policies (in Sindh, Punjab and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa), the Home-Based Workers (HBW) Policy and HBW Act in Sindh, the Punjab Domestic Workers (DW) Policy and the Punjab DW Bill.

Tripartite constituents, human rights institutions and CSOs increased their capacity to advocate on equal opportunities and non-discrimination in employment. Likewise, through specific training events, the project managed to improve the capacity of Federal and Provincial Statistical Departments and Provincial Labour Departments to mainstream gender in the data collection and analysis processes. The project also worked to sensitize and engage other stakeholders, such as parliamentarians, judges, national human rights institutions and the media. A ministry officer completed an online ILO training via ITC-Turin. Regarding the production of awareness-raising tools, a number of resource materials such as training cards on C-100 and C-111, Urdu and English handbooks, posters and IEC materials on relevant national legislation were disseminated.

SAFWU sensitized 500 women about their rights to organize and collective bargaining related to the agriculture sector as per ILO Conventions C-89 and C-98, as well as about the non-discrimination and equal opportunities provisions guaranteed by ILO Conventions C-100 and C-111. The Workers Employers Bilateral Council of Pakistan, EFP and APWA also organized consultations and events aimed to sensitize their members about equal opportunities and non-discrimination.

Panama

As highlighted before, by 2019 Panama remained in compliance with all requested reports submitted to the supervisory bodies (Panama had missed its reporting obligations several times before the project started).

Capacity development and social dialogue activities were carried out for members of the Tripartite Committee on Harmonization of Regulations with Conventions 87 and 98, and the Tripartite Committee for Rapid Handling of Freedom of Association Complaints. Tripartite workshops were also held in 2018 and 2019 on CEACR reporting, and on ILO Conventions C-100, C-111, and C-144. Thus, between October 2018 and March 2019, the project developed the following activities according to its work plan: An institutional forum for reporting to ILO supervisory bodies; an awareness-raising workshop for labour inspectors; elaboration of guidelines on fundamental rights for inspectors; a course on fundamental rights for members of the Judiciary; a tripartite workshop to discuss ILO Conventions C-100 and C-111; and a tripartite workshop on ILO Convention C-144.

A member of CEACR and the Director of the ILO Office for Central America met with the Minister of Labour and Social Welfare and his staff to discuss compliance with ILS and its

supervisory system. ILO regional officers had regular contact and meetings with ministry officials regarding ILS implementation, particularly on Conventions C-87, C-98 and C-100. Eight tripartite participants attended remote training in 2017 on best ILS reporting practices. Judges, lawyers and law teachers attended ILS and fundamental labour rights trainings in 2017 and 2018.

Paraguay

As highlighted before, after project completion in 2019, Paraguay remained in compliance with all requested reports submitted to the ILO and the supervisory bodies. Specific workshops for employers and workers gave them tools to participate more, and better, in the control process of information about the ILS. In 2019, the Paraguayan Union (CUT-A) submitted observations to CEACR on the reports submitted by the government.

In order to help resolve the comments of ILO supervisory bodies and establish a path for bringing Paraguayan legislation in line with ILS, the project supported the editing of an annotated version of the Paraguayan Labour Code, which highlighted the consistency of its articles (or lack of) with regards to diverse ILS and Human Rights treaties, as well as its relationship with other national regulations. The annotated Labour Code may play a role in the dissemination of ILS among law professionals, students, and other intended users.

A three-month tripartite diploma on ILS was organized in 2018 by the Catholic University of Asunción, with ILO support. The diploma was addressed to lawyers, students, accountants, workers, representatives of enterprises (who in the end, unfortunately, did not attend), and government officers. The purpose of the diploma was to expand the local professional community's knowledge of labour law (a matter seldom discussed/disseminated in Paraguay), particularly regarding international conventions and their relationship with local regulations. In a country where labour issues receive very limited attention from academia and the media, the tripartite diploma was an important contribution for building the capacity of a young generation of professionals and practitioners.

The project also provided support to the Tripartite National Committee on Fundamental Rights and Forced Labour in the elaboration of an Action Plan (2017-2019) for the National Strategy to Combat Forced Labour, as well as the edition of a tripartite guide for intervention in cases of forced labour. The project also provided support to the National Commission for the Prevention and Eradication of Child Labour and the Protection of Teenage Labour in its work on the elaboration of a national strategy on child labour, as well as in the design of methodological guidelines for a national plan on protected adolescent work. The preparation of draft bills on the issues of forced labour and "*criadazgo*" (domestic work by children) was also supported by the project.

In-country training was held regarding forced labour in order to promote the ratification of the Protocol to C-29. A member of the Committee of Experts was invited to the country and held fruitful exchanges with authorities. By the end of the project, an international meeting on the protection of FPRW was held in the Supreme Court. Additionally, six representatives of tripartite constituents were part of ITC-Turin training programmes on FPRW and forced labour.

Thailand
<p>Before the project start, Thailand had not submitted timely reports to CEACR regarding its compliance with ratified fundamental ILO Conventions. The GLO/15/27/EUR project helped reinforce ILO’s work on international labour standards in the country, in order to increase Thailand’s capacity to respond to ILO supervisory bodies in a timely and adequate manner. By 2019, Thailand remained in compliance with all requested reports submitted to the supervisory bodies</p> <p>DEVCO project funds were used to translate the results of a DG TRADE-funded gap analysis on the existing mechanisms, laws and policies to address trafficking and forced labour, in light of the requirements of Convention No. 29 and the Forced Labour Protocol. A P29 Ratification Committee was established to encourage ratification of the Protocol. Likewise, with project support more than ten technical consultations were held on the requirements under Convention No. 29 and the Protocol. Technical consultations were held and attended by ministry officials, workers’ and employers’ organizations, the judiciary, and civil society. As a result of the efforts above, the RTG ratified the Protocol 29 by the end of May 2018.</p> <p>Case studies on forced labour in Thailand were commissioned by the project in 2017, in order to support the application of the ILO Fundamental Conventions (particularly C-29) and human rights. However, due to political sensitivities, it took longer than expected to engage local stakeholders and the results of the case studies were published in October 2018, after the ratification of P29. Given the above, there was a delay in starting capacity building activities with members of the Judiciary. A mismatch between schedules and expectations led to the fact that some training activities planned for the six-month project extension period were not eventually implemented.</p>

11) To what extent was the project efficient in delivering the desired/planned results? Are there other more efficient means of delivering more and better results (outputs and outcomes) with the available inputs?

Overall Project
<p>The project was efficient in delivering its planned results. In the opinion of the representative from DEVCO B1, Brussels:</p> <p><i>“The project used the allocated resources efficiently and effectively and the project, in general, remains very good value for money as it contributed to enhancing people’s fundamental rights on the ground.”</i></p> <p>The project’s main objective was to improve the quality and timeliness of countries’ reporting to ILO supervisory bodies. This objective was attained in all countries.</p> <p>The overall idea of linking the benefits of the GSP with countries’ compliance with Fundamental Conventions and their reporting to ILO supervisory bodies is a good strategy to promote ILS. The incentives for compliance provided by the GSP+ are a good argument for ILO to use in order to raise government and private sector awareness on ILS, embed reporting</p>

consultations within constituents' annual work plan/ procedural routines, and help counter unfounded fears that implementing ILS will raise production costs and thus reduce enterprises' competitiveness.

As explained by a representative of the Employer's Federation of Pakistan: *"The way to deal with fear is to develop an understanding that both economic growth and social compliance are important. GSP+ is linked to compliance. For sustainability, we need to focus on social growth for economic success. At this point in time, we get fewer tariffs in the European Union with GSP, and that helps the economy; in the future, we will be able to do it without GSP and will have a greater level of productivity and development."*

Likewise, it may be said that the project maximized its results on the basis of rather modest financial inputs. Thus, by establishing synergies with other ILO projects, promoting tripartite social dialogue and obtaining financial support from other sources to co-fund some costs/ initiatives, the DEVCO project achieved a relevant level of efficiency which translated into the positive results described above.

Building the capacity of tripartite partners to address the implementation of ILS through social dialogue is an efficient strategy to develop ownership among constituents and promote the sustainability of initiatives. Combining the expertise of ILO international ILS Specialists with that of the local staff seems to be a balanced and cost-effective way to transfer knowledge and implement concrete interventions on the ground. Translating materials and using local language speakers as trainers are effective means to promote interest and ownership from participant in training events.

Raising awareness on ILS among workers and employers, extending project focus to the informal economy and youth, developing activities at both national and provincial levels, linking training to academia and using ITC-ILO expertise to raise the knowledge of technical staff at various countries are all useful strategies that contributed to the project's capacity to deliver planned results.

Likewise, in several countries, the project went beyond the objective of improving reporting and used social dialogue to discuss concrete issues that had been raised by the CEACR, and helped draft regulations (labour laws, sector-specific norms) that align national legislation with ILS. The final outcome of efforts to promote legal reform is not always predictable and may take much more time, even years, to be accomplished. With varied degree of success, the project bolstered that process in most target countries.

