



International Labour Organization

iTrack

Evaluation

ILO EVALUATION

- Evaluation Title: **Promoting Labour Relations and Social Dialogue in Georgia**

- ILO TC/SYMBOL: **(ENPI 2014/347-044) GEO/14/01/EEC**

- Type of Evaluation : **Internal Final Project Evaluation**

- Country(ies) : **Georgia**

- Date of the evaluation: **30.05 – 30.06.2017**

- Name of consultant(s): **Aleksandar Krzalovski**

- ILO Administrative Office: **Project Office Georgia**

- ILO Technical Backstopping Office: **DWT/CO-Moscow**

- Other agencies involved in joint evaluation: **N/A**

- Date project ends: **30.06.2017**

- Donor: country and budget US\$ **467,217 (400,000 EUR)**

- Evaluation Manager: **Zsolt Dudas**

- Key Words: **ILO, Social dialogue, tripartite commission**

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

PROMOTING LABOUR RELATIONS AND SOCIAL DIALOGUE IN GEORGIA

PROJECT (ENPI 2014/347-044) NO. GEO/14/01/EEC

INTERNAL FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION

EVALUATOR: ALEKSANDAR KRZALOVSKI

TBILISI, GEORGIA, JUNE 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Acronyms.....	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1. BACKGROUND.....	7
1.1. Project Background.....	7
1.2. Project Summary Table	9
1.3. Evaluation Background	10
2. METHODOLOGY	10
3. MAIN FINDINGS	11
3.1. Project Design.....	11
3.2. Project Implementation – General Observations	13
3.3. Project Components (Specific Objectives).....	13
3.3.1. Component 1: Tripartite Social Partnership Commission (TSPC)	14
3.3.2. Component 2: Georgian Employers Association (GEA).....	15
3.3.3. Component 3: Georgian Trade Unions Confederation (GTUC).....	16
3.4. Relevance	17
3.5. Effectiveness	18
3.6. Efficiency	20
3.7. Sustainability.....	20
3.8. Special Considerations / Cross-cutting Issues	21
4. CONCLUSIONS	22
5. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	23
APPENDICIES.....	24
1. Terms of Reference for the Evaluation	25
2. List of Interviewees	29
3. Bibliography	30
4. Project Activities Summary.....	31
5. TSPC Strategic Plan 2016-2017 – Implementation Progress.....	32
6. USDOL funded project “Improved Compliance with Labour Laws in Georgia”	34

List of Acronyms

AA – Association Agreement (with the European Union)
AHTC – (Ad-Hoc) Tripartite Commission (predecessor of TSPC)
BAG – Business Association of Georgia
DWT-CO – Decent Work Team – Country Office
ER – Expected Result
GEA – Georgian Employers Association
GSMEA – Georgian Small and Medium Enterprise Association
GTUC – Georgian Trade Unions Confederation
HR – Human Resources
ILO – International Labour Organisation
ILS – International Labour Standards
IOE – International Organisation of Employers
IR – Industrial Relations
ITUC – International Trade Unions Confederation
LC – Labour Code
MOLHSA – Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs
OO – Overall Objective
OSH – Occupational Safety and Health
SME – Small and Medium Enterprises
SO – Specific Objective
SWOT – Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (Analysis)
TSPC – Tripartite Social Partnership Commission
USDOL – United States Department of Labour

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Georgia passed through many turbulent periods in its development since its independence of 1991. That included coup d'état in 1992, than so called Rose revolution of 2003 that brought a change in governing power in early 2004, a war conflict with Russia in 2008 that led two of its regions de facto out of the state control, up to its first peaceful transition of power after elections of 2012.

Georgia strategic orientation is toward accession of Euro-Atlantic structures (NATO and EU). It has signed Individual Partnership Agreement Plan with NATO in 2004 and Association Agreement with EU in 2014.

In the area of labour relations, significant events were: the adoption of new Labour Code in 2006, as well as its amendments in 2013. The first one, often described as “ultra-liberal” favoured significantly employers, enabling dismissal from work at any time, without explanation or justification, depriving the workers right to even file a complaint about it. The amendments of 2013 aligned it with the international labour standards (ILS). The period in between was characterized by massive layoffs, tensed labour relations, absent social dialogue and it affected significantly the social partners – major ones being the Georgian Association of Employers, (GEA) and Georgian Trade Union Confederation (GTUC) – ILO’s members and main partners in Georgia.

In line with its mission, ILO interventions in Georgia since 2006 were indeed to make legislative changes to align the labour code with ILS, which it finally achieved as main contributor in the process to amend the Law in 2012. It was also crucial in establishing the social dialogue and first Ad-Hoc Tripartite Commission - AHTC in 2010 and establishment of the Tripartite Social Partnership Commission (TSPC) in 2016. ILO also helped its social partners GEA and GTUC throughout this period.

Against this background ILO developed a project Promotion of Labour Relations and Social Dialogue in Georgia, to further strengthen social partners and their cooperation, through the TSPC. Its three components (and corresponding specific objectives), focused on strengthening TSPC, GEA and GTUC. The project started in January 2015 and is planned to be completed by the end of June 2016. It has overall budget of 400,000 EUR, funded by the European Delegation in Georgia. Therefore, this evaluation is internal final project evaluation, aiming to assess the project implementation and achievements and give recommendations on sustaining those results.

EVALUATION BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the final internal evaluation of the project „Promoting Labour Relations and Social Dialogue in Georgia“ was to evaluate progress made (by reviewing and assessing achievements) and make recommendations on how to improve the sustainability of achieved results. Assessment is made on the basis of project objectives and outputs and the project document. Main evaluation criteria are: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

The evaluation should serve primarily to ILO and its social partners in Georgia to sustain project achievements in their further endeavours, but also to other stakeholders such as the European Union Delegation as a donor of this project.

The evaluation was carried out by one consultant and included following steps:

- Desk review: review of project reports and other documentation;
- Field visit to Tbilisi, to conduct direct interviews with the:
 - o Project team leader and staff members, as well as Skype interviews with relevant specialists at DWT-Moscow and HQ;
 - o National Government, as well as employers' and trade union representatives;
- Collecting relevant documents from social partners.

Generally, the evaluation was reviewing:

- the achievements of the Project by assessing to what extent the stated objectives and major outputs have been achieved;
- the efficiency and effectiveness of the project implementation;
- to what extent the project has been relevant and has met the needs of its target groups;
- the likelihood of sustainability of the project outcomes;
- emerging risks and opportunities.

The field visit was conducted in the period of 5-9 of June 2017. During the visit in Tbilisi, a total of 20 interviews (involving 22 people) were conducted by the evaluator, including all relevant stakeholders.

A set of 15 most relevant documents were sent to the evaluator prior to the field visit. In addition, during the field visit in Tbilisi, ILO Country office and project partners provided 26 documents more, though some of them (12) were only in Georgian language.

This report is result of the conducted processes above and contains assessment of the project achievements according to the key evaluation criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability) and provides recommendations for further action after the project ends.

CONSLUSIONS

ILO's project significantly contributed to promotion of labour relations and social dialogue, especially by re-activating tripartite dialogue and breakthrough work on establishing the Tripartite Social Partnership Commission (TSPC). Also, its strategic guidance of social partners GEA and GTUC, as well as similar support to TSPC, led to creation and implementation of their strategic plans, which included increased operational capacities, widening the constituents support and membership networks, improved portfolio of services.

ILO's role was highly appreciated by all involved stakeholders and many of them emphasized its involvement as crucial, best suited for this type of intervention (social dialogue) and done in very satisfactory way. Assistance to social partners was also highly valued. They all expect further presence, assistance and direct support from ILO, especially in further improvement of social dialogue on national level and strengthened work of TSPC.

Most of the activities were implemented as planned, with some delays ranging from one to several months, though not provoking significant problems and in most cases quite justified, having in mind that the nature of the project was in large extent about building trust and relations among social partners.

One group of activities (bi-partite pilot programs) was re-arranged to bi-partite trainings after several attempts in selected companies and after careful consideration with the social partners.

There was also synergy and complementary activities (especially concerning GTUC) with the USDOL funded project.

The project was very relevant. It addressed the lack of structural social dialogue and the intervention helped create TSPC.

Most of the intended effects were achieved. TSPC was created and became operational, while both social partners GEA and GTUC improved their work with increased membership, strengthened positions and portfolio, according to their strategic plans – also products/outputs of this project.

ILO's performance was rather efficient. The amount of work and achievement by a small country project office is impressive. There was also wise use of headquarters support and deployment of senior specialists from the DWT/Country office, as well as good pairing with national consultants.

There are visible prospects to sustain these achievements, though with some uncertainties. TSPC is likely to continue and improve its work even without ILO, though its further involvement may contribute to do that faster and better. GEA and GTUC may continue to develop their portfolio and regional expansion.

Issues of special concern, such as gender, knowledge sharing, but also international labour standards and social dialogue, were all well addressed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Social consensus is needed on country's priorities.** This refers to the debate about the speed of reforms (including in the context of ILS) towards EU integration. If EU accession is consensual, than it is better to reach international labour standards rather sooner than later.
2. **ILO should remain present and active, mainly on national level with all three partners: TSPC, GEA and GTUC.** This project was well designed and implemented on three pillars of the social dialogue, in the case of Georgia both social partners GEA (employers) and GTUC (workers) and two of them engaging with the Government through TSPC. This concept should be continued for a longer term.
3. **Ambitious plans, good basis for the coming period.** Strategic plans of all three actors in the project appear to be over-ambitious for the period of two years (as they were designed). Their evaluation by the year end and development of new ones, should be good basis for further work in the years to come.
4. **Further strengthening of GEA and GTUC.** Although a lot has been done on stabilising both major partners of ILO in the previous period, as well as their capacities strengthened with this project, there is still a lot to be done to improve their work and set ground for the foreseeable future. Strategic plans give enough direction in which areas additional interventions would be most effective.
5. **Expansion of portfolio and regional outreach of both GEA and GTUC.** Both organisations have certain range of services for their constituencies. However, it should be expanded with new elements, including topics for trainings and widen them much more to the other regions, as well as on the company level, preferably in collaboration between GEA and GTUC.

