

**FINAL REVIEW OF THE DECENT WORK COUNTRY PROGRAMME (DWCP) FOR MONTENEGRO
(2019-2021)**

REPORT

JUNE 2022

MARIJA NASHOKU MA, INDEPENDENT REVIEWER (EVALUATOR)

TABLE OF CONTENT

| | |
|---|----|
| ACRONYMS | 3 |
| I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 4 |
| II. INTRODUCTION | 7 |
| 1. Background and Programme Description | 7 |
| 2. Purpose and Scope of Evaluation | 7 |
| 3. Criteria and Questions | 8 |
| 4. Review Methodology and Limitations | 10 |
| III. PROGRAMME STATUS..... | 12 |
| 5. Review of Implementation..... | 12 |
| 6. Results and Achievements by Outcomes..... | 13 |
| 6.1. DWCP Priority One: Strengthening Social Dialogue Mechanisms and Collective Bargaining..... | 13 |
| 6.2. DWCP Priority Two: Creation of favourable conditions for employment and sustainable entrepreneurship | 14 |
| 6.3. DWCP Priority Three: Formalization of the informal economy | 16 |
| 7. Findings by Evaluation Criteria | 16 |
| 7.1. Relevance | 16 |
| 7.2. Coherence | 19 |
| 7.3. Effectiveness | 21 |
| 7.4. Sustainability..... | 24 |
| 7.5. Efficiency..... | 25 |
| 8. Lessons Learned | 27 |
| 9. Conclusions | 27 |
| 10. Recommendations | 29 |
| 11. Annexes..... | 32 |

TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: DWCP priorities in Montenegro | 4 |
| Table 2: Montenegro DWCP Priorities and Outcomes | 7 |
| Table 3: Evaluation Questions | 9 |
| Table 4: Number of respondents according to stakeholder groups..... | 10 |
| Table 5: Montenegro DWCP Priorities and Outcomes | 13 |
| Table 6: DWCP Priority One and Outcomes..... | 13 |
| Table 7: DWCP Priority 1 - Indicators and Level of Achievement | 13 |
| Table 8: DWCP Priority Two and Outcomes | 14 |
| Table 9: DWCP Priority 2 - Indicators and Level of Achievement | 15 |
| Table 10: DWCP Priority Three and Outcomes | 16 |
| Table 11: DWCP Priority 3 - Indicators and Level of Achievement | 16 |
| Table 12: DWCP linkages to SDGs and contribution to the achievement of targets | 23 |

ACRONYMS

| | |
|--------|--|
| DWCP | Decent Work Country Program |
| DWT/CO | Decent Work Technical Support Team/Country Office |
| EAM | Employment Agency of Montenegro |
| EESE | Enabling Environment for Sustainable Enterprises |
| EO | Employer Organization |
| ESAP | Employment and Social Affairs Platform |
| EU | European Union |
| ILO | International Labour Organization |
| ILS | International Labour Standards |
| MED | Ministry of Economic Development |
| MEF | Montenegrin Employers Federation |
| N/A | Non-Applicable |
| OECD | Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| RBSA | Regular Budget Supplementary Account |
| SC | Social Council |
| TOR | Terms of Reference |
| TU | Trade Unions |
| TVET | Technical and vocational education and training |

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Programme Background and Description

The second iteration of the Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) for Montenegro (2019-2021) was developed through an extensive tripartite consultative process including ILO and national constituents. The DWCP supports the national development priorities as informed by the Montenegro Development Directions 2018–2021, advances on the national Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) priorities, and defines the ILO contribution to the Integrated UN Programme for Montenegro¹ (2017–2021). The DWCP for Montenegro was signed in March 2019. The Programme envisions three priorities aiming to help the country address the challenges where the ILO has a comparative advantage in the field of labour and social policies:

Table 1: DWCP priorities in Montenegro

| |
|---|
| Priority 1: Strengthening social dialogue mechanisms and collective bargaining |
| Priority 2: Creation of favourable conditions for employment and sustainable entrepreneurship |
| Priority 3: Formalization of the informal economy |

Two significant changes have affected the implementation of the DWCP in Montenegro: the COVID-19 pandemic and the change of the Government as a result of the 2020 parliamentary elections. The pandemic increased the vulnerabilities of the labour market. According to ILO, employment losses mainly translated into rising inactivity rather than unemployment. The pandemic exacerbated the structural problems of the Montenegrin labour markets from before the pandemic. The main issues are low employment and high inactivity, especially for youth, women, and the low skilled, as well as elevated levels of informal employment². With the new Government, the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (MLSW), being the key counterpart of ILO has become part of the Ministry of Economic Development (MED). The appointment of key senior officials was delayed, which influenced the implementation of the DWCP.