Unfortunately, given the wide geographic dispersion and different, specific issues affecting each country, the project was not able to promote horizontal cooperation, sharing and learning among target countries.

12) Has the project received the necessary institutional, technical, and administrative guidance from different decision-making levels for successful execution?

Overall Project

In terms of implementation, the GLO/15/27/EUR project is a decentralized project. While the project had a part-time Project Manager in ILO HQ, and received active support from NORMES staff, for all practical purposes the technical and administrative decisions were taken at each RO/country level. Likewise, while limited funds did not allow the project to hire a National Coordinator in Thailand, Panama and Paraguay, and for a short period of time in the other three countries, ILO RO and CO provided technical, administrative and financial backing to the project. However, given project budgetary constraints, in some cases, ROs and COs were limited in providing all the support needed in terms of international expertise (e.g. travel costs, consultations). In the case of Panama and Paraguay, ILO had no field office in those countries, a fact that added a layer of difficulty to project implementation.

The project received the necessary institutional and technical guidance from different decision making levels. ILS Specialists at RO and CO levels were actively involved in periodically visiting the target countries to support social dialogue and promote the implementation of specific research, trainings and other initiatives, and to expand the application of ILS to the informal economy and other sectors. It may be said that the overall project budget does not reflect the real input in terms of human resources provided by the ILO.

ILO engaged other structures in support of project actions in various instances. For example, in one case (Paraguay), the project involved a member of CEACR in an in-country event with high-level government authorities; in another case (Cabo Verde), the participation of country representatives in the International Labour Conference was used to energize stakeholders into action in support of the project.

ILO's Brussel Office was in charge of the relationship between ILO and EU. It negotiated the contract with DEVCO, and as a counterpart of NORMES was in charge of doing the follow up, monitoring and verification of compliance with financial rules.

Among some ILO staff, there is the perception that the project tried to *“address very important issues in too many countries with too little money”*.

Possible synergies among various ILO projects in a country were not always perceived as positive. In Thailand, ILO staff was of the opinion that: *“The project was fundamentally ill-conceived in duplicating activities of another much better endowed EU project with similar objectives targeting similar beneficiaries.”*

In one country (Paraguay), the project had a slow start that was attributable, according to the Santiago Office, to *“difficulties in communication between ILO HQ and the field”*.

13) How efficient were the management and accountability structures of the project?

Overall Project
Project design and implementation had to harmonize DEVCO interests, the target countries' needs, and ILO's mandate. The project management strategy was designed to ensure the engagement of the social partners in project implementation, and build on other previous

and current ILO interventions in each target country. This was deemed to be an adequate path to ensure national ownership, while promoting cost-efficiency and alignment with the priorities identified by the supervisory bodies. Increasing coordination among local stakeholders also helped advance project implementation.

Notwithstanding the above, it may be said that the GLO/15/27/EUR project had a significant mismatch between the project's goals and the resources available to achieve them. The project had a limited (if any) autonomous management structure in most of the target countries. A local project team was envisaged in only three of the target countries, for only six months. The coordination and monitoring of the Project at ILO HQ was ensured by an officer who had other main functions.

The challenge of having insufficient human resources for project management was addressed through the active engagement of ILO Officers and Specialists working at RO and CO levels, which assumed the tasks (in addition to their main responsibilities) of coordinating and implementing project activities. Likewise, where specialized services were needed, the project engaged local consultants to support certain project activities. However, the project would have greatly benefitted from a stronger central manager to support field staff needs, not only someone in charge of reporting to the donor. Likewise, the project would have benefitted from the presence of stable, local staff in each target country throughout LOP in order to provide closer support to tripartite partners' initiatives.

Thailand Office staff considered the project management arrangements as *“very inadequate, combining a budget too low to assign dedicated staff and burdensome reporting”*. Moreover, project implementation was more difficult in those countries where there was no ILO presence (Panama, Paraguay). However, it may be said that while spreading too little money among too many countries may not be very cost-effective, in the case of the GLO/15/27/EUR project, the money was well invested in each country.

Yearly ILO reports to the EC on project implementation were timely and extensive. Accountability was strengthened by the implementation of a visibility strategy, in coordination with EU delegations in some countries, which aimed at making project outcomes known to the local public.

3.5 Sustainability

14) How effectively is the project building the necessary capacity of people and institutions?

Overall Project

The project was very effective in building understanding and capacity on ILS. It also stressed the interest, for all constituents, of reporting to ILO supervisory bodies and other institutions, and provided information about how to do it properly.

As a result of the project's capacity building efforts, relevant improvements in the quality of reporting were observed in Cabo Verde, Mongolia and Pakistan (which, being a federal country, presents greater difficulties in getting information on provinces; nonetheless,

reporting from the latter improved). Panama, Paraguay and Thailand also submitted their reports on time. In the case of Panama, timely compliance has been positively appraised by ILO constituents and other organizations.

The complexity of the capacity building efforts deployed by the project (related to the variety of themes, audiences and means involved in the same) is reflected in the following excerpts from interviews in different countries.

Cabo Verde

A representative of the Ministry of Justice and Labour highlighted:

“Training to labour inspectors was very useful. Not only in Praia, but in St. Vincent, Sal, in all the islands. DGT staff persons were also trained. The DGT prepares reports for ILO supervisory bodies. A member of the DGT received training on ILS-related issues in Turin; it was very helpful for her and she later replicated the training with her colleagues. Other institutions, such as the media, judiciary, parliamentarians, universities, were also sensitized by the project. There was a strong promotion of ILS. After receiving training, the judges can now use more of the ILO Conventions within their resolutions.”

However, a representative of the EU Delegation at Praia stressed:

“The capacity in the country is there, but it is weak. They can produce a report, but not as good as they can with the support of ILO. It’s also a problem of priorities within the MJT; people have other things to deal with. And when there is a turnover of staff that affects the capacity to deliver.”

Mongolia

A representative from the Confederation of Mongolian Trade Unions stressed:

“People have increased their capacity and knowledge, partly due to our methodology of organizing informal workers. The project contributed to helping organize informal economy workers; in the framework of this project, we reached all 36 affiliated organizations, 14 sectoral organizations and 22 province-based organizations. We contributed to them, to increase their experience. Gave them tools on how to organize their workers. Meeting informal workers at their workplaces is more difficult than with formal workers. We developed a new methodology for workshops and seminars in their workplace. This was new for us; it was a challenge to call them, to gather them.”

Pakistan

A Punjab Labour Department representative stated:

“There is much difference before and after the project. Capacity building has increased, along with people’s exposure to knowledge, on minimum benchmarks on ILS. We had wonderful trainings on these issues, and the knowledge was extended to partners. It is in the interest of the partners that in order to be able to export they have to comply with ILS. The unions managed to extend this knowledge to all partners. (...) Reporting to the ILO has improved too.”

ILO has been very supportive of the government and manufacturers, and provided significant contributions to improve their capacity.”

A researcher from the MOPHRD, in charge of preparing Cabo Verde’s reports to ILO supervisory bodies, highlighted that:

“Training was very helpful. I joined ministry in Feb 2018 and at that time, I had no prior knowledge or experience regarding the ILS and labour matters. I learned a lot about ILS reporting, and how to make a good report and contribute to domestic matters. The training course ran for two months, with 20 or more lectures, one per topic. There were materials posted on a website, and also videos. After seeing the videos, there were questions and an assignment. The course was easy to follow. It covered all the aspects of reporting and information on Conventions. Tutors were assigned to all participants. My tutor’s teaching method was good. In case of any problem, I could contact him. There was good community communication among participants too.”

Panama

The representatives of the tripartite constituents saw their capacities improved through their participation in project activities and processes, which increased their knowledge. Tripartite constituents adopted the project objective as a technical and political priority, and promoted compliance with CEACR observations and proposed a draft regulation on collective bargaining in the public sector.

Paraguay

A representative of the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security highlighted that:

“People’s knowledge (on ILS) has improved a bit; it is slowly improving as international norms and control systems are disseminated and the required instances start applying them. I think that the project raised people’s awareness on ILS, and it is a step forward. People absorbed this knowledge. When they later receive additional training they will not be starting from scratch. People will keep improving. It is necessary to promote more compliance with ILS at the judiciary level.”

Thailand

Insufficient information was available to the Evaluator on this issue/country.

15) To what extent are planned results of the project likely to be sustained and/or scaled-up and replicated by stakeholders?

Overall Project

The project’s two-year span was a very short time to ensure the sustainability of outcomes in all target countries. The likelihood of the sustainability of project results is variable, according to the intensity and scope of the activities that were implemented in each country, the

spectrum of stakeholders involved in the same, and the perspectives for the institutionalization of social dialogue.