1. BACKGROUND

This section gives an overview of the Georgian context for the implementation of the ILO project “Promoting Labour Relations and Social Dialogue in Georgia”, project design summary, as well as background to this evaluation.

1.1. Project Background

Since its independence from the former Soviet Union in 1991, Georgia passed some turbulent times, including the so called Rose Revolution in 2003 (non-violent change of power), followed by rather radical (by some labelled as ultra-liberal) reforms, as well as brief war conflict with Russia in 2008, which led to two of the country’s regions (Abkhazia and South Ossetia) to become de facto independent (i.e. without any control by the State authorities).

Namely, after having independence vote on referendum, Georgia experienced bloody coup d’état and few years of internal civil war. Two major events characterized the political scene since then: so called Rose Revolution of the late 2002 and early 2003, which saw first peaceful (though following massive civil unrest and protest due to election frauds) transition of power; as well as first democratic shift in power in 2012 which saw the party Georgian Dream replace by then ruling coalition led by the United National Movement party.

The decade after the Rose Revolution, under the presidency of Mikhail Saakashvili, saw the country orientation clearly move towards EU/NATO membership and undergo radical reforms, by some described even as ultra-liberal. In that period Georgia observed several successes, especially in the economy, having double-digit GDP growth in some of those years, and in general performing comparatively better than most of the European countries with 3-4% growth in most of the period. It brought the country to prominence of the World Bank ranking for economic freedoms and easiness of doing business, where it is still among top 20 countries, i.e. performing better than 90% of the countries in the world. One of the major successes was also fight against corruption, which was on a massive scale before, but now Georgia holds 44th place in Transparency International’s Corruption Perception Index. On the other hand, all these economic figures, did not bring down the (official) unemployment rate, which was fluctuating between 10 and 15%.

In the field of labour relations (one of the major spheres of interest of the International Labour Organisation (ILO)), the main event was adoption of the new Labour Code in 2006, almost fully favouring employers, allowing among other things to dismiss workers without any notification, justification or period for termination of the contract, depriving employees even of the right to appeal it. It was in breach with almost all of the basic 8 ILO conventions that Georgia had previously ratified. This situation with labour rights not in compliance with international standards, was a natural “mission call” for ILO to step-up and work on necessary legislative changes, but also on promotion of social dialogue. ILO indeed had a key role in this field, brokering the Tripartite Agreement that led to the establishment of the Tripartite Commission in 2010. The ILO has played a key role to bring about legislative changes to the Labour Code in 2013 compliant with International Labour Standards (ILS). Over these years, ILO established excellent relationship with the Georgian constituents (national authorities, employers and employees associations), as well as with others stakeholders, including EU Delegation in Georgia (particularly important as the country signed Association Agreement with EU).

Georgian scene in terms of social partners was characterised by one dominant trade union (Georgian Trade Union Confederation – GTUC) and since 2000 also one representative of the employers (Georgian Employers Association – GEA), until 2009/2010 when new associations emerged. GTUC and GEA are members of their respective international organisations (ITUC and IOE) affiliated with ILO, resulting in quite close and frank cooperation.

Obviously, the period after adoption of the Labour Code of 2006 was quite difficult one for the workers and their representatives, which was/is dominantly the Georgian Trade Union Confederation (GTUC). Existing already from the Soviet time, it saw its membership significantly dropping from over 230,000 before that Law was enacted, down to below 78,000 in 2011. Large part of it was due to massive layoffs in the public sector, illustrated by dismissal of 40,000 police members in one day, as well as 11,000 teachers in a short period of time. This massive effect on GTUC membership was also due to the fact that around 65% of the members were employed in the public sector (which in itself was and is another challenge – to expand membership into the private sector). Still, GTUC and its 21 member Trade Unions were fighting their battles, managing to reinstate many workers back in their workplace, while also reverting the trend and starting to increase its membership base since 2011 lowest point.

It could be imagined that in the same decade after the Rose Revolution, situation on the Employers side would have been much better. However, that period was marked by the emergence of two new (besides GEA – Georgian Employers' associations founded in 2000): Business Association of Georgia (BAG) in 2009 and the Georgian Small and Medium Enterprises Association (GSMEA) in 2010. Some of the companies that are members of these new associations, are also members of GEA. Still, both of these new associations are leaving to GEA the leadership in terms of labour relations, as it is only one allocating resources to follow these issues. GEA offers a range of services to its members, from legal advice on current (and changing) legislation, through awareness raising about international labour standards, to trainings and consultancies to companies, including matching them on various B2B events, seminars, conferences, business forums and exhibitions, that they are organising throughout the country and abroad. It also has training and service center (TESC), with a developed portfolio of training curriculums, ranging from establishing a business, through organisation and management courses, to thematic ones and of course, training on labour issues.

Both organisations (GEA and GTUC) faced significant challenges in the previous period, from major drops in membership to emergence of competitive associations. Therefore, increasing their capacity was still a priority for effective social dialogue in Georgia. Following negative assessments and reports, ILO engaged in systematic work on improving the situation. In the period of 2009-2013 it consisted of three phases. The first one (May 2009 – May 2010) focused on establishing social dialogue in the country, which resulted in creation of a high-level (comprised of presidents of three constituents , i.e. Government, employers and trade unions) Ad Hoc Tripartite Commission (AHTC). After a short break in presence in Georgia, ILO launched the second phase in October 2010 that was dedicated to work with its local constituents from the social partners' organizations, namely the Georgian Employers Association (GEA) and the Georgian Trade Unions Confederation (GTUC) – both affiliated with ILO as members of their respective international organisations, represented in ILO structures. Finally, after the change of Government in 2012, the third phase was all about the changes in the Labour Code, which was effectuated in June 2013 when the Parliament adopted a set of amendments, aligning Georgian Labour Code with ILS.

Against this background ILO developed a project proposal “Promoting Labour Relations and Social Dialogue in Georgia”, with a three-fold focus: on both of its social partners (GEA and GTUC), as well as social dialogue (through Tripartite Commission - TSPC), that the EU decided to support with a budget of 400,000 EUR.

1.2. Project Summary Table

Title of the action:	Promoting Labour Relations and Social Dialogue in Georgia
Lot:	Comprehensive Institution Building – CIB 2012
Location(s) of the action:	Georgia
Duration of the action:	30 months (January 2015 – June 2017)
EU contribution:	EUR 400,000 (100%)
Objectives of the action:	<p>Overall objective: The overall objective of this project is to contribute to improve the governance of the labour market through the application of sound and harmonious labour relations.</p> <p>Specific objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tripartite and bipartite dialogue in Georgia is effectively promoted at national, regional and enterprise levels. 2. Effectiveness of employers' organisations in addressing labour relations issues and in servicing the needs of their constituencies is improved. 3. Effectiveness of workers' organisations in addressing labour relations issues and in representing workers' rights and interests is improved.
Target group(s):	Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs (MoLHSA) Department of Labour and Employment Policy, Chancellery of Georgia staff responsible for supporting the Tripartite Social Partnership Commission, Georgian Trade Unions Confederation (GTUC) and its affiliates, Georgian Employers Association (GEA) and their members, Employers' and workers' representatives.
Final beneficiaries	The final beneficiaries of this project intervention will be workers and employers in Georgia.
Estimated results:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The national Tripartite Social Partnership Commission (TSPC) is fully operational and capacitated in addressing core labour and employment issues. 2. Pilot programmes implemented at workplace level on bipartite dialogue for improving working conditions, reducing labour disputes and enhancing organisational climate and efficiency. 3. The Georgian Employers Association (GEA) has adopted a strategy and action plan to improve its effectiveness in addressing labour and employment issues. 4. GEA capacities in providing effective services in labour and employment to its members are reinforced. 5. The awareness and capacity to respect International Labour Standards (ILS) and national labour law have significantly increased among Georgian firms, more especially small and medium-sized enterprises. 6. Capacities of GTUC staff and elected officials at national, regional and branch levels enhanced. 7. GTUC's representation base increased with a special focus on unorganized sectors.
Main activities:	A wide range of services will be provided to Georgian constituents (Government, employers and workers organizations) in order to strengthen social dialogue, including, but not limited to: training programmes, including development of training materials, advisory services, and planning workshops.

1.3. Evaluation Background

As the project is approaching its final date of implementation period, by the end of June 2017, and as per usual practice the ILO initiated procedure for the final internal project evaluation, to be conducted in the last month of the project implementation period.

The purpose of the final internal evaluation of the project „Promoting Labour Relations and Social Dialogue in Georgia“ was to evaluate progress made (by reviewing and assessing achievements) and make recommendations on how to improve the sustainability of achieved results. Assessment is made on the basis of project objectives and outputs as stated in previous section (and the project document). The main evaluation criteria are: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

The evaluation should serve primarily to ILO and its social partners in Georgia to sustain project achievements in their further endeavours, but also to other stakeholders such as the European Union Delegation as a donor of this project.

2. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was carried out by one consultant and included the following steps:

- Desk review: review of project reports and other documentation;
- Field visit to Tbilisi, to conduct direct interviews with the:
 - o Project team leader and staff members, as well as Skype interviews with relevant specialists at DWT/CO-Moscow and HQ;
 - o National Government, as well as employers' and trade union representatives;
- Collecting relevant documents from social partners.