Purpose, Scope, Methodology and Limitations of the Review

The review intends to contribute to programme improvement and learning through getting feedback from relevant stakeholders, and analysing the results achieved from interventions implementation. Whenever applicable, the review is proposing adjustments in the approach and strategies for implementation. The main clients of the review are the specialists and management of the ILO DWT/CO Budapest, ILO country staff, including development cooperation projects, ILO Regional Office for Europe, technical departments at the Headquarters, and UN agencies, donors, tripartite constituents, and national implementing partners in Montenegro. All interventions implemented under the DWCP from its start until the end of May have been covered by the review, as well as the progress made on tangible outcomes directly resulting from ILO contributions have been taken into consideration. The review assessed the achievements as a result of the DWCP implementation and based on the evaluation questions. The review methodology adheres to the ILO Evaluation Policy³, UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation⁴, as well as 2020 Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation⁵.

To produce this report, three channels of data collection were used: document analysis, key informant interviews (21) and group interviews (3 – 9 participants). In total, 30 stakeholders (22 female and 9 male) representing 10 stakeholder groups responded to the invitation by the consultant to participate in the DWCP review. The review process followed the standards of integrity and respect for the beliefs, human rights and gender equality of the respondents. The data collection was conducted online to

¹ Result Area 3 on Social Inclusion

² https://www.ilo.org/budapest/countries-covered/montenegro/WCMS_466561/lang-en/index.htm

³ <https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationpolicy/lang-en/index.htm>

⁴ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

⁵ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866>

mitigate the potential risks from the COVID-19, and to accommodate the respondents' needs for efficient data collection. Due to the current changes in the Government and the structure of the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare some respondents have not participated in the review.

Findings

Overall, the perceptions and findings from the review process are in majority very positive regarding the implementation and achievements from DWCP interventions. The COVID-19 accompanied by changes in the political context in Montenegro have significantly affected the implementation of the interventions in terms of timeline and change of approaches but demonstrated commitment and engagement by ILO and stakeholders to adapt, and use innovative approaches and seek solutions to emerging challenges. Thirteen key findings were identified with the review:

Relevance

1. The ILO DWCP in Montenegro addressed beneficiaries' needs based on what has been agreed during the development of the DWCP, but also to new emerging needs that were not envisioned in the DWCP such as the COVID-19 pandemic
2. ILO consultations with constituents and other stakeholders have been proactive and extensive despite the pandemic and changes in the Government structures
3. COVID-19 pandemic delayed and/or postponed the implementation of interventions envisioned in the DWCP and ILO provided various types of assistance to help Montenegro's counterparts deal with the pandemic impact.

Coherence

4. ILO interventions are aligned with Montenegro's national priorities, ILO priorities in the region and international development frameworks including the SDGs
5. The DWCP has clearly defined priorities and outcomes that include indicators and targets, thus contributing to better measurement of the achievements.

Effectiveness

6. ILO and national constituents made noteworthy progress toward the outcomes under the DWCP priorities
7. ILO's positive relationship with the stakeholders enhances the likeliness of their commitment and engagement
8. DWCP interventions incorporated and promoted gender equality, and other cross-cutting themes and contributed to specific SDGs

Sustainability

9. ILO interventions are highly sustainable, but long-term investments are required
10. Outputs from the DWCP interventions are used and valued by the national constituents

Efficiency

11. Technical and financial resources were efficiently utilized to achieve the DWCP outcomes
12. Current management and governance structures were used wisely to support the implementation
13. The COVID-19 pandemic affected the efficiency of the DWCP implementation

Conclusions:

Section 8 of the review report brings together these findings into seven conclusions.

- 1: The relevance of ILO interventions to national stakeholders' needs was high overall.
- 2: ILO interventions are well-aligned with the national priorities, ILO priorities in the region, SDG goals and broader UN development objectives for Montenegro.

- 3: The clearly defined outcomes accompanied by indicators and targets have guided the ILO and national counterparts to carefully plan the interventions and make progress toward the achievements of the DWCP outcomes.
- 4: ILO's positive relationship with all relevant stakeholders has created an environment that motivated the majority of the stakeholders to be committed and engaged in the implementation and contribute toward the achievement of the outcomes.
- 5: The DWCP was effective in incorporating and promoting the cross-cutting themes. Gender mainstreaming and gender-focused interventions were included in the interventions, although the pandemic has constrained planned interventions in the third priority related to reducing the informal work with a special focus on women.
- 6: The interventions implemented by the ILO are sustainable as in most cases relevant government institutions are involved as partners and/or as beneficiaries.
- 7: ILO has been successful in securing funds for the implementation of the DWCP from third parties and to implement joint interventions with other UN agencies.