In most countries, the project contributed towards institutional strengthening, capacity development, and the enactment of laws and policies. Thus, it is likely that such lessons will remain available at the institutional level. It is expected that the increased awareness and understanding of FPRW and related ILS among government officers, workers' and employers' representatives and local experts that was acquired through the project will inform future national debates and discussions on labour laws.

Improvements in (timeliness and quality of) reporting to supervisory bodies seem to be sustainable achievements in all target countries, moreover given the incentives provided by the GSP+ mechanism. However, in some countries, the issue of weak inter-institutional coordination remains to be a factor that may hamper the sustainability of results in the long run. As highlighted by a representative of the EU Delegation at Praia:

“The project has worked a lot on inter-institutional coordination and created tools to facilitate the collection of data, but what we see now is that it is difficult for partners to continue doing it without the input from ILO. The problem is that the country really has a very small administration, and the reporting is burdensome, so in the end they do it, but that needs a lot of pressure. (...) The project helped create an inter-ministerial commission to continue the work, but the truth is that the inter-ministerial commission is still not working. Due to the limited availability of human resources, and to the lack of prioritization, they don't see the reporting as the most important thing. (...) I am not very optimistic about the sustainability of results. The project worked well, with a good methodology to attain sustainability, but people here would need some more time to attain it. Project results are not yet sustainable right now.”

The recent ratification of C-144 by Cabo Verde in March 2019 may nevertheless contribute to increase the sustainability of project results, by institutionalizing a mechanism for social dialogue.

Generally speaking, ensuring the effective implementation of ILS in the field requires a longer timeframe to attain sustainable results. Regarding the implementation of ILS at the field level, it is expected that some results of the project will be seen later, 3 or 4 years from now. As highlighted by a representative of employers in Pakistan:

“The basic problem for implementing ILS is the mind-set. Most managers at middle management level, workers and their leadership are not knowledgeable enough of ILS at the workplace. Those who are supposed to apply them have a traditional mind-set: They give more importance to the outputs at all cost and are not aware of the social impact of economic activities. (...) The process of transforming this trend is time-consuming, not very fast moving. (...) In most of our activities, the success may be 30-35% but there is an enormous scope for improving it. The level of understanding of ILS has improved, but the issue is how it works in the ground. Managers and workers need a lot of backup from top management to implement the standards. What is yet to be achieved is a challenge. Much more needs to be done, but we are optimistic.”

Overall, the outcomes of several processes that were started under the project are still very fragile and would need follow-up and technical assistance from ILO to achieve more sustainable results. In some countries there is a need for further national discussions that consider institutional priorities. For many institutions, the project served as an “eye-opener” and they would need further support to continue working on the issue. Stakeholders present a variable degree of weakness, and may thus need a more tailored response.

The GLO/15/27/EUR project is leaving behind a good number of institutions, particularly unions, with training capacities and outreach, which would be able to replicate and expand project actions. Embedding the promotion of ILS within their institutional action plans contributes to increase sustainability. For example, in the case of Mongolia, CMTU’s Action Plan on the Informal Economy has directed the attention of this union’s leadership to the needs of members in the informal economy. It has provided pathways for CMTU to engage its members, identify key areas of need, and develop responsive services.

Likewise, embedding project objectives within a country’s UNDAF, as happened in Cabo Verde, or linking the follow-up of project achievements to other ongoing ILO projects as occurred in Mongolia and Thailand, also contributes to an increased likelihood that project results will be sustainable. The approval of the revised draft of the Mongolian Labour Law by Parliament, currently in the pipeline, may become a game changer and contribute to the sustainability of results in this country.

Results seem less sustainable in those countries where there is little involvement from the private sector, weakness of ministry of labour structures, relative indifference from employers towards ILS, and a limited presence of the ILO, like in Panama and Paraguay. These countries would need further specific actions from ILO RO to ensure the sustainability of project outcomes.

16) What further concrete steps could be taken to increase the perspectives of the sustainability of the results?

Overall Project
<p>A close follow-up of project results and of the evolving situation of ILS in each target country should be ensured by ILO Standards Specialists at RO, as part of their regular responsibilities. Country status with regards to ILS should be assessed twice a year in order to monitor eventual improvements.</p> <p>The ILO should continue providing capacity building and technical assistance in selected countries in order to ensure that government and social partners keep working on ILS-related issues through the other projects that are under development. Specific support for compliance with ratified Conventions should be incorporated as an activity line within ongoing ILO projects (e.g. Mongolia, Thailand). In countries with limited ILO presence (Cabo Verde, Panama, Paraguay) the ILO could allocate RBSA funds to support constituents’ initiatives to implement ILS.</p>

ILO should continue to facilitate tripartite social dialogue on ILS in order to ensure better and effective application of Fundamental Conventions and to support the government and social partners in meeting their reporting obligations. An annual event to review the status of compliance with ILS in each country and to agree on steps forward to be taken by constituents should be organized by the ILO, particularly in those countries where the organization has a more limited presence (Cabo Verde, Panama, Paraguay). Such in-country events would provide an opportunity for constituents to continue their partnership beyond the project timeframe and to promote the effective application of ratified ILO Conventions and relevant Recommendations.

Notwithstanding all the achievements attained by the project, much work is left regarding the effective implementation of ILS in the target countries. For example, as highlighted by representatives of SAFWU, a great breach exists between law and practice regarding the effective implementation of ILS in various sectors and regions of the country:

“Employers do not always comply with ILS. In many cases, C-111 is not working. There are several issues with regards to freedom of association. All provinces have an Industrial Relations Act, but the different laws do not connect with one another. We can have unions at the provincial and national level. If employers have business in one province, workers can join a provincial union. If the business is in more than one province, then it would be a federal industry union; there is no other option. But if one of the provinces (let’s say with only two workers) does not want to unionize, then you cannot form an industry union. Given this break, employers often create phony company offices with two or three employees in other provinces, so that the people where their main operations are located (say, 5,000 people in another province) cannot form an industry union. This is killing freedom of association in Pakistan and thus the possibility to do collective bargaining.

“Big pharmaceutical companies, such as Company XX⁹ (a subsidiary of an international company) permanently have up to 500 employees working under temporary contract basis. They fire them and rehire them every three months, and some have been working like that for the past 10 years. When the union files a complaint, the company will invoke that the union ‘does not exist’ because the company has another office in another province, and the two employees there are not part of the union. Many companies, such as Company YY working on building materials, or Company ZZ working on oil or mills, often do the same. They also create yellow unions, which lead to collective bargaining disappearing in practice.

“ILO needs to work on this. We need to do amendments and arrange our laws, but we are still waiting to hear from the Province Labour Department. There are lots of anti-labour practices, denunciations against union leaders, yellow unions, or these tricks to declare the ‘non-existence’ of unions. We need to work on a new Federal Industrial Act. ILO did a lot of work regarding labour inspection and trained labour inspectors on ILS, but there is still a gap between reality and the law. If a labour inspector goes to a workplace, he will find that contracted workers receive minimum wage and no right to social security. Some labour inspectors are bribed and close their eyes, and the number of labour inspectors in each province is reduced, not sufficient. Labour inspectors seldom go back to the same industry. In the garment sector, included in GSP+, which should have social compliance with ILS,

⁹ Company names withheld for confidentiality.

consultants have a checklist and companies show documentary evidence, but it is not real. This is not denounced because of possible economic loss.”

Working under one project umbrella in multiple countries, with a wide variety of stakeholders on different fronts and issues, may be an interesting strategy to promote countries' compliance with reporting obligations to supervisory bodies. However, interventions aiming to promote **compliance with the implementation of Fundamental Conventions** (and particularly on freedom of association and collective bargaining), **may need a narrower approach** focused more on tripartite stakeholders and less on activities (e.g. legal reform and monitoring the implementation of enforcement mechanisms).

Thus, in terms of ensuring the sustainability of project achievements and the effective implementation of ILS, much room is left for ILO to double down on its work.

IV. LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

4.1 Lessons Learned

The evaluation identified some lessons learned, which were drawn from some of the challenges as well as the positive results obtained by the project. This section lists only a selection of the most relevant of these lessons learned, so that they can be taken into consideration in current and/or future interventions.

- a. Projects focusing on social dialogue and normative work (e.g. integrating norms into the institutional environment) need longer timeframes to see sustainable results. Legal reform and the institutionalization of cooperation mechanisms among stakeholders need longer periods of time to bear fruit. In the case of the project under evaluation, two years was too short to complete the complexity of tasks and results originally expected from the project. While countries' reporting to ILO supervisory bodies greatly improved, the short duration of the project does not guarantee the sustainability of these results.
- b. Human resources are a key input for projects promoting social dialogue and aiming to increase countries' compliance with ILS. Project staffing should be commensurate to the wide spectrum of tasks and responsibilities implied in this kind of project. The project would have greatly benefitted from having at least one full-time local coordinator in each country. Likewise, the services of a full-time project manager would have benefitted the project, allowing for closer support from ILO HQ and going beyond the task of ensuring timely reporting to the donor.