Generally, the evaluation was reviewing:

- the achievements of the Project by assessing to what extent the stated objectives and major outputs have been achieved;
- the efficiency and effectiveness of the project implementation;
- to what extent the project has been relevant and has met the needs of its target groups;
- the likelihood of sustainability of the project outcomes;
- emerging risks and opportunities.

Full Terms of Reference is given in Appendix 1.

The field visit was conducted in the period of 5-9 of June 2017. During the visit in Tbilisi, a total of 20 interviews (involving 22 people) were conducted by the evaluator, including all relevant stakeholders. Full list of interviewed persons is given in Appendix 2.

A set of 15 most relevant documents were sent to the evaluator prior to the field visit. In addition, during the field visit in Tbilisi, ILO Country project office and project partners provided 26 more documents, though some of them (12) were only in Georgian language. The List of consulted documents is given in Appendix 3: Bibliography.

This report is the result of the above conducted processes and contains assessment of the project achievements according to the evaluation criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability) and provides recommendations for further actions after the project ends.

3. MAIN FINDINGS

This project for promotion of labour relations and social dialogue in Georgia was designed and implemented at a start of a relatively stable and consolidated period of country's otherwise turbulent two decades since its independence from the former Soviet Union in 1991.

It was against this background, described in more details in the section 1.1, that ILO designed this project to promote labour relations and social dialogue, i.e. to implement what was amended in the Labour Code and strengthen the cooperation among social partners.

Before discussing the project itself, it is worth mentioning that in an absence of structured social dialogue in the period since the Labour Code of 2006, many stereotypes were developed, most of which are still actual and very present also today in Georgian reality. This stigma associated with labour issues is still affecting the pertinent public discourse and presents an obstacle to bringing about certain changes. Some of the most frequently mentioned in interviews with the stakeholders perceptions were: less regulation is good for business (meaning - more rights for workers are harmful for companies); there should be value created first, to have something to redistribute (debating that the economy should be unleashed, like it was indeed in 2006, so when there is prosperity in terms of increased incomes and profits for companies, there will be something to share with workers and citizens in general); there is no need to set minimal wage, the market will regulate it anyway (even in a situation when the official minimal wage is still, from the 90-ties, set to 20 Georgian Lari (GEL), i.e. 8 USD per month, and everybody agrees that no one should work for or pay that low wage, neither it is the case in practice). All of these are mainly the arguments expressed by the business community, however they are also prevalent in the public opinion. All that created significant resistance to labour reforms to achieve more balanced labour relations.

3.1. Project Design

In order to effectuate and sustain its achievements from the previous period (three-phased intervention) by assisting the social partners in enforcing the Labour Code amendments, as well as to build up on the established relations with the social partners, the ILO approached the EU Delegation in Georgia to support this type of project as early as 2010. The EU support became feasible especially after signing of the Association Agreement with the country in 2014, so the EU Delegation decided to fund this project of ILO with a direct contract in the amount of 400,000 EUR, for a period of 30 months (major elements are already presented in subsection 1.2 above).

It should be noted though, that the appraisal of the proposal and negotiation period until the contract was signed took almost a year and instead of early 2014, the project started in January 2015.

In addition, the originally planned budget of 600,000 EUR was reduced by 1/3 affecting the volume of activities initially envisaged, although without altering the key components of the planned activities. The ILO managed to address this by increased synergy with the project funded by USDOL (Improved Compliance with Labour Laws in the Republic of Georgia 2014-2018) under which more resources were allocated especially for GTUC support, as the two projects were complementary. Finally, it should be noted that the USDOL project (see more details in Appendix 6) was comparatively larger than the EU one (budget of 2 million USD for the initial project period, expanded later with additional 1 million USD). The evaluator was made aware of all these circumstances, so they are taken into account in discussion of the findings further below.

As visible from the description of the country context, especially in terms of the labour relations, ILO designed this project in a very fitting way to the actual needs. Its focus on development of harmonious labour relations was adequate and three-fold objective(s) dedicated to each of the components, namely: TSPC, GEA and GTUC, was well thoughtful and balanced. Problem analysis in the project document is based on evidence and justified, leading to a very clear project design, especially on the level of objectives and estimated results.

The mixture of the proposed methodology and instruments for implementation of activities was diverse, in many cases based on previous experiences from other contexts/projects tested in practice, but also with some experiments, allowing for flexibility and adaptations to take place throughout the project. That mixture, on the other hand (at least as viewed from evaluation perspective), created some small confusions, as for some activities it was not clear what instrument is or will be used, for some activities more instruments were combined and in addition (as some activities were bipartite or tripartite) the same activities were counted under different objectives/results. However, these unclarities were rather minor and have not affected the implementation of the project.

The table below structures activities per objective, as in the project document (with simpler descriptions):

* SO-Specific Objectives; ER-Estimated Results; PP-Project Proposals; WP- Work Plans

* Classification/numbering of activities was different between PP and the WP (e.g. Ia vs 111)

SO	ER	(PP)		(WP)	Description of activity		
1	1	I	A	111	ILO guide translation and corresponding trainings		
			B	112	TSPC staff trainings		
			C	113	TSPC study visit to EU country (Netherlands)		
			II	A	121	TSPC strategic workshop and development of Strategic Plan	
			B	122	Advisory/training sessions		
			C	123	Evaluate TSPC strategic plan		
		II	Pilot 2P dialogue	A	211	Bipartite (2P) dialogue in three organisations (companies)	
				B	212	Advisory workshops in those selected organisations	
				II	A	221	Training program for the selected organisations
				B	222	Evaluate trainings and seminars	
2	3	I	A	311	GEA audit		
			B	312	Focus groups with companies		
		II	A	321	GEA strategic and action plan		
		II	GEA capacity	A	411	Widen GEA competences and improve website	
				B	412	Cooperation mechanism with BAG and GSMEA	
				C	413	Advocacy on training curriculum	
				D	414	Technical assistance to develop training curriculum	
		I	Respect ILS	A	511	Promote respect for ILS and LC	
				B	512	Info-sessions on ILS and LC	
				II	A	521	ILS and LC handbook
B	522			Info-sessions for SMEs			
3	6	I	A	611	Train GTUC members in TSPC		
			B	612	Develop ToT for GUTC officials		
			C	613	Select GTUC trainers (15)		
			D	614	Conduct ToT		
		II	A	621	Develop GTUC training plan		
			B	622	Support to GTUC negotiators		
			C	623	Monitor and adjust trainings		
			D	624	Links with regional TU's		
		I	GTUC member	A	711	GTUC motivation package	
				B	712	Develop campaign tools	
				II	A	721	Raising awareness campaign
				B	722	Evaluate campaigns	

* Comparison of planned and implemented activities is given in Appendix 4.

3.2. Project Implementation – General Observations

The main observation about the implementation of the project is that most of the activities have been implemented by the time of evaluation, i.e. by the end of the project (as it is ending in the same month) with some of the remaining ones, scheduled to take place by the end of June 2017 (project end). They were implemented to a large extent as planned, with adequate modifications where applicable, as well as despite some delays, with good quality and to high satisfaction of beneficiaries and project partners.

For two groups of activities, additional explanation is needed. Namely, all (4) activities (211-222) related to the estimated result no.2 (pilot bipartite programs in 3 companies) were replaced with bipartite trainings at the end of 2015 through a discussion in the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) that includes all the project stakeholders and the EUD. It was done after visits to companies were made, discussions held, it was found out that the response and level of cooperation from companies was limited hence it was concluded that it will not work as planned. After careful consideration and further consultations with social partners, bipartite trainings were organised instead, to a much better effect, as they appeared to be among the most appreciated activities of the project. Second, a large set of activities intended for GTUC (a total of 7, from 613 to 711) were actually implemented jointly under the USDOL project (throughout 2015 and 2016) apart from the few activities (712-722) addressed. The ILO project office made it in a very compatible manner and successfully blended both projects.

Another general observation is that some of the activities were implemented with small or larger delays. The Project Activities Summary table in Appendix 4 is showing (with yellow highlight) the planned timings for all the activities and marks when those were actually implemented (with different signs/letters, depending on the type of activity). It shows that the majority of activities were on time, while the delays in the other ones ranged from one to several months. However, these delays did not seem to have provoked any significant problems in project implementation and in most instances were perfectly justified, as much of this project was about building trust and strengthening relations among the social partners.

The major general finding though is about the role of ILO in the project, and - it is exceptionally positive. All of the interviewed parties expressed great satisfaction with the work of ILO office, appreciated ILO's commitment and support and emphasized its role not only in this project, but as major (f)actor in the field of labour relations in Georgia. Many superlatives were said about ILO, with some selected quotes as follows: "ILO's role was/is absolutely crucial", "ILO has the lion's share in the issue of social dialogue", "ILO had a huge role in pushing the Government/Ministry for changes", "ILO is best suited for labour relations issues/project", "ILO's role in the county is useful and well respected", "we are very grateful to ILO, they helped us survive the tough years".

Of course, there were some voices that pointed out to the delays in the project and expectations that ILO office should have been a bit more proactive and "pushy" towards the Government, but also the social partners. Even more comments were about the future, i.e. expectation for ILO to stay in the country, keep or even step-up its role in promoting social dialogue, as well as continue to be a balancing power in labour relations devoted to ILS and bringing those standards fully to Georgia.

3.3. Project Components (Specific Objectives)

The project was all about social partners and their cooperation, so the three components focused on:

- 1) Tripartite Social Partnership Commission (TSPC) composed of Government, employers and workers representatives;
- 2) Georgian Employers Association (GEA) as representative of employers;
- 3) Georgian Trade Unions Confederation (GTUC) as dominant employees' voice.