4.2 Good Practices

The evaluation identified several good practices, which contributed to advancing the project's normative work.

- a. **The use of research to create awareness on ILS among tripartite stakeholders and promote change (Mongolia):** After the first months of project implementation, it became clear that the approval of the revised labour law would take more time than originally expected. ILO staff, therefore, used a project-funded NHRCM study on the situation of ILS in small and medium enterprises as a vehicle for action, and promoted the participation of workers' and employers' organizations in the initial review of the research findings and recommendations. This helped to raise the awareness of policy makers about decent work deficits in the country.
- b. **Build the capacity of local consultants and social partners in reporting to supervisory bodies (Cabo Verde):** Given budgetary constraints and language barriers, instead of bringing in the services of international consultants, the project trained local professionals and members of government, workers' and employers' associations so that all activities and outputs were delivered by national partners. This promoted ownership of results by local stakeholders and should contribute to the sustainability of project results. ILO's role was to provide assistance in the design and delivery of the activities, monitor progress and perform quality assurance for the products. As part of their learning process, the partners also carried out an assessment of the outcomes of

the project with the ILO. Likewise, the use of Portuguese by ILO staff promoted stakeholders' participation.

- c. **Establish synergies with other ILO projects (Mongolia, Thailand):** Coordinating project activities with those of other ILO projects and partners helps link the project to long-term strategic frameworks, increase the resources available to implement activities, and enhance project results and sustainability.
- d. **Mainstream the promotion of ILS within stakeholders' institutional action plans (Mongolia):** In the case of Mongolia, CMTU's Action Plan on the Informal Economy should contribute to promote the sustainability of project achievements after end of LOP.

V. CONCLUSIONS

- A. The project was successful in achieving its main objective: Improving the timeliness and quality of target countries' reporting on the Fundamental Conventions to the ILO supervisory bodies. By 2019, all countries addressed by the project had submitted all requested reports to CEACR. Linking trade benefits to compliance with ILO Fundamental Conventions, as proposed in GSP+, is a promising path to help tripartite constituents address the implementation of their obligations and reporting to ILO supervisory bodies.
- B. The project was relevant to the needs of ILO constituents in each country and other local stakeholders, and coordinated, where possible, its actions with other ILO projects and the UNDAF in each country. The project model was a flexible, multi-country intervention that was managed in a decentralized manner, in which outcomes were tailored to specific country needs.
- C. The project design was ambitious, as it tried to articulate ILO's mandate with limited resources available from the donor and varied priorities and needs of an increasing array of stakeholders in six countries around the world, in some of which the ILO had no local office. Given these constraints, the project's timeframe and resources were insufficient with regards to constituents' needs and the requests for technical assistance received by the ILO from local stakeholders.
- D. Notwithstanding the above, the project was very efficient in mobilizing additional resources and achieving most of its outcomes on the basis of rather modest resources. Moving the project forward under these conditions was only possible due to the support provided by ILO's Regional and Country Offices, the synergy established with other ILO projects, and the recognition of ILO's unique role by all countries' tripartite stakeholders.
- E. The project was very relevant and offered an interesting vehicle for the application of both ILO's social dialogue and normative mandates. Social dialogue work was at the core of the project design and theory of change, and it was consistently applied in all countries, promoting ownership among stakeholders. Involving other stakeholders in a "tripartite +" scheme was a useful strategy to strengthen the case for countries to comply with the implementation and reporting on ILS. Normative integration work focused on promoting labour law reform and regulations and policy development in various countries, as well as on the harmonization of federal and provincial regulations. Normative implementation work was mainly addressed through the capacity building of key stakeholders (labour inspectors, judges, union members, middle management in enterprises) and the establishment of tripartite and/or inter-ministerial mechanisms to follow up on the implementation of ILS.
- F. Building the capacity of stakeholders is an effective means to empower them into further autonomous action, but it is a process that takes time before results may become sustainable. Given the short timeframe of the project, most of its normative implementation work may not be sustainable in the long run. Tripartite constituents would need additional support from ILO to institutionalize project achievements and to scale-up or replicate its results. Countries' reporting to ILO supervisory bodies would need periodic technical support from the ILO in order to make project results more sustainable.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the findings of this evaluation and follow from both the lessons learned and the conclusions.

Recommendation 1: Sustainability – Implement a follow-up programme to support the sustainability of results in selected target countries.

With the aim of ensuring the sustainability of the GLO/15/27/EUR project results, the ILO should implement a follow-up programme in selected target countries for the next two years. This would allow them to detect and address issues that may affect the sustainability of key results in each country and provide technical assistance to the same. Country results may be more sustainable in some countries (Mongolia, Pakistan) than in others.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO NORMES, ILO Regional and Country Offices	High	Mid-Term	Medium

Recommendation 2: Project Design - Consider a longer timeframe for project implementation.

Given the variety of institutional, political, social, cultural and economic factors that may influence social dialogue, the duration of projects focusing on promoting countries' compliance with ILS should be no less than four years, a timeframe that would contribute to consolidating the sustainability of their results. Country-specific work plans should be revised and updated every year in order to adapt project implementation to the challenges that arise from unexpected shifts in context.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
DG DEVCO, ILO (NORMES)	High	Mid-Term	Low

Recommendation 3: Project Design – Allocate human resources according to project implementation needs.

Projects working in various countries and doing social dialogue and normative work should have at least one full-time, local technical staff per country and one full-time project manager at the central level. This would help countries address the high demand for ILO assistance, help foster innovative partnerships, ensure a strong coordination between the project and other EU, ILO or UN-funded projects, follow-up on recommendations, and ensure the quality of project outputs.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
DG DEVCO, ILO (NORMES)	High	Mid-Term	Medium

Recommendation 4: Project Design – Allocate financial resources commensurate with the projects' complexity and operational needs.

In order to maximize the use of resources, future multi-country projects aimed at improving compliance with HR and ILS Conventions may consider working on a reduced number of countries (two or three countries) and increasing the amount of funds available to each country.

A more robust fund in support of local stakeholders' initiatives should be established, to be used on a competitive basis in each project target country.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
DG DEVCO, ILO (NORMES)	High	Mid-Term	Medium

Recommendation 5: Project Design – Consider focusing on projects of regional scope.

In order to promote synergies among countries, foster horizontal learning, share expertise and resources from ILO Regional Offices, and maximize the use of travel and other costs, future multi-country projects aimed at improving compliance with ILS Conventions may consider it useful to work on a region-specific basis (e.g. one project for South-East Asian countries, another for Central American or West African countries). This would help create further capacities at the regional and local level, instead of using HQ experts.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO NORMES, ILO Regional Offices	High	Mid-Term	Low

Recommendation 6: Project Design – Consider developing projects with a more focused thematic scope.

In order to promote synergies among countries and foster horizontal learning, future multi-country projects aimed at improving compliance with FPRW may consider it useful to work on a Convention-specific basis (e.g. a project focused on promoting country improvements regarding ILO Conventions 87 and 98 on freedom of association and collective bargaining, respectively; or on Convention and Protocol 29 on forced labour; etc.).¹⁰

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO NORMES	Medium	Mid-Term	Low

¹⁰ Comment from ILO NORMES: *“This recommendation might be difficult to implement, given that the unit in charge of the promotion of fundamental principles and rights at work has adopted an integrated approach promoting FPRWs as a package rather than focusing on individual subjects. The need for policy coherence among ILO units needs to be taken into consideration, especially in order to foster synergies among ILO projects many of which will often be managed by FUNDAMENTALS.”*

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Master List of Evaluation Questions

Relevance and strategic fit

- 1) To what extent was the project aligned to national priorities and complemented other on-going ILO and wider UN initiatives on labour rights and ILS in the participating countries?
- 2) To what extent were the needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders taken into account in project design?

Validity of design

- 3) Were the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground? Did they need to be adapted to specific national needs or conditions?
- 4) Did the project design establish a clear strategy to solve the problems and needs detected?
- 5) To what extent was the monitoring and evaluation framework appropriate and useful in assessing the project's progress?

Project results and effectiveness

- 6) To what extent the project achieved planned objectives? Has the quantity and quality of the outputs produced been satisfactory?
- 7) To what extent did the project coordinate and collaborate with other on-going ILO, UN and/or other partners' programmes/projects/initiatives to increase its effectiveness and impact?
- 8) What are the main factors –internal to the project and external- that have hindered the project capacity to reach the objectives? Are there alternative strategies that would have increased the perspectives of achieving the project objectives?

Efficiency of resource use

- 9) To what extent have material, human, and institutional resources been sufficient and adequate to meet project objectives?
- 10) What have been the amount, quality, and opportunity of the products supplied?
- 11) To what extent was the project efficient in delivering the desired/planned results? Are there other more efficient means of delivering more and better results (outputs and outcomes) with the available inputs?
- 12) Has the project received the necessary institutional, technical, and administrative guidance from different decision-making levels for successful execution?
- 13) How efficient were the management and accountability structures of the project?

Sustainability

- 14) How effectively is the Project building the necessary capacity of people and institutions?
- 15) To what extent are planned results of the project likely to be sustained and/or scaled-up and replicated by stakeholders?
- 16) What further concrete steps could be taken to increase the perspectives of the sustainability of the results?

Annex 2: List of Interviewees

Name of Focal Person	Organisation/Unit	Position	Email	Interview Date	Interview time (Geneva time)
Global - NORMES					
Chittarath Phouangsavath	ILO HQ	Project Manager; ILS Department (NORMES)	phouang@ilo.org	09.12.19	09:00
ILO - Brussels					
Audrey Le Guével	ILO Brussels Office	Programme and Operations Officer	leguevel@ilo.org	12.12.19	11:00
EC - Brussels					
Angela-Raffaella Della Porta	DEVCO	Project Manager	Angela-Raffaella.DELLA-PORTA@ec.europa.eu	08.01.20	Written questionnaire
Cabo Verde					
Sofia Amaral de Oliveira	DWT CO Dakar	Legal Standards Specialist,	oliveiras@ilo.org	16.12.19	14:00
Ms Suleima Delgado	Ministerio de Justicia e Trabalho	Advisor	suleina.l.delgado@mj.gov.cv	26.12.19	11:00
Ms. Carla Folgoa	EU Delegation Praia	Programme Manager	Carla.SEZOES-FOLGOA@eeas.europa.eu	07.01.20	14:00
Mongolia					
Parissara Liewkeat	ILO Country Office for China and Mongolia (CO-Beijing)	Programme Analyst	liewkeat@ilo.org	12.12.19	09:00
Lkhagvademberel Amgalan	ILO Country Office for China and Mongolia (CO-Beijing)	National Project Manager	lamgalan@ilo.org	13.12.19	09:00
Maya Sholtoi	Ministry of Labour and Social Protection representative	Senior Officer in charge of labor law	sholtoi_maya@yahoo.com	24.12.19	01:30
Tsevel Otgontungalag	Confederation of Mongolian Trade Unions (CMTU)	Director, Labour Monitoring and legal policy department	cmtu.tungaa@gmail.com	23.12.19	10:00
Tamir Enkhbaatar		Head of Youth Committee	cmtu.tamir@gmail.com		

Name of Focal Person	Organisation/Unit	Position	Email	Interview Date	Interview time (Geneva time)
Zolboo Narantsogt	Mongolian Employers' Federation (MONEF)	Head of Business relations, membership and training department	zolboo@monef.mn	24.12.19	10:30
Unurjargal Zagdaa	National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia (NHRCM)	Senior officer	z.unurjargal@nhrcm.gov.mn	23.12.19	02:00
Pakistan					
Syed Saghir Bukhari	ILO Pakistan CO	Project Coordinator, Senior Programme Officer	bukhari@ilo.org	30.12.19	14:30
Ingrid Christensen	ILO Pakistan CO	Country Director	christensen@ilo.org	30.12.19	11:00
Dr. Sohail Shahzad	Punjab Provincial Department of Labor	Past Director General	Suhail1210@hotmail.com	30.12.19	13:30
Zahoor Awan	Pakistan Workers' Federation representative	General Secretary	pwfrwp@gmail.com	27.12.19	Written questionnaire
Fasihul Karim Siddiqi	Employers' Federation of Pakistan representative	General Secretary	fs@efp.org.pk	24.12.19	11:00
Mr. Waqar Memon Mr. Asad Memon	Sindh Agriculture and Fishing Workers Union (SAFWU) representative – informal sector	General Secretary of SAFWU President SAFWU	Saf.workersunion@gmail.com	20.12.19	12:00
Sarnalia Sharif	Research Officer from MoOP&HRD who participated in an online ILS reporting course conducted by the ITC Turin.	Research Officer	hrdsection72@gmail.com	19.12.19	17:00
Paraguay					
Humberto Villasmil	DWT Santiago SRO	Principal Specialist ILS	villasmil@ilo.org	19.12.19	14:00
Verónica López	Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security representative	Advisor	595 981458206	23.12.19	14:30
Jorge Barboza	Judge	Organizer of Diploma on ILS and Paraguayan Labour Law	barbozafrancojorge@yahoo.com	23.12.19	13:00

Annex 3: List of Documents Reviewed

A. General Information provided by ILO NORMES on GLO/15/27/EUR Project

- DEVCO project GLO1527EUR Description of Action (pdf)
- C-37416 Results-oriented Monitoring (ROM) Report 09.03.2018 – Draft (pdf)
- C-37416 ROM Review Summary 09.03.2018 (pdf)
- GPS+ Interim Report DEVCO 13.10.2017 (pdf)
- PARDEV Minute Sheet on Project Approval 26.08.2016 (pdf)
- PARDEV Minute Sheet on Project Corrigendum 23.01.2017 (pdf)
- Request for a no-cost extension explanatory note 22.05.2018
- Final Progress Report - Consolidated Report GSP+ - Version in progress (Word)
- BUD/CT, Routing Slip: FFS GLO1527EUR (Project Financial Information)

B. CEACR Reports

- International Labour Organization, Report of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, Application of International Standards (I), 2016. Report III (Part 1A), International Labour Conference, 105th Session, 2016
- International Labour Organization, Report of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, Application of International Standards (I), 2017. Report III (Part 1A), International Labour Conference, 106th Session, 2017
- International Labour Organization, Report of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, Application of International Standards (I), 2018. Report III (Part 1A), International Labour Conference, 107th Session, 2018
- International Labour Organization, Report of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, Application of International Standards (I), 2019. Report III (Part 1A), International Labour Conference, 108th Session, 2019

C. Cabo Verde

- ILO, Annex A. List of project publications and materials produced
- ILO, Annex B. List of events and activities (per year)
- ILO, Annex C: Participants
- ILO, Annex D: Press clippings

Links on Project Visibilization Strategy

- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c6Ovxvr0eiU&feature=youtu.be>
- <https://web.facebook.com/ueemcv/videos/555704641562217/>

D. Mongolia

- ILO, Annex B: List of Publications and produced materials
- ILO; Annex C: Survey Results from Participants in International Labour Standards Training, as of April 16, 2018
- ILO, Annex E: Translation of Testimonials
- ILO, Annex F: List of Events/ Activities, 2017 - 2019

- International Labour Organization, Decent Work Country Program, Mongolia, 2006 – 2010 (pdf)
- International Labour Organization, “Support to trading partners including GSP+ beneficiary countries to effectively implement ILS and comply with reporting obligations” Project (Mongolia Action -MNG/16/50/EUR): PROJECT STATUS, September 2016 – January 2017 (Word)
- Project MNG1650EUR_workplan (XLS)
- GSP+ Combined Logframe_Mongolia-December 2015_20170905 (Word)
- Final agenda_AFCYD training 29 June 2018 as of 28 June 2018 (Word)
- Final revised agenda_MBA training_27-28 July 2018 (Word)
- GSP+2_Participants of the activities_06072018 (XLS)
- Links to news coverage GSP+2 project (Word)
- Media coverage -GSP+ projects_ combined list (Word)
- Project status report_MNG1650EUR_20180709 (Word)
- Report on MBA training on CL and FL 27-28 June 2018 (Word)
- Folder with around 20 articles in Cyrillic alphabet, on GSP+ projects - Media coverage (pdf)
- GSP+ Combined Logframe -Mongolia-December 2015_20170905 (Word)
- GSP+DEVCO - Mongolia-Report_20170905 (Word)
- The National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia (NHRCM), 16th Status Report on Human Rights and Freedoms in Mongolia, Ulaanbaatar, 2017 (pdf)
- The National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia (NHRCM), Study on the fundamental principles and rights at work in SMEs in Mongolia report-concise-summary, Dec 8, 2017 (pdf)

E. Pakistan

- ILO, Annex A: List of Publications and produced materials
- ILO, Annex B: List of events /activities, 2017-2019 where project contributed either through technical inputs or both technical or through allocation of resources
- ILO, Annex C: Testimonies from the partners
- ILO, Annex s/n; EFP Statement on Gender Equality

F. Panama

- OIT, Annex A: Actividades, productos y resultados del Proyecto DEVCO Panamá - UE, OIT (Año 2018) (pdf)
- OIT, Annex B: Informe relativo a Panamá sobre los Pronunciamientos de la Comisión de Expertos en la Aplicación de Convenios y Recomendaciones de la Organización Internacional del Trabajo 2007-2017 (Informe reelaborado por: Vasco Torres De León (pdf)

G. Paraguay

- Organización Internacional del Trabajo, Código del Trabajo de la República del Paraguay rubricado y concordado, 1ª edición, 2019 (pdf)
- Programa Final Diplomado Tripartito en Derecho del Trabajo y de la Seguridad Social_v5, 2018 (pdf)