In the following sub-sections, the main findings are presented about each of the above regarding their role in the project and social dialogue in general. This is also because the three specific objectives of the project were related exactly to those three actors.

3.3.1. Component 1: Tripartite Social Partnership Commission (TSPC)

The first form of social partnership came to being in Georgia through previous ILO intervention (2010), when the Minister of Labour in the Georgian Government and presidents of GEA and GTUC, after a series of meetings agreed on forming (Ad-Hoc) Tripartite Commission (AHTC) to address social dialogue in the country. However, it was only meeting ad hoc (often “coinciding” with visiting ILO High level missions) and no major decisions were made or agreed upon, neither minutes were kept from those meetings. According to the amendments to the Labour Code in 2013, the current TSPC was established formally and the two Prime Minister’s decrees (#258 and #272) mandated its modalities of work. In practice, however, this was not functioning.

Therefore, much of the efforts of ILO Country Office, especially in the first year of the project implementation (2015) was devoted to countless meetings with social partners and Government representatives, to elaborate on the value of having a social dialogue and the need for systematic approach to this issue, to create a national forum for discussion of labour issues. After initial and symbolic attempt on May 1, 2015 (which ended up in ultimately fruitless debate) the breakthrough came with the ILO organized retreat workshop in January 2016 with high-level representatives from all three sides attending. The retreat adopted the TSPC Strategic Plan 2016-2017 (see Appendix 5) and has agreed to a quarterly schedule of meetings and working group level discussions. It likewise agreed for a more robust role of the MoLHSA in chairing as well as hosting the TSPC Secretariat. A department was created in the Ministry and first staff members (currently 4) were dedicated to perform Secretariat tasks. The first quarterly TSPC meeting was held in April 2016, but instead of continuing on a quarterly basis, the second meeting took place only in 2017. Besides those two (or actually three) TSPC sessions, there were also six meetings of the working group (operational body assigned by TSPC). Minutes are kept from all these meetings (though they were available only in Georgian language, at the time of the evaluation).

All these are among of the major achievements of the project. Although the TSPC was supposed to be established by law (amendments brought in 2013), it did not come to being until this ILO intervention. In addition, it was done in a context of animosities between the social partners and even more between them and the Government, which the initial meeting in 2015 clearly exposed. That makes the ILO work even more valuable, to manage in a relatively short time (even if 1-2 months beyond schedule) to work out these complex relationships and nurture good relations with all three institutions and persuade them to work together and constructively approach the creation of TSPC. In addition, the retreat session where the creation of TSPC was agreed also contained a training/ awareness-raising session, where parties were introduced with the essentials of social dialogue and the notion that it may be a win-win situation for all, if they enter the dialogue with good will, constructively and give their contribution in the process. Finally, ILO’s professional approach made sure that TSPC Secretariat also adheres to minimum professional standards of managing the meetings, providing adequate background materials, keeping minutes and ensures follow-up on decisions made at TSPC meetings.

According to several interviews, the fact that the Commission (TSPC) was created, is already a success in itself. During the evaluation debriefing session, social partners assessed the plan and concluded that more than 70% of it was already implemented. Most frequently mentioned achievements were the work on occupational safety and health (OSH) and labour inspection legislations. On the other hand, slow pace of meetings of the Commission (only two in over a year) was criticized, although the Working group was praised that partially compensates it. Although the Strategic Plan seems too ambitious, expectations from TSPC are still high, including by both social partners.

Indeed, the thematic support the ILO provided to TSPC was beyond what was planned in the project. Discussion on Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) issues, as well as focus on Labour Inspection gave significant depth and content to the work of the Commission. In addition GEA voluntarily took over the preparation (and did provide drafts before the end of this project) of two documents on Education and Investment policies, to be debated in further meetings of TSPC. Other issues were also on the agenda of the TSPC Working Group, like mediation or the need for additional amendments to the Labour Code.

All in all, it is very good that TSPC is (re)created. Slow dynamics of its work may be justified within the context of elections in late 2016, if the planned tempo of quarterly meetings is maintained from now on. TSPC is a young institution and is yet to establish itself and gain respect from social partners and wider public. It is not there yet, as the expectations of both employers and employees are much higher, to see tangible results in the very near future. Though, it is also true that both GEA and GTUC (and others) are members of TSPC on equal footing as the Government, so they should also contribute more to its work and overall performance.

A planned part of this component was also to pilot bi-partite social dialogue in three selected companies. As described above, after several attempts and low response by those companies, as well as in consultation with all stakeholders (PAC), the activity was changed to bi-partite trainings. So instead of 3 companies, it involved in implementation representatives from a total of 48 companies (half being participants on behalf of the employers, while the other half from employees/trade unions). Therefore, the outreach was actually much higher than originally intended. In some of the relevant interviews this was seen as one of the most useful activities, as in many cases representatives of two social partners met for the first time and had a chance to debate labour issues with their counterparts from various similar companies and try to find solutions for real problems they are facing at their workplace.

Besides all these activities related to social dialogue, there were also some indirect effects, such as the debate on minimum wage, that involved Fair Labour Association and several multinational companies (e.g. Nike, Puma, etc.), to raise awareness of rather unacceptable situation with the minimum wage currently set for the amount of 20 Lari per month, as an obstacle (rather than enabler) for foreign investments. Finally, as part of this component, two publications were produced, i.e. translated in Georgian – the ILO handbooks on social dialogue and on collective bargaining.

3.3.2. Component 2: Georgian Employers Association (GEA)

Founded in 2000 GEA established itself as the main representative of the businesses/companies in Georgia, replacing in that position Soviet-era Chamber of Commerce (which still exists, but is seen more as para-Government institution rather than real representative of employers). It was maintaining its status for a decade, but the turbulences at the end of that decade led to the creation of other two employers' associations (Business Association of Georgia – BAG and Georgian Small and Medium Enterprises Association – GSMEA) in 2009 and 2010 respectively. The first one represents large companies (around 70, contributing to 20% of Georgian GDP), while the other works on behalf of small entities, usually with only one employee. However, in the field of labour relations, the leading role of GEA is undisputed by both other associations of employers.

This position of GEA among its peers and its membership in the International Organisation of Employers (member/constituent of ILO) meant that they are the legitimate partner for this project of ILO as representative of the employers. Therefore, the whole second component of the project was devoted to strengthening of GEA, which included three sub-components: audit and subsequent development of strategic plan; increasing capacities through improvement of GEA's training program

and better communication with its peers (BAG and GSMEA); promotion of ILS among companies, GEA members.

This component of the project was almost fully implemented as planned and generally within the envisaged timings. A thorough audit of GEA was performed in the first year, followed by detailed SWOT analysis and validation workshops with some of its members, resulting in a Strategic Plan that was adopted before the end of 2015. The audit/SWOT registered numerous strengths of the organization, like: credibility among peers and the public; stability, including diversified sources of income; qualified, competent, well-educated and trained staff; clear and effective organisational structure, etc. It also identified several fields for improvements, such as: broadening the membership, including with regionalisation and sectoral groupings; devotion to social dialogue; focus on vocational education and expansion of the training portfolio; better PR; and other recommendations. Many of them found its place in the new strategy and ILO assisted in the implementation of these commitments, for example through training of trainers on ILS and OSH.

In regards to the improved cooperation with BAG and GSMEA, numerous consultations were held on ILO initiative that led to their own (GEA with the other two) more frequent meetings to prepare joint positions ahead of discussions or negotiations with other social partners. This was particularly the case regarding the review of OSH standards and preparation of the law on this matter, as well as in terms of preparations for TSPC (and its Working Group) meetings – which became almost a rule, i.e. mandatory gatherings of GEA, BAG and GSMEA. This resulted in rather consolidated and strong position of employers vis-à-vis the other partners and indeed monolithic appearance on the TSPC formal sessions. At the time of evaluation, this was also acknowledged by both Government and Trade Unions representatives, who admitted that employers' preparations for these meeting and level of consensus were better than theirs.

For the sub-component on promotion of ILS, a set of 6 two-day trainings were implemented throughout 2016 which involved almost 200 participants from various companies – mainly GEA members (but also some members of BAG or GSMEA), as well as one workshop by external consultant with GEA staff on improvement of their services, including training portfolio, web-site and other issues.

Through the trainings awareness and knowledge base of participants on the ILS, Labour Code of Georgia, Mediation and Collective bargaining were raised and practical skills in solving labour disputes were developed.

GEA is a reliable partner of ILO in Georgia. It participated fully in the project and as part of it improved its overall performances and strengthened capacities. It has a well-developed training portfolio on 12 topics, two of which are directly linked/relevant to this project (e.g. OSH, ILS), which is likely to be increased as an effect of the ILO trainings delivered throughout the project period. It has also good and diverse sources of funding (around 1/3 of the funding is coming equally from the following sources: membership fees, payments for participation in trainings; external projects). GEA is also an active contributor to TSPC (e.g. with preparation of two policy papers, on education and investments), though its involvement may and should be increased.

3.3.3. Component 3: Georgian Trade Unions Confederation (GTUC)

On the side of employees, the situation is very clear, as GTUC is by far the dominant representative, although according to the central registry, there are around 100 unions in the country. It survived the major challenge for its pure existence, in the period of 2007-2011, when the number of members decreased from over 230,000 to less than 78,000. Large part of it, though, was due to massive layoffs (therefore – automatic), especially by the Government itself when enormous number of people were dismissed/fired in a short period of time (e.g. 40,000 police officers, 11,000 teachers, etc.). GTUC and

some of its member TU's, like the railway workers' TU or the Teachers' Association, fought their battles (in many cases successfully reinstating workers in their positions back in the company) already in those crisis times, however it took GTUC four years to revert the trend of decrease in membership and even today it has not reached more than 150,000.

As noted before, many of the envisaged activities for GTUC within this project (613-711), were, due to budget restrictions, jointly implemented with the complementary USDOL project. In any case, a lot has been done to support GTUC work, including: (like with GEA) SWOT analysis and consequent development of the Strategic Plan; trainings and info-materials on collective bargaining; direct assistance in negotiations (collective agreements); improvements of links with trade unions in the regions; implementation of campaigns for occupational safety, as well as for increase of membership.

GTUC analysis identified some strengths/advantages, like: motivated people, their activism and commitment, good support network and international affiliations, etc. On the other side, points for improvement were noted as follows: lack of strategic orientation, unstable funding, unclear and unfit organisational structure and internal communication, mentality of (especially older) members of management, not many young people and women in the leadership. ILO tackled most of them within the two projects.

One of the major achievements is in the area of collective agreements. Although not many new agreements were signed in the project period (according to some interviewees, only 4, so an increase from 48 to 52 in total), but one to which ILO also contributed many efforts was very important, as it was reached between the Teachers' Union and the Ministry of Education (which was for the first time since Georgian independence) and covers the Union with the largest number of members (currently 45,000, out of almost 100,000 active teachers), which was their size before the Labour Law of 2006.

GTUC emphasizes great support received from ILO in the last decade, by some described as "ILO helped us survive!" GTUC gradually restored faith of employees in their work (and their constituent members, especially performance of the Teachers' Associations, to (re)start from scratch and regain already over half of its membership back - some 45,000). Support to increase of membership base was one of the activities of the project and by the end of it, the membership reached around 150,000. On the other hand, GTUC should create and widen its training portfolio as well as other services and offer them to its members. Direct cooperation with GEA on this (if not also on many other issues) seems like a good idea, as they cooperated on successful "helmet" campaign for safety at workplaces.

Besides overall/general observations and findings, as well as the ones related to social partners (and with that – to the three specific objectives of this project), like most of the other evaluations, this one was also looking at several criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, as well as some issues of special consideration, like gender. These are reviewed in the following sub-chapters.

3.4. Relevance

As described in the background/context for this project, Georgia in 2013 was going out of the period of "ultra-liberal" Labour Code, bringing back some balances in line with ILS. After almost a decade of practicing previous law, it was not an easy task to start implementing new provisions. Also, the previous attempt (in 2010) to constitute the tripartite commission, was short-lived and it was a high time to try to re-establish it. Finally, both major social partners of ILO went through tough periods in their work and needed new impetus and revitalisation.

ILO designed the project very much in line with these problems and needs. They were very well identified, the proposed interventions were relevant to contribute to resolution of some of those problems, while some of them still persist.

The Project design was very valid, consistent and clear, especially on the level of objectives and expected results, with the three-fold focus on social partners. Some small confusion in the design and further in the implementation of few activities, was noticeable on the level of methodology / instruments used to implement certain activity. Namely, as part of this project it was intended to foster cooperation among the tripartite partners (Government, GEA, GTUC) and with other social partner organizations (e.g. GEA with BAG and GSMEA), while the project objectives were strictly separated per social partner. So, it was not always clear where do belong the activities where both (bipartite trainings for example) or all three of them participate (e.g. meetings of TSPC).

ILO's intervention, as stated already in general observations above, was/is highly appreciated by all the stakeholders. They all emphasized exactly the relevance of the action, great need for social dialogue on national, but also on a company level. Direct support to all three social partners was credited as very timely and helpful (some say even "indispensable") by each of them, although there were partial remarks on equal approach, i.e. that not all partners benefited from the program in the same way/amount.

There were rather few remarks that ILO could have used even more and better its influential role and push for faster implementation of certain activities (e.g. the work of TSPC). However, building trust and maintaining relations with all actors in this field requires time, patience and ILO managed rather well to "keep everybody on board", i.e. motivate them to cooperate with ILO and especially among themselves.

As for the question – what future brings, or what are the further needs, there is obvious need to improve TSPC work, while much more can be done in terms of training on company level. These two actually may continue without ILO's direct involvement, though everyone expects at least their presence and guidance, especially on a higher level and nation-wide issues. Therefore, ILO should maintain its presence as it is highly relevant, keeping the approach of balancing factor among all three social partners, continuing to strengthen their capacities, with a focus on national level.

3.5. Effectiveness

Most of the planned activities were implemented by the time of this evaluation. Remaining ones were scheduled for the last month of implementation. Some of the activities were realised with some delays (ranging from one to few months), but it doesn't seem that it affected the overall achieved results of the project. On the contrary, some more time was needed for strengthening relations and building mutual trust among the main actors in the project, therefore certain delays were justified.

Project deliverables were mainly satisfactory. Most of the interviewed persons valued effects from various activities in which they participated. Scores on individual training evaluation sheets are rather high (above 4.5 out of 5). Appreciation was given for translations of guidelines/manuals on labour relations. Many pointed out the good choice of various consultants/experts that gave adequate inputs when they were called to provide their advice to local counterparts in Georgia. Among the most useful activities, respondents rated the comparative study visit to the Netherlands, which obviously was an eye-opener to most of the involved participants.

It is worthy to mention the flexibility/adaptability of the approaches, both from the side of the donor, but more from the project team, to make adequate changes/adaptations when facing problems like in the case of the second expected result (pilot programs for company level social dialogue in 3

organisations). Namely, after several attempts and numerous consultations with selected companies, it was concluded that the activity will not be supported within the company or will not give the intended result/effect. Therefore it was replaced with bipartite trainings, which after all, appeared to be among the most appreciated activities and most frequently recommended for the follow-up.

Besides the already emphasized achievements, like the re-start of TSPC, or the work on OSH and labour inspections legislation, among of the activities with a striking effect directly contributing to the overall objective of promoting social dialogue, were the direct encounters between workers and employers on bipartite trainings. Not to mention that it was rarely happening that people from the same company would be represented in a training for both employees and employers, this direct work, confrontation on concrete issues and jointly seeking practical solutions was what essentially this project intended to do.

Regarding the progress on indicators towards the overall objective and in each of the three specific objectives, not all numbers were crafted by the time of the evaluation and some were not available in the partners' reports, but on the majority of the indicators there was visible progress. Here are some illustrations in each of the mentioned segments:

- There was an increase in the main two indicators on the level of Overall Objective (OO), i.e. in the number of collective agreements and coverage of workforce by them. Although the number of new agreements was not very big (according to some interviews, only 4), one of them was particularly important, as it covered teachers in the country and not only the members of the signatory on behalf of workers (Teachers' Union) which are currently around 45,000, but actually all teachers whose number is close to or even above 100,000 people;
- Targets for Specific Objective 1 (SO1) were certainly reached with a number of 2 TSPC meetings and 6 meetings of TSPC Working Group – something that was not existent prior to the project. Although some parties were not satisfied with the dynamics of TSPC, it actually raised a number of issues, like OSH, Labour Inspections, mediation and even the minimum wage, that are expected to be processed as laws, amendments to the law, or settlements among partners in the coming period;
- Regarding Expected Result 1 (ER1), Strategic Plan was developed and adopted in January 2016 (around middle point of the project implementation) and according to the assessment by partners at the debriefing session, even after open disputes among them it was concluded that indeed around 2/3 of the plan was implemented (see Appendix 5);
- ER2 seemed problematic in the first year, but with the change of approach approved by the partners (PAC), brought significant results, with 48 companies included in bi-partite trainings (instead of initially planned 3) and almost 200 people participating in them;
- Regarding SO2, although it is not known what is the exact figure of labour issues submitted by employers to its organisations, the services of GEA are appreciated by its members, as shown by participants in all trainings that were part of the project, but also indirectly by the high rate of income received through membership fees;
- Also, the expected results under this objective were mainly achieved. GEA developed its 2-year Strategic Plan (ER3) and its staff participated in planned trainings on ILS and other capacity building activities (at least 35% of the staff in the first year of implementation and up to 60% by the end of the project – ER4). Finally, certain number of employers and their managers were informed about changes in the Labour Law/Code (ER5);
- Achievements regarding SO3, to be reflected mainly in the number of labour management cases initiated by employees handled through their unions, are still to be reported by GTUC and validated, though as mentioned above even with one of them (collective agreement for teachers) significant impact has been done. In addition, concrete cases of casualties in the construction sector and in the mining industry, brought to the action regarding OSH (joint campaign of GEA and GTUC, as well as submitted proposal for law discussed on TSPC level);

- Finally, both results related to GTUC were achieved, by participation of the planned number of workers to bi-partite and other trainings (ER6), as well as by the number of people reached by the campaign to increase membership, which resulted in an estimated rise in the membership from around 110,000 before the project to some 150,000 at the end of it. Of course, not all of that increase may be attributed to this project, but nevertheless contribution of ILO in that respect was important, or even significant.

3.6. Efficiency

It was rather surprising to realise that a project of this size and complexity was conducted by ILO project office with only four staff members, including one international CTA and three national staff (officers/assistants).

This is to emphasize that in terms of efficiency, ILO project office deserves highest marks. Of course, it can always be debated whether an office with fully local staff would be sufficient (and even less expensive than in this case, where half of the budget was used for salaries), but it seems that a rather ideal combination was made in this case, to combine the necessary international expertise (also to keep ILO high standards and its own reputation) with local dedication and performance. This limitation in resources (especially human) perhaps explains some of the delays mentioned previously.