Annex 4: Lessons Learned and Good Practices Templates

A. Lessons Learned

<p>ILO Emerging Lesson Learned Template Evaluation Title: Support to Trading Partners including GSP+ Beneficiary Countries to effectively implement International Labour Standards and comply with Reporting Obligations Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/15/27/EUR Name of Evaluator: Dwight Ordóñez Date: January 10, 2020</p>	
<p>LL # 1 The following Lesson Learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the conclusions of the full evaluation report.</p>	
LL Element	Text
Brief summary of lesson learned (link to project goal or specific deliverable)	Projects focusing on social dialogue and normative work (e.g. integrating norms into the institutional environment) need longer timeframes to see sustainable results.
Context and any related preconditions	In the case of the project under evaluation, two years was too short to complete the complexity of tasks and results originally expected from the project.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	NORMES, ILO Brussels, PARDEV
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	The short duration of the project does not guarantee the sustainability of these results.
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	N/A
ILO administrative issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Departments in charge of design and/or negotiation of projects with funding agencies.
Other relevant comments	N/A

<p>ILO Emerging Lesson Learned Template Evaluation Title: Support to Trading Partners including GSP+ Beneficiary Countries to effectively implement International Labour Standards and comply with Reporting Obligations Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/15/27/EUR Name of Evaluator: Dwight Ordóñez Date: January 10, 2020</p>	
<p>LL # 2 The following Lesson Learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the conclusions of the full evaluation report.</p>	
LL Element	Text
Brief summary of lesson learned (link to project goal or specific deliverable)	Project staffing should be commensurate to the wide spectrum of tasks and responsibilities implied in this kind of project.
Context and any related preconditions	The project would have greatly benefitted from having at least one full-time local coordinator in each country. Likewise, the

	services of a full-time project manager would have benefitted the project,
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	NORMES, ILO Brussels, PARDEV
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	Human resources are a key input for projects promoting social dialogue and aiming to increase countries' compliance with ILS. Commensurate allocation of staff to project would have allowed for a more appropriate implementation in the field and a closer support from ILO HQ, going beyond the task of ensuring timely reporting to the donor.
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	N/A
ILO administrative issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Departments in charge of design and/or negotiation of projects with funding agencies.
Other relevant comments	N/A

B. Emerging Good Practices

<p>ILO Emerging Good Practice Template Evaluation Title: Support to Trading Partners including GSP+ Beneficiary Countries to effectively implement International Labour Standards and comply with Reporting Obligations Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/15/27/EUR Name of Evaluator: Dwight Ordóñez Date: January 10, 2020</p> <p>GP # 1 The following emerging Good Practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.</p>	
LL Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	The use of research to create awareness on ILS among tripartite stakeholders and promote change (Mongolia).
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	Given that the approval of the revised Mongolian labour law was taking much more time than originally expected, ILO staff used a project-funded NHRCM study on the situation of ILS in small and medium enterprises as a vehicle for action, and thus promoted the participation of workers' and employers' organizations in the initial review of the research findings and recommendations.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	The practice helped raise the awareness of policy makers about decent work deficits in the country.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	Increased engagement of constituents in project activities. Beneficiaries: Employers, workers.
Potential for replication and by whom	The use of research as an engagement and awareness raising strategy may be replicated by project managers in other similar projects.
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	The strategy contributes to P&B Outcome 2: Ratification and application of ILS.

Other documents or relevant comments	N/A
--------------------------------------	-----

<p>ILO Emerging Good Practice Template Evaluation Title: Support to Trading Partners including GSP+ Beneficiary Countries to effectively implement International Labour Standards and comply with Reporting Obligations Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/15/27/EUR Name of Evaluator: Dwight Ordóñez Date: January 10, 2020</p> <p>GP # 2 The following emerging Good Practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.</p>	
LL Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	Training local professionals and members of government, workers' and employers' associations so that all activities and outputs are delivered by national partners, not external consultants. This promoted ownership of results by local stakeholders and should contribute to the sustainability of project results.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	The practice was originated as a response to budgetary constraints and language barriers.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	The practice promotes ownership of results by local stakeholders and should contribute to the sustainability of project results.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	Tripartite constituents have continued to produce the annual report to CEACR on their own after project end.
Potential for replication and by whom	Project managers may replicate the practice in wide spectrum of project.
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	The strategy contributes to P&B Outcome 2: Ratification and application of ILS.
Other documents or relevant comments	N/A

<p>ILO Emerging Good Practice Template Evaluation Title: Support to Trading Partners including GSP+ Beneficiary Countries to effectively implement International Labour Standards and comply with Reporting Obligations Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/15/27/EUR Name of Evaluator: Dwight Ordóñez Date: January 10, 2020</p> <p>GP # 3 The following emerging Good Practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.</p>	
LL Element	Text

Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	Establish synergies with other ILO projects to enhance resources available in support of project activities (Mongolia, Pakistan, Thailand).
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	Need to rethink and link all separate logframes into a common country strategy.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	The good practice helped link the project to other long-term strategic frameworks and increased the resources available to implement activities.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	The GLO/15/27/EUR was used more as an input to a country program than a separate project. This practice benefits both constituents and project managers.
Potential for replication and by whom	By any country where multiple ILO projects are under implementation.
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	Linked directly to Thailand DWCP and Mongolia country work plan
Other documents or relevant comments	N/A

ILO Emerging Good Practice Template Evaluation Title: Support to Trading Partners including GSP+ Beneficiary Countries to effectively implement International Labour Standards and comply with Reporting Obligations Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/15/27/EUR Name of Evaluator: Dwight Ordóñez Date: January 10, 2020	
GP # 4 The following emerging Good Practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.	
LL Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	Mainstream the promotion of ILS within stakeholders' institutional action plans (Mongolia)
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	CMTU was strengthened and enabled to continue implementing actions to promote ILS.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	CMTU's Action Plan on the Informal Economy contributed to promote the sustainability of project achievements after end of LOP.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	Increased union work on the informal economy. Trade union member unions and youth.
Potential for replication and by whom	Easily replicable strategy by trade unions.

Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	The strategy contributes to P&B Outcome 2: Ratification and application of ILS.
Other documents or relevant comments	N/A

Annex 5: Evaluation Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE:

FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION – DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION PROJECT

PROJECT TITLE: SUPPORT TO TRADING PARTNERS INCLUDING GSP+ BENEFICIARY COUNTRIES TO EFFECTIVELY IMPLEMENT INTERNATIONAL LABOUR STANDARDS AND COMPLY WITH REPORTING OBLIGATIONS

DC PROJECT CODE : GLO/15/27/EUR

DONOR: EUROPEAN COMMISSION (DG DEVCO)

TOTAL BUDGET APPROVED: USD 1,176,126

ILO ADM UNITS: ILO OFFICES IN BANGKOK, BEIJING, DAKAR, ISLAMABAD, SAN JOSE and SANTIAGO

ILO TECHNICAL UNIT: INTERNATIONAL LABOUR STANDARDS DEPARTMENT (NORMES)

EVALUATION DATE: TBC

PROJECT MANAGER: CORINNE VARGHA, Director, International Labour Standards Department (NORMES)

EVALUATION MANAGER: BOBUR NAZARMUHAMEDOV

TOR PREPARED: 16 September 2019

Introduction and Rationale for the independent evaluation

The European Union Special Incentive Arrangement for Sustainable Development and Good Governance (Generalized Scheme of Preferences/GSP +) grants full removal of certain tariff lines to vulnerable countries which make binding obligations to ratify and effectively implement 27 international Conventions on human and labour rights, environmental protection and good governance. Out of the 27 Conventions, 8 are core ILO Conventions¹¹.

The Project, funded by the European Commission's DG DEVCO, was developed to specifically contribute to improve the application of the 8 Fundamental ILO Conventions in beneficiary countries of the GSP + scheme (Cabo Verde, Mongolia, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay and Thailand), with a view to reducing and progressively eliminating discrimination, forced labour, child labour, and violations of freedom of association. In particular, the selected countries have been assisted on the critical issues raised by the ILO supervisory bodies and reflected under EU GSP+ monitoring, and better meet their standards-related obligations under the ILO.

¹¹ The ILO's fundamental conventions are: *Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87)*; *Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98)*; *Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29)*; *Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105)*; *Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138)*; *Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182)*; *Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100)*; *Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111)*.

The project facilitates the EU's monitoring of whether beneficiary countries abide by their commitments, such as maintaining the ratification of international conventions covered by the GSP+, ensuring their effective implementation, complying with reporting requirements, accepting regular monitoring in accordance with the conventions and cooperating with the EC on providing information.

The ILO supports this process of promoting democratic institution building by not only setting standards, but also by promoting compliance through providing technical assistance and through its supervisory bodies, such as the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR). The EU draws on the comments of CEACR to evaluate the outcomes of assistance to developing countries with a view to boosting social development and inclusive growth.