The project (country) office was supported by technical experts from the sub-regional office, as well as the Social Dialogue Unit in ILO's headquarters. In addition, there were also some international consultants and trainers (from Slovenia, Ireland, Germany, Netherlands, etc.) brought to Georgia for specific assignments within the project (audits of social partners, strategic plans, trainings, publications) and also a team of three ILO National Consultants was created and trained, who also delivered already certain trainings and will be available for further engagements in that respect.

The project office regularly monitored the implementation of the activities and produced all reports that were required (annual for 2015 and 2016 and one flash report in between). Collection and availability of data could have been better, as the partners were participative and some of them very responsive too. However, with such a small number of staff, who were also responsible for the implementation of activities in the first place, monitoring and reporting was covered relatively well. The focus in reporting though was on outputs rather than outcomes (only brief statements on perceived progress on each of the specific objectives in the beginning of each annual report).

In terms of costs, again, this looks like a highly efficient project, as many activities were implemented and results achieved with a rather small budget for direct activities. The project was labour-intensive and much of the results were provided directly by the engaged staff, as well as the social partners.

3.7. Sustainability

Sustainability is usually a problematic issue for most of the projects. However, in the case of this project, as all of the work was directed towards local social partners (TSPC, GEA, GTUC), i.e. in a rather institutionalized manner, there is a higher likelihood that the outcomes will be sustained.

The tripartite social dialogue is de-facto institutionalised through the Tripartite Social Partnership Commission (TSPC). Even there were remarks on its performances so far - it is existing, it had a good start and will certainly continue, no matter how big ILO support role will be (or will completely end). It was already stated above, that everyone involved in this project, expect continued ILO presence, but all are prepared to step-in and carry on with the TSPC agenda and improve its work in the future.

Regarding two social partners - GEA and GTUC, they are the obvious leaders in the field of labour relations within their own constituencies and are sufficiently capable of maintaining their efforts for further improvements.

Both GEA and GTUC have strategic plans and training programs and are likely to continue and gradually include relevant (ILO) subjects in their portfolios. GEA seems to be better prepared at this point in time and perhaps may assist also GTUC in developing a similar training curricula, or jointly come to one. Both also expressed the need to expand trainings on company level and in regions.

Finally, the campaigns that were part of the project activities, led to an increased membership (especially with GTUC) and therefore should be continued.

3.8. Special Considerations / Cross-cutting Issues

The evaluation had to look at two issues of special consideration: gender and knowledge sharing.

Regarding gender, although it was not given particular attention in the project document or in the reports (not mentioned at all as a term in the project document and only once and twice respectively in the reports 2015 and 2016), in practice gender balance was relatively well present. Starting from the list of participants in trainings (the majority were women), through persons involved in daily implementation of the project, up to the participants in this evaluation process, the project had gender mainstreaming.

The second issue of special consideration was knowledge sharing and there is plenty of evidence it was going on all the time in various ways. Inputs from ILO international experts coming on short term missions were highly valued by participants in their encounters. There were also ILO national consultants who were trained before and were sharing their knowledge on subsequent trainings. There was certain level of sharing even among the social partners (e.g. preparation of particular documents for the work of TSPC, like GEA was working on drafting policy papers on education and investments), although they should naturally be opposed on every issue. It was already mentioned, that perhaps the most valuable knowledge sharing happened with the study visit to the Netherlands.

In addition to these two required special considerations, there are two more that are regularly checked for ILO projects: International Labour Standards (ILS) and Social Dialogue.

For both we can say that they were very much at the core of this project, with social dialogue being one of the three expected results, while for ILS there were specific activities (mainly training and also small campaigning parts). The project increased awareness on ILS, both among the leadership of GEA/GTUC and their members. As for the social dialogue, as quite a bit was already written in previous chapters, it had a rather good start, but has to be intensified in the near future.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The project was very relevant.

ILO project Promotion of Labour Relations and Social Dialogue in Georgia, funded by the EU, was well designed to respond to the actual needs in labour relations, after the previous interventions that brought about the amendments to the Labour Code in line with the International Labour Standards, so the focus in this period was to enable (again) tripartite social dialogue and strengthen social partners to implement those legislative changes.

Most of the intended effects were achieved.

The project was quite effective. Both social partners (GEA and GTUC) improved their performance and they both clearly attribute much of it to the ILO, including this project. The TSPC was (re)created and is fully functional with an operational Secretariat, though the expectations from social partners from it are quite higher than what it has achieved so far.

ILO was balancing well social partners, listening to their needs, but also openly debating points of disagreements (including stereotypes) when not in line with ILS, ILO Conventions or other standards. Nevertheless, social consensus is needed (especially among GEA and GTUC) about the strategic path of Georgia and then the need is to align priorities in labour relations to that path. ILO's assistance is and will be welcomed to support it, primarily at the national level, with the TSPC.

Rather efficient implementation.

With a project office of only four persons, running at the same time also the much bigger US funded project with the same staff, this project was highly efficient in terms of costs compared to the amount of activities and results achieved. Some shortcomings in delayed activities and incomplete monitoring data are understandable with such limited resources.

Visible prospect to sustain achievements, though with some uncertainties.

Much of the project was about institutionalisation, i.e. creating a functional TSPC as THE institution for tripartite social dialogue, as well as strengthening organisational capacities of all three social partners. This was mainly done, which gives prospects of continuation even without ILO's further support. The TSPC will continue with planned meetings and it should take more regular pace, though in the near future might still need assistance and sometimes "push" from ILO, but also from other social partners.

GEA and GTUC increased their level of products and services and are also expected to continue some (if not many) of the activities (especially trainings to its members) with an increased intensity. They should expand themselves the portfolio and regional outreach, while the ILO's support should remain on national level.

Well addressed issues of special concern.

The project was all about two of the cross-cutting issues that are usually of special concern to ILO – International Labour Standards and social dialogue. The first one was addressed through trainings (after achieving those standards to be incorporated in Labour Code with previous projects/efforts), while social dialogue was the central topic to this project.

Of additional interest for this project were two more issues: gender and knowledge sharing. While the latter was happening to a large extent, gender seemed neglected (rarely appearing in design or reports), but in practice was also well mainstreamed, as for example small majority of participants in activities were women and they were included also in the decision making throughout most of the project, though it should be improved within the employers' associations.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Social consensus is needed on country's priorities.

Georgia has decided for pro-European strategic orientation. However, policies in the last decade or more were not much in line with it, justifying the limitations of worker's rights with the need for economic prosperity. Many of those stereotypes are still very present in Georgian society, resisting to necessary changes on the path to the EU. With the prospect of EU membership still quite far away for Georgia, it is on the country itself and on the issues of labour relations it is to a large extent in the hands of social partners GEA and GTUC to decide whether they will abide to that path and standards anyway or will continue to resist changes to prolong benefits for businesses/employers.

ILO should remain present and active, mainly on national level with all three partners: TSPC, GEA and GTUC.

Work of ILO in Georgia is highly appreciated and its role is respected by all parties, i.e. social partners. Its achievements are visible and many of them may be sustained even without further involvement. However, ILO is expected to continue its support to the country and two major social partners, GEA and GTUC. Perhaps this support should be limited to national level, with a further focus on social dialogue within the TSPC (and assistance in building that national consensus), and maybe mentoring role for GEA/GTUC expansion throughout the regions.

Ambitious plans, good basis for the coming period.

What was achieved through this project was perhaps ambitious. Goals set in each of the three strategic plans were more adequate for 5-year rather than 2-year plans. Therefore, they are a good basis to continue ILO's involvement and gradually achieve remaining and maybe more challenging issues in each of those plans and reach higher levels of consensus in further social dialogue, especially through the TSPC. Adaptation of the planning for the coming period should be with more concrete issues to be tackled (e.g. labour inspections) and adequate targets set, while also a more focused approach will be beneficial.

Further strengthening of GEA and GTUC.

Mentoring role of ILO may remain also in further strengthening of its two social partners in Georgia, GEA and GTUC. They both passed tough period and are grateful to the ILO for its assistance in those times. They are doing well on consolidation of their status, positions in the society and increasing trust among its members (also broadening constituency base), so ILO's involvement may be gradually decreased. However, ILO's support is still needed (and expected), so further close communication and cooperation, perhaps in more mentoring kind of a role may be the best model in the foreseeable future.

Expansion of portfolio and regional outreach of both GEA and GTUC.

Within this project, GEA and GTUC widened their understanding of ILS and other labour related issues and expanded their portfolios with new services (e.g. trainings on ILS), as well as experimented with initiatives in various regions of Georgia. One of the more successful of those experiments were bipartite trainings that emerged as very well appreciated by the participants from both employers and employees "sides". This may be continued by GEA and GTUC together, or with the use of ILO's National Consultants, in further diversification and expansion of their services to new products and regions, also with direct work on company level. They can even cooperate to support the other side where there is no representation (e.g. companies – GEA members, where there is no Trade Union, or companies with strong GTUC presence, which are not members of GEA) for a mutual benefit.

LIST OF APPENDICES

- 1. Terms of Reference**
- 2. List of Interviews**
- 3. Bibliography**
- 4. Project Activities Summary**
- 5. TSPC Strategic Plan implementation progress**

APPENDIX 1. Terms of Reference for the Evaluation

TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOR THE FINAL EVALUATION OF THE

„PROMOTING LABOUR RELATIONS AND SOCIAL DIALOGUE IN GEORGIA “PROJECT
(ENPI 2014/347-044) GEO/14/01/EEC

Donor: European Union - ENPI

Implementing Agency:

International Labour Organization (ILO), DWT/CO-Moscow, Project Office in Georgia

Type of Evaluation: Internal Evaluation

Timing: Final

Date & Duration of the evaluation: 15 days in May-June, 2017 (3 days – desk research, 5 day mission to Tbilisi, 5 days drafting the report, 2 days finalizing the report)

Geographical coverage: Georgia

Duration of the project 30 months: January 2015 – June 2017

Total amount of the project budget: USD 467,217 (EUR 400,000)

1) Background of the project

Over the past years, the ILO has forged an excellent relationship with the Georgian constituents, as well as with others stakeholders such as donors, including the EU, embassies and NGOs.

As demonstrated before, the ILO has played a key role in Georgia in regard with labour legislation and social dialogue. With support from its regular budget, Polish and Dutch funding, the ILO has been helpful in setting up the first national tripartite forum, assessing problems related to the 2006 Labour Code, coordinating with the EU and foreign embassies to advocate for changes in the legislation, developing a framework for labour mediation and finally, in assisting the GoG and Parliament to amend the Labour Code and make it compliant with ILS. The EU is fully committed to support Georgia's program of key political, judicial and economic reforms.

The challenge is therefore to strengthen the capacities of the GoG and social partners for them to be able to implement the newly adopted legislation. In this respect, the ILO received funding from US Department of Labour to improve compliance with labour laws in Georgia. However the institutional weakness is such that additional support is required to create the conditions for a functioning and effective social dialogue, as a mean to promote better working conditions in Georgia.

With its in-depth knowledge of the Georgian environment and the strong credibility from its constituents it has gained over the years, ILO was considered to be in a position to ensure the needed continuity between the labour law reform it has contributed to make happen, and the following step of enforcing it.

The overall objective of this project is to contribute to improve the governance of the labour market through the application of sound and harmonious labour relations.

Specific objectives:

1. Tripartite and bipartite dialogue in Georgia is effectively promoted at national, regional and enterprise levels.
2. Effectiveness of employers' organizations in addressing labour relations issues and in servicing the needs of their constituencies is improved.

3. Effectiveness of workers' organizations in addressing labour relations issues and in representing workers' rights and interests is improved.

Target group(s): Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs (MoLHSA) Department of Labour and Employment Policy, Chancellery of Georgia staff responsible for supporting the Tripartite Social Partnership Commission, Georgian Trade Unions Confederation (GTUC) and its affiliates, Georgian Employers Association (GEA) and their members, Employers' and workers' representatives.

Final beneficiaries: The final beneficiaries will be workers and employers in Georgia.

Estimated results:

1. The national Tripartite Social Partnership Commission (TSPC) is fully operational and capacitated in addressing core labour and employment issues.
2. Pilot programs implemented at workplace level on bipartite dialogue for improving working conditions, reducing labour disputes and enhancing organizational climate and efficiency.
3. The Georgian Employers Association (GEA) has adopted a strategy and action plan to improve its effectiveness in addressing labour and employment issues.
4. GEA capacities in providing effective services in labour and employment to its members are reinforced.
5. The awareness and capacity to respect International Labour Standards (ILS) and national labour law have significantly increased among Georgian firms, more especially small and medium-sized enterprises.
6. Capacities of GTUC staff and elected officials at national, regional and branch levels enhanced.
7. GTUC's representation base increased with a special focus on unorganized sectors.

Main activities: A wide range of services were provided to Georgian constituents (Government, employers and workers organizations) in order to strengthen social dialogue, including, but not limited to: training programs, including development of training materials, advisory services, and planning workshops.

1) Scope, Purpose and Clients of the Final Evaluation

The purpose of the final internal evaluation of the „PROMOTING LABOUR RELATIONS AND SOCIAL DIALOGUE IN GEORGIA“ project is to evaluate progress made and make recommendations on how to improve the sustainability of achieved results. The project evaluator should review and assess the progress and achievements of the project. The objectives and outputs as mentioned in the Project Document will be the starting point of the evaluation. The project should be evaluated in terms of efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and finally sustainability of the project, as they are described below.

Generally, the evaluation will:

- 1) Review the achievements of the Project by assessing to what extent the stated objectives and major outputs have been achieved;
- 2) Review the efficiency and effectiveness of the project implementation;
- 3) Review to what extent the project has been relevant and has met the needs of its target groups;
- 4) Review the likelihood of sustainability of the project outcomes
- 5) Review emerging risks and opportunities.
- 6) Provide recommendations for further action and follow-up.

The internal evaluation will serve the following - external and internal - clients' groups:

- The ILO Project Office in Georgia
- The ILO DWT-CO Moscow
- The ILO Headquarters management and backstopping units
- The tripartite constituents
- The Donor

The evaluation is to be carried out with the participation of the ILO tripartite constituents and will also review joint performance in delivering planned outputs and supporting the achievement of outcomes.

2) Key evaluation questions

This project evaluation should address the progress of the project to date – in this, it should deal with the following main ‘effect and impact concerns’: validity of project design, delivery of project strategy, and project performance. The latter should include relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, causality and unanticipated effects, alternative strategies and gender concerns. Finally, the project assessment should also deal with the lessons learned during the project. OECD/DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance will be used to interpret the answers to the evaluation questions.

Specific questions to be addressed include:

A. Are we doing the right thing?

Rationale/Relevance

- 1) Do the problems/needs that gave rise to the project still exist, have they changed or are there new needs that should be addressed?

B. Are we doing things in the right way?

Effectiveness of achieving expected results

- 1) What progress has been made towards achieving project objectives and is that progress sufficient?
- 2) What outputs have been produced and delivered and has the quality of these outputs been satisfactory?
- 3) Were the events, activities organized by the ILO relevant to the stated objectives?
- 4) Do you find useful the information, analytical materials, technical expertise, guidelines and other outputs of the project?
- 5) Have you received appropriate information on international and regional experiences, modern approaches and best practices?

Efficiency in the use of inputs and satisfaction of intended beneficiaries

- 1) How effectively does the project management monitor project performance and results?
- 2) Has data been collected to measure the outputs of the project?
- 3) Is it necessary to collect additional data?
- 4) Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) been used efficiently?
- 5) Have activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- 6) Have activities been cost effective?
- 7) Did the target groups participate in the formulation and implementation of the project?

Sustainability

- 1) What is the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes?
- 2) What project components or results appear likely to be sustained after the project and how?

C. Are there better ways of achieving results?

Lessons learned and good practices for future application

- 1) What are the major lessons learnt through the project implementation and what are the implications for the project implementation?
- 2) Do you have any suggestions for improvement of future activities or the project as a whole?

Special considerations:

Gender Concerns:

- 1) Have women and men in the target groups benefited equally from the project activities?
- 2) To what extent did the project mainstream gender in its approach and activities?
- 3) To what extent did the project use gender/women specific tools and products?

Knowledge Sharing:

- 1) Has sufficient attention been given to documenting the project experiences and achievements?
- 2) In what ways has the knowledge pertaining to these project experiences and achievements been documented?

3) Have the project experiences and achievements been shared with stakeholders within and outside the ILO (with similar ILO projects in-country and in the region, other donors' projects, government agencies etc.)?

3) Methodology

- a) Desk review: review of project reports and other documentation;
- b) Interviews with the Project team leader, the national project coordinator and the national project assistant; Skype interviews with relevant specialists at DWT-Moscow and HQ.
- c) Interviews with national government representatives as well as employers' representatives and trade union representatives.
- d) Field visit to Tbilisi.

The evaluator will have access to all relevant material on the project from ILO DWT/CO Moscow and the national project office in Tbilisi. The documentation will include the project document, work plans, progress reports, evaluation reports and other relevant documents. Key documentation will be sent to the evaluator in advance.

4) Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

The evaluator should include, but not be limited to, the questions raised in Section 3 in his/her evaluating work and the resulting findings, conclusions and recommendations. The project team will arrange the necessary field visit and share all the necessary project info with the Evaluator.

5) Main deliverables

The evaluator will present an initial report on the ... June 2017 to the evaluation manager. The Evaluation manager will share the report with the project team and relevant stakeholders on ... This will allow the project stakeholders and staff to discuss findings and provide comments and additional information, if need be.

The report should be prepared in English and preferably be no more than 25 pages in length, excluding annexes. It is suggested to structure the report as follows:

- Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions and recommendations
- Project background
- Evaluation methodology
- Description of the current status of the project (stocktaking), per each of the specific objectives
- Findings
- Conclusions and recommendations
- Lessons learnt
- Good practices
- Annexes including the TORs, a list of those consulted by the evaluator

6) Management arrangements, Provisional work plan and timetable

The external evaluation will be managed by the ILO Project Office in Georgia.

It is envisaged that the evaluator will be engaged for approximately 15 working days:

Desk research: 3 days, to get acquainted with the provided documents.

Field visit to Tbilisi: 5 days for interviews with national project staff and stakeholders.

Report writing: 5 days for the first draft

Finalizing report: 2 days for addressing comments and finalizing the report.

The project will cover all related costs.