As per ILO's evaluation policy, this Project is subject to a final independent evaluation. This final evaluation examines the overall progress, outputs delivered, and assess the impact of the Project. This terms of reference (TOR) describes the scope of work and expected outputs from the evaluation.

Background of the Project and status

An important component of the ILO action in the field of International labour standards (ILS) is the technical assistance offered to countries to overcome difficulties in reporting and application of ILO Conventions. The action leads to technical advice and training on the application of ILS from the ILO to the target countries, which allow them to carry out actions with a view to reducing the implementation gap with respect to the specific Conventions they had ratified. The countries also analyze their reporting practices and benefit from ILO technical advice and training with a view to building their reporting capacity in both quantitative and qualitative terms. The ILO is a neutral and trusted partner for this assistance.

In cases where the ILO's supervisory bodies note continuous or serious failures to effectively apply and report compliance on ILS, the ILO has a commitment to strengthen ILS implementation through technical cooperation and assistance at the country level. Such technical cooperation is anchored in the legal obligations undertaken under ratified Conventions, reflects the needs of national constituents, and is guided by the comments of the supervisory bodies.

ILO instruments, in particular the 8 Fundamental Conventions, have become a reference point when it comes to social development including within the framework of the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The project contributes in particular to the realization of Sustainable Development Goal 8 through improved labour relations and working conditions in the beneficiary countries, consistent with the focus countries' ILO commitments. Target countries were assisted to take action to apply the 8 fundamental ILO Conventions and better meet their standards-related obligations, in particular on the critical issues raised by the ILO supervisory bodies and reflected in EU monitoring systems. They were also assisted to fulfil their ILO Constitutional reporting obligations under these Conventions.

The five main outcomes are the following:

Outcome 1. The selected countries increase their compliance with their reporting obligations with respect to the ILO's Fundamental Conventions through the development of administrative/institutional capacity.

Outcome 2. The output of the reporting process at country level is improved through the increased and effective participation of the tripartite partners.

Outcome 3. Tripartite constituents are enabled to increase their institutional capacity through training on ILS and their supervisory mechanisms, which they can adapt and replicate.

Outcome 4. National curricula on ILS are available and taught at national training institutions.

Outcome 5. Application of fundamental ILS is strengthened through initiatives and action by tripartite constituents, parliamentarians and judges (at central and local level).

The strategy is to act on several fronts, in order to improve implementation of ILS and compliance with reporting obligations arising from ratified fundamental Conventions. In each country, selected key actors (members of the national administration, representatives of employers' and workers' organizations, judges and parliamentarians) capable to improve implementation of ILS are given technical assistance, training and will be made aware of the critical issues.

Activities include:

- Awareness-raising and training on the content of selected fundamental ILS.
- Research to generate information on the status of implementation of ILS, including legislative gap analyses, advice on elements that will enable tripartite constituents to take the relevant decisions aimed at full implementation.
- Strengthening of data collection and reporting capacity of the tripartite constituents including the capacity of using the systemic approach to managing ILS constitutional obligations.
- Development/publication of curricula or thematic materials on ILS (publications, studies, translation, conferences, etc.)
- Development of participatory processes and cross institutional action for implementation.

The management structure is comprised of NORMES (HQ) responsible for the overall coordination and reporting of the project; ILO field offices and ILS technical specialists in the ILO Decent Work Support Teams responsible for the planning and implementation of the project at the national level; and ILO Turin Centre which is responsible for specific training activities.

The project started on 1 September 2016 for an initial period of 24 months. A Mid-term report was submitted to the EC in October 2017. Subsequently a request for a six months no-cost extension was submitted to the EC in May 2018 and approved. The Project closed on 31 January 2019, and the final progress report will be officially sent by 31 July 2019, as stipulated in the agreement.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation:

The purpose of the independent evaluation is to give an assessment of the effectiveness and the sustainability of the project across the major outcomes; assessing performance as per the

foreseen targets and indicators of achievement at output and outcome levels; strategies and implementation modalities chosen; partnership arrangements; constraints and opportunities; and to provide lessons to improve performance and delivery of future project results. The evaluation will cover the project's various components, outcomes, outputs and activities as reflected in the project document as well as subsequent modification and alterations made during its implementation.

Findings and recommendations from the evaluations are specifically directed to:

- Project management Department (NORMES),
- ILO Country Offices in Bangkok, Beijing, Dakar, Islamabad, San Jose and Santiago
- EVAL.
- European Commission - DEVCO.

Methodology

The evaluation will be based on a participatory approach, involving a wide range of selected key stakeholders, taking into account the need for adequate gender representation. To the extent possible, quantitative and qualitative data will be collected, validated and analysed. The evaluation process will include the following:

- A desk review of relevant documents related to project performance and progress, including the initial project document, revised log frame, work plans, and progress reports.
- Interviews with project management staff, relevant staff in the country offices (Brussels, Bangkok, Beijing, Dakar, Islamabad, San Jose and Santiago) and ILO HQ through Skype/videoconference.
- Relevant staff in Turin Centre through Skype/call.
- Field interviews through Skype/videoconference with individuals and/or focused group discussions with relevant national stakeholders (i.e. Government, Public institutions, social partners, DG DEVCO in Brussels, EU Delegations).

The methodology is suggested for the evaluation, which can be adjusted by the Evaluator if considered necessary, in accordance with the scope and purpose of the evaluation and in consultation with the Evaluation Manager.

The evaluation should be carried out in adherence with the relevant parts of the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy; ILO Policy Guidelines for Evaluation: Principles, Rationale, Planning and Managing for Evaluations (3rd ed. August 2017).¹²

The following is the proposed methodology:

i. Inception Phase

The Evaluator will review the project document, work plans, project monitoring plans, progress reports, previous project reviews completed by ILO and/or donor, government documents, meeting minutes, workshop reports, ILO's programme policy frameworks and other relevant documents that were produced through the project or by relevant stakeholders. In addition, the Evaluator will conduct initial electronic or telephone interviews with key project informants (International Technical Specialist (IPS) and National Project Coordinators) and an inception

¹² https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_571339.pdf

meeting with the Evaluation Manager, Project team and technical backstopping unit in ILO HQ (via Skype or face-to-face). The objective of the consultation is to reach a common understanding regarding the status of the project, the priority assessment questions, available data sources and data collection instruments and an outline of the final evaluation report. The following topics will be covered: status of logistical arrangements, project background and materials, key evaluation questions and priorities, outline of the inception and final report. Based on the scope and purpose of the evaluation, document review, briefings and initial interviews, the Evaluator will prepare an inception report with the final methodology.

ii. Data Collection Phase

The Evaluator will first complete relevant consultations with internal project stakeholders such as the IPS, project and technical backstopping staff and those in the list of key stakeholders. If the Evaluator wishes to speak with other stakeholders beyond the list, this can be discussed with the Evaluation Manager. The Evaluator will conduct interviews with project management staff, relevant staff in the country offices to obtain their views and feedback on the project. This will include one or more meetings divided per stakeholder group with Government Representatives, Social Partners and Implementing Partners. The IPS, with support from the project team will help in organising electronic and/or in-person meetings/group discussions.

The Evaluator will work together with the Project Management Team, to ensure that the participants who can provide information to answer the questions are invited to the meetings or, if availability does not allow, that separate meetings are organized. Based on these meetings and the document review, the Evaluator will build an initial set of conclusions and possible recommendations for next steps. Debriefing sessions will take place via skype, telephone or face-to-face depending on each country context.

iii. Report Writing Phase

Based on the inputs from discussions and interviews with key stakeholders, the Evaluator will draft the mid-term evaluation report. The draft report will be sent to the Evaluation Manager, who will share the report with key stakeholders for their inputs/comments. The Evaluation Manager will consolidate all comments including methodological comments and will then share them with the Evaluator for consideration in finalizing the report. The Evaluator will finalize the report, taking into consideration the stakeholder comments and submit one complete document, with a file size not exceeding 3 megabytes. Photos, if appropriate should be included, inserted using lower resolution to keep overall file size low. A debriefing will be held with the ILO and the donor, in-person or through conference call, following the submission of the final report.

Evaluation Criteria and Suggested questions

The Project will be evaluated against criteria such as its relevance and strategic fit, the validity of project design, project effectiveness, the efficiency of resource use, the effectiveness of management arrangement, and sustainability, as defined in the ILO policy guidelines for evaluation (2017).¹³ The Gender dimension will be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables, and final report of the evaluation. In terms of this evaluation, this implies involving both men and women in the consultations, evaluation analysis and evaluation reporting. Moreover, the Evaluator should review data and information that is

¹³ http://www.ilo.ch/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_571339.pdf

disaggregated by sex and gender and assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve the lives of women and men.