Timelines: May – June 2017

APPENDIX 2. List of Interviews

Name of the Person Interviewed, Title, Organization
Zsolt Dudas, Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) of ILO Office in Georgia / Project Team Leader
Ekaterina Kharchkadze, Project Assistant
Nika Kochiashvili, EU Delegation to Georgia
Lejo Sibbel, Senior ILS Specialist, DWTST/CO Moscow (via Skype)
Irma Gelashvili, MoLHSA, Secretariat of TSPC
Lika Klimiashvili, MoLHSA, Secretariat of TSPC
Vladimir Curovic, Senior Specialist in Employers' Activities, DWTST/CO Moscow (via Skype)
Gocha Aleksandria, Specialist in Workers' Activities, DWTST/CO Moscow (via Skype)
Tornike Dvali, Adviser, Human Rights Secretariat, Prime Minister's Office
Paata Beltadze, ILO National Consultant
Zakaria Shvelidze, ILO National Consultant
Irakli Kandashvili, ILO National Consultant
Micheil Chelidze, President of GSME (accompanied by Misha Kordzakhia)
Mikheil (Misha) Kordzakhia, Vice-President, Georgian Employers Association (GEA)
Nikoloz Nanuashvili, Analytical manager, Lawyer of BAG (accompanied by Misha Kordzakhia)
Eteri Matureli, Vice-President, Georgian Trade Unions Confederation (GTUC)
Lasha Biladze, ILO National Consultant, GTUC
Mari Alughishvili, Vice-President of Teacher Union (member of GTUC)
Natalia Kordadze, Vice - Presidents of Teacher Union (member of GTUC)
Misha Chigladze, Lawyer, Participant of the Bipartite Workshop (employers representative)
Giorgi Mirtskhulava, Lawyer, Participant of the bipartite workshop (employers representative)
Giorgi Khitalishvili, Vice-president of Railways Trade Union, Participant of the Bipartite workshop

APPENDIX 3. Bibliography

Documents sent to evaluator prior to the filed visit:

1. Project Document
2. Final budget of the Project
3. Work-plan for 2015
4. Annual Report for 2015
5. Flash report (semi-annual) for 2016
6. Annual report for 2016
7. Project Logical Framework
8. Work-plan for 2016
9. Annexes to the Work-plan
10. Report on Strategic Retreat of the Georgian Tripartite Social Partnership Commission
11. Strategic Plan of TSPC
12. Training on Workplace Dialogue
13. Bipartite Training Reports from ILO National Consultant
14. Collective Bargaining Workshop Reports, ILO National Consultant
15. ToR of the Study trip to Netherlands

Documents obtained during the filed visit:

1. ESI: Georgia as a Model
2. ESI: Bandukidze and Russian Capitalism
3. ESI: Jacobins in Tbilisi
4. Regulation on Approval of the Tripartite Social Partnership Commission
5. Mission Report from the Study Trip in Netherlands
6. GEA SWOT Analysis
7. GEA Strategic Plan 2016-2019
8. GEA Presentation
9. GEA Portfolio of Services
10. GTUC SWOT Analysis
11. GTUC Strategic Plan 2015-2017
12. GTUC Communication Strategy
13. GoG Resolution on Establishing Labour Inspection
14. GoG Resolution for Approval of Program on Monitoring of Labour Conditions
15. TSPC Minutes from Meetings (in Georgian language) (3)
16. TSPC Minutes from Working Group Meetings (in Georgian) (6)
17. TSPC other documents (in Georgian) (3)

APPENDIX 4. Project Activities Summary

ILO Project (EU): Promoting Labor Relations and Social Dialogue in Georgia																																					
Overall objective (OO): To contribute to the improvement of labour market governance through application of sound and harmonious labour relations																																					
SO	ER	(PP)	(WP)	Description	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30			
1	Social Dialogue	I	a	111	ILO Guide transl.+training					X	X																										
			b	112	TSPC training													X																			
			c	113	TSPC twining in EU (study trip NL)																														X		
		II	a	121	TSPC strategic workshop + SP														X	strategic retreat																	
			b	122	Advisory/training sessions													X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
			c	123	Evaluate TSPC strategic plan																															->	
	Pilot 2P Dialog.	I	a	211	2P dialogue in 3 organisations																																
			b	212	Avisory workshops in 3 org.																																
		II	a	221	Training program for 3 org.																																
			b	222	Evaluate trainings + seminar																															X	
2	GEA SP	I	a	311	GEA audit						A					W																					
			b	312	Focus groups with companies							FG	W																								
		II	a	321	GEA strategic and action plan											W	SP																				
	GEA capacity	I	a	411	GEA competences + website											T								T			T						G	G			
			b	412	Cooperation mechanism BAG																																
			c	413	Advocacy on training curriculum																																
			d	414	TA to develop training c.culum																				X	X	X										
	Respect ILS	I	a	511	Promote respect for ILS and LC																																
			b	512	Info-sessions on ILS and LC								IS											IS	IS	IS	IS										
		II	a	521	ILS and LC handbook																																
b	522	Info-sessions for SMEs																																consultations			
3	GTUC capacities	I	a	611	Train GTUC members in TSPC																																
			b	612	Deveop ToT for GUTC officials																															X	
			c	613	Select GTUC trainers (15)																															X	
			d	614	Conduct ToT																															X	
		II	a	621	Develop GTUC training plan																																
			b	622	Support to GTUC negotiators																															T	T
			c	623	Monitor and adjust trainings																															X	X
			d	624	Links with regional TU's																																started
	GTUC member	I	a	711	GUTC motivation package																														developed		
			b	712	Develop campaign tools																															leaflets	X
II	a	721	Raising awareness campaign																																many new membe	X	X
	b	722	Evaluate campaigns																																	X	->

A-audit; T-training; W-workshop; G-guide; I-internet/web; FG-focus groups; SP-strategic plan (adoption); X-implemented activity; -> - to be completed

APPENDIX 5. TSPC Strategic Plan 2016-2017 – Implementation Progress

* **green highlight** – completed activity; **yellow highlight** – started activity, work in progress; **red letters** – additional explanations on progress

	Topics	Actions required/Outputs	Indicators/Source of verification
I q 2016	1. European Social Charter (ratification of outstanding provisions) 8 of 10 agreed	1.1 MoLHSA background paper 1.2 Ratification of ESC outstanding provisions	Ratification act TSPC decision TSPC protocol
	2. Development/strengthening of mediation	Working group Concept paper/MoLHSA	TSPC decision No. of working group meetings /tripartite decisions
	3. Ratification of ILO convention 144	Working group initiated ILO technical support (if needed)	Ratification act
	4. Strategic plan approval	Strategic plan (MoLHSA/GEA/GTUC)	Strategic plan developed and approved
II q 2016	1. Pension reform	1.1 GTUC paper 1.2 GoG paper (MoLHSA) 1.3 GEA paper?	Pension reform minutes/protocol
	2. Labour Code amendments	1.1 ILO background paper 1.2 Roundtable 1.3 Working group (MoLHSA)	Draft amendments agreed upon Submission of amendments to Government/Parliament Approval of LC amendments
	3. Approval of list of mediators	Working group (MoLHSA) ILO training of mediators with tripartite input	Agreement on the roster of mediators Protocol
	4. CEACR 2016 report		TSPC decision(s) – follow-up recommendations TSPC protocol
	5. OSH (sent to Parliament)	1.1 Draft OSH law (MoLHSA/GEA/GTUC) 1.2 TSPC approval	OSH law developed/adopted
III q 2016	1. Investment policy (drafted)	GEA Paper	further input by GEA
	2. Education system (drafted)	GEA Paper	TBC by GEA
	3. Institute of Labour Inspection	1.1 LI Round table and RT report on sanctions (ILO) 1.2 Draft legislation/decreed 1.3 Accidents insurance concept paper (GTUC)	Timetable for implementation agreed

International Labour Organization
DWT and Country Office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia

IV q 2016	1. Annual evaluation of TSPC	Annual report(secretariat) Consultation (MoLHSA/GEA/GTUC)	
	2. Approval of plan 2017	Draft plan for 2017	TSPC endorsement of 2017 Plan
	3. Minimum wage	GTUC minimum wage analysis (public defender/ombudsman)	TSPC recommendations TSPC decision (protocol)
I q 2017	1. TSPC piloting in regions	Review of pilot in Adjara experience	Workshop reports/mission reports No. of items agreed by tripartite constituents to be included in the regional TSPC workplan
	2. Labour Market Policy/employment services	Compilation of all ongoing projects/activities (Secretariat)	TSPC recommendations No. of legal initiatives proposed/tasked Coordination mechanisms established
	3. Labour courts/arbitration	Feasibility paper on Labour Courts and the suitability of arbitration in labour disputes	

APPENDIX 6. USDOL Funded Project “Improved Compliance with Labour Laws in Georgia”

In the framework of a 36-month project funded by the US Department of Labour – “Improved compliance with labour laws in Georgia”, ILO, in close coordination with its constituents and relevant partners, will:

(1) Enhance the capacity of the Government of Georgia (GoG) to enforce labour laws and respect ILS by:

- supporting the GoG in adopting a 3-year strategy and action plan to enforce the labour legislation;
- supporting the development and implementation of information and awareness raising tools on the Labour Code for workers and employers;
- assisting in establishing a Labour Inspectorate (LI) in conformity with ILS;
- enhancing the capacities of the LI to effectively enforce the Labour Code;
- training judges on the national labour laws and the judicial use of ILS;
- assisting in reinforcing the capacities of labour mediators and raising the awareness of the social partners on the benefits of mediation to prevent and resolve labour disputes;
- providing technical assistance for consolidating the GoG’s capacity to address labour trends and issues.

(2) Strengthen the effectiveness of Georgian Trade Unions Confederation (GTUC) and its affiliates in representing workers’ rights and interests, by:

- supporting unions in the adoption of a 3-year strategy and action plan to improve their capacities in representing workers’ rights and interests;
- enhancing unions’ capacities at recruiting, communicating and educating members to better represent workers’ rights and interests;
- reinforcing unions’ capacities to serve their members’ needs in labour relations;
- nurturing emerging unions leaders at effectively exercising growing influence and occupying key functions.

The project exercises an integrated approach to assist Georgia in developing a culture of compliance by simultaneously establishing public institutions for inspection, mediation and adjudication, strengthening the capacity of trade unions at organizing workers to negotiate their working conditions and peacefully resolve labour disputes and encouraging employers to respect labour laws and properly manage their personnel.