Due to the nature and timeline, the Evaluator, in consultation with the evaluation manager, will develop a methodological note in line with the points listed below:

Relevance and strategic fit

- 1) *To what extent was the project aligned to national priorities and complemented other on-going ILO and wider UN initiatives on labour rights and ILS in the participating countries?*
- 2) *To what extent were the needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders taken into account in project design?*

Validity of design

- 1) *Were the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground? Did they need to be adapted to specific national needs or conditions?*
- 2) *Did the project design establish a clear strategy to solve the problems and needs detected?*
- 3) *To what extent was the monitoring and evaluation framework appropriate and useful in assessing the project's progress?*

Project results and effectiveness

- 1) *To what extent the project achieved planned objectives? Has the quantity and quality of the outputs produced been satisfactory?*
- 2) *To what extent did the project coordinate and collaborate with other on-going ILO, UN and/or other partners' programmes/projects/initiatives to increase its effectiveness and impact?*
- 3) *What are the main factors –internal to the project and external- that have hindered the project capacity to reach the objectives? Are there alternative strategies that would have increased the perspectives of achieving the project objectives?*

Efficiency of resource use

- 1) *To what extent have material, human, and institutional resources been sufficient and adequate to meet project objectives?*
- 2) *What have been the amount, quality, and opportunity of the products supplied?*
- 3) *To what extent was the project efficient in delivering the desired/planned results? Are there other more efficient means of delivering more and better results (outputs and outcomes) with the available inputs?*
- 4) *Has the project received the necessary institutional, technical, and administrative guidance from different decision-making levels for successful execution?*
- 5) *How efficient were the management and accountability structures of the project?*

Sustainability

- 1) *How effectively is the Project building the necessary capacity of people and institutions?*
- 2) *To what extent are planned results of the project likely to be sustained and/or scaled-up and replicated by stakeholders?*
- 3) *What further concrete steps could be taken to increase the perspectives of the sustainability of the results?*

Evaluator`s responsibilities and deliverables

1. Key responsibilities:

- The design, planning and implementation of the evaluation and the write-up of the evaluation report, using an approach agreed with ILO, and for delivering in accordance with the ILO's specifications and timeline;
- Consulting and liaising, as required, with ILO, stakeholders and partners to ensure satisfactory delivery of all deliverables; and
- Making herself/himself available, if required, to take part in briefings and discussions, online or, if judged necessary, at the ILO Geneva Office or other venue, on dates to be agreed, in line with the work outlined in these ToRs, details of which will be worked out by the end of the inception phase.

2. Key deliverables:

i. Deliverable 1: Inception report with methodology¹⁴

The inception report should detail the Evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection procedures. The inception report should also include an evaluation matrix, proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables. The evaluation methodology should include a description of:

- ☐ An analytical approach to assessing the project across locations;
- ☐ A methodology to select and evaluate, among the Project Countries, a sub-set of countries to be reviewed in depth, as mentioned in the evaluation scope section above.

ii. Deliverable 2: Draft Evaluation Report

To be submitted to the Evaluation Manager in the format prescribed by the ILO checklist number 5.¹⁵

iii. Deliverable 3: Presentations of Draft Report

A presentation should be prepared for the ILO on the draft report, to be used during the debriefing.

iv. Deliverable 4: Final Evaluation Report

To be submitted to the Evaluation Manager as per the proposed structure in the ILO Evaluation guidelines, checklist number 5, carefully edited and formatted.¹⁶ The quality of the report will be determined based on quality standards defined by the ILO Evaluation office.¹⁷ The report should also, as appropriate, include specific and detailed recommendations by the Evaluator based on the analysis of information obtained. All recommendations should be addressed specifically to the organization or institution responsible for implementing it. The report should also include a specific section on lessons learned and good practices¹⁸ from that aspect of the

¹⁴ http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_165972.pdf

¹⁵ http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_165967.pdf

¹⁶ http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166357/lang--en/index.htm

¹⁷ http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang--en/index.htm

¹⁸ http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206158/lang--en/index.htm

project that the evaluation is focusing on, either that could be replicated or those that should be avoided.

v. Evaluation summary

A standalone summary of the evaluation in the template provided by EVAL for wider dissemination.¹⁹

Proposed workplan and timeframe

The evaluation is foreseen to be undertaken in the time period, 10 October 2019 to 30 October 2019 (TBC), with the aim to submit the final evaluation report to the donor no later than 10th November 2019. The total effort is expected to be 20 work days to complete the full assignment.

Phase	Tasks	Responsible Person Timing	Days Proposed
I	Inception phase: Desk review, initial briefing with Evaluation Manager, internal briefings with the IPS and Project Coordinators, development of a draft inception report and agenda for meetings	Evaluator	5 working days
II	Circulate draft inception report to Project stakeholders, consolidate comments and send to Evaluator	Evaluation Manager	
III	Final Inception report and evaluation plan	Evaluator	1 working day
IV	Data collection phase: Meetings with key stakeholders, facilitate stakeholder meetings and interviews, debriefing with ILO Field Offices	Evaluator	7 working days
V	Report writing phase: Draft evaluation report based on desk review and consultations from field visits	Evaluator	5 working days
VI	Circulate draft evaluation report to Project stakeholders, consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to Evaluator	Evaluation Manager	
VII	Finalize report including explanations on comments not included	Evaluator	2 working days
VIII	Approval of report by EVAL	EVAL	
IX	Official submission to PARDEV	Evaluation Manager	
Total			20 working days

Evaluation Management Arrangements

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

¹⁹ http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166361/lang--en/index.htm

The evaluation will be led by an Independent Evaluator under the general supervision of the Evaluation Manager and ILO EVAL Office. The Independent Evaluator will be responsible for the deliverables under the TOR and required to ensure the quality of data (validity, reliability, consistency, and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases.

For this independent final evaluation, the final report and submission procedure will be as follows:

- The Evaluation Consultant will submit a draft evaluation report to the Evaluation Manager;
- After reviewing compliance with the TORs and accuracy, the Evaluation Manager will forward a copy to the project staff and other key stakeholders for comment and factual check;
- The Evaluation Manager will consolidate the comments and send these to the Evaluation Consultant;
- The Evaluation Consultant will finalize the report, incorporating any comments deemed appropriate and providing a brief note explaining why any comments might not have been incorporated. He/she will submit the final report to the Evaluation Manager;
- The Evaluation Manager will forward the report to EVAL for approval;
- The Evaluation Manager officially forwards the evaluation report to stakeholders and PARDEV; and
- PARDEV will submit the report officially to the Donor.

Payment schedule

Deliverable	Percent
Inception report	30 %
Draft report	40 %
Final report	30%

Proposal submission criteria

The following will be considered minimum contents of the proposal. Please submit in the order listed:

- Expression of interest/motivation letter;
- A copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae, which must include information about the qualifications held by the candidate;
- Previous work samples of similar work done (two evaluation reports);
- A detailed methodology for meeting the objective of the TOR, with a description of the deliverables and work plan that will identify the major tasks to be accomplished and be used as a scheduling and managing tool, as well as the basis for invoicing;
- A statement confirming availability to conduct this assignment and the daily professional fee expressed in US dollars, please provide assumptions taken;
- A statement confirming that the candidate has no previous involvement in the delivery of the subject project in the countries of intervention or a personal relationship with any ILO Officials who are engaged in the project;
- Contact details for at least three organizations who have engaged the Evaluator for similar assignments;

- A specific statement that the evaluation will comply with UN Norms and standards; and
- Mention and reference to the Code of Conduct for carrying out the evaluations.

Applications submitted without a fee/rate will not be considered.

Administrative and logistical support

The Project management, together with the ILO Country Offices will provide relevant documentation and logistical support to the evaluation process, i.e. assist in organizing meetings with stakeholders.

Profile of evaluation consultant

The Evaluator should have the following qualifications:

- Advanced university degree in social sciences or related graduate qualifications;
- A minimum of 10 years of professional experience in conducting programme or project evaluations, experience in the area of child labour/research/social dialogue will be an added advantage but not required;
- Proven experience with logical framework approaches and other strategic planning approaches, M&E methods and approaches (including quantitative, qualitative and participatory), information analysis and report writing;
- Fluency in written and spoken English is required, knowledge of one or more languages spoken in the project countries would be an asset;
- Knowledge and experience of the UN System is desirable;
- Understanding of the development context of the Project Countries is an added advantage;
- Excellent consultative, communication and interviewing skills;
- Demonstrated excellent report writing skills in English; and
- Demonstrated ability to deliver quality results within strict deadlines.

The deadline for submission of the expression of interest for undertaking the evaluation is by **11.00 pm (Geneva time) on Thursday, 3rd October 2019**. Interested candidates should submit an expression of interest based on the criteria outlined above with the subject header ***“Evaluation of the EC Project GLO/15/27/EUR”*** to the **Evaluation Manager, Mr. Bobur Nazarmuhamedov** (nazarmuhamedov@ilo.org) with a copy to **Mr. Peter Wichmand** (wichmand@ilo.org).