Lessons Learned

The review process contributed to the surface of the three lessons learned, as follows:

1. COVID-19 increased the relevance of some programme areas and underlined ways the ILO could assist Montenegro to manage medium- and longer-term recovery needs and coping with future crises more effectively.
2. Diversification of resources to support the implementation of the DWCP is valuable, but it requires a support structure for effective and efficient implementation
3. Changes in the approach while working with beneficiary institutions are important for ensuring continuity in the implementation and reaching the outcomes

Recommendations

Eight recommendations have been developed based on the conclusions and lessons learned:

- 1: Continue to strengthen the social dialogue by building the capacities of the Social Council
- 2: Develop interventions that are essential for medium-term socio-economic recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic
- 3: Improve monitoring of the progress of DWCP
- 4: Strengthen the capacities of the employers' and workers' organizations for responding to crisis situations based on COVID-19 experiences
- 5: Provide opportunities for their national counterparts to share their achievements among themselves by creating a platform for knowledge sharing and networking to maintain their commitment and engagement
- 6: Consider the level of ILO representation in the country
- 7: Plan the engagement of human resources for the implementation of development cooperation projects according to the volume of interventions
- 8: Continue to diversify the work with the social partners and other national counterparts on the local level

II. INTRODUCTION

1. Background and Programme Description

This document presents the review report for the Decent Work Country Program (hereafter called DWCP) for Montenegro 2019-2021. The DWCP for Montenegro is a result of a tripartite consultation on International Labour Organization (ILO) support in Montenegro for the period 2019–2021. The programme was agreed upon at a tripartite strategic planning workshop held in February 2018 in Podgorica with the aim of creating employment, extending social protection, guaranteeing rights at work, and promoting social dialogue as key components of economic and social policies. At the same time, the DWCP supports the national development priorities as informed by the Montenegro Development Directions 2018–2021, advances on the national Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) priorities outlined by the Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support Mission (MAPS), especially SDG 8⁶, and defines the ILO contribution to the Integrated UN Programme for Montenegro (2017–2021), especially Result Area 3 on Social Inclusion.

The main resources for the implementation of the DWCP are being provided from the ILO regular budget, RBTC funding, development cooperation projects and cost-sharing by the national partners.

The overall objective of the DWCP is to help the country address challenges where the ILO has a comparative advantage in the field of labour and social policies. The DWCP has three priorities with a total of seven outcomes.

Table 2: Montenegro DWCP Priorities and Outcomes

| Priority | Outcomes |
|---|---|
| 1. Strengthening social dialogue mechanisms and collective bargaining | 1.1 Increased relevance of the Social Council as a dialogue platform |
| | 1.2 Stronger employers' and workers' organizations |
| | 1.3 New labour legislation is in line with International Labour Standards and the EU acquis |
| 2. Creation of favourable conditions for employment and sustainable entrepreneurship | 2.1 Reduced skills mismatch and in particular among youth |
| | 2.2 Improved efficiency of labour market institutions |
| | 2.3 Enabling environment for sustainable enterprises promoted |
| 3. Formalization of the informal economy | 3.1 Improved public interventions facilitating the transition to the formal economy |

2. Purpose and Scope of Evaluation

The main purpose of the review is to contribute to programme improvement and learning. More specifically, it is to get feedback for improving further collaboration, taking stock of the results to date and proposing adjustments in the approach and strategy if necessary. It is also to ensure internal and external accountability.

In line with the requirements from the TOR, the objectives of the review are:

⁶ Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all

- i. to assess the context of implementation and provide summary of results and achievements per each of the outcomes;
- ii. to analyze the relative effectiveness under each outcome and identify areas for improvement;
- iii. to assess the extent to which international labour standards were mainstreamed in the implementation of activities undertaken within the framework of the DWCP;
- iv. to identify good practice examples and lessons learned;
- v. to assess the programme performance in regard to gender equality and non-discrimination; and
- vi. to provide recommendations for the next stage of cooperation, including possible recommendations on activities, strategies, and design and implementation process, as relevant and appropriate.

The main clients of the review are the specialists and management of the ILO DWT/CO Budapest, ILO country staff, including development cooperation projects, ILO Regional Office for Europe, technical departments at the Headquarters, and UN agencies, donors, tripartite constituents, and national implementing partners in Montenegro.

The review covered all activities carried out under the DWCP from its start until the end of May 2022. The review has taken into account the findings of the evaluation of the EU-funded project on social dialogue that was conducted in 2021. Also, the review focused on the progress made on tangible outcomes directly resulting from ILO contributions.

The following OECD-DAC⁷ evaluation criteria are used within the scope of this review: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, sustainability, and efficiency. As part of the review, within each of the evaluation criteria, cross-cutting issues (gender equality, non-discrimination, as well as aspects not considered/addressed by the programme) have been explored and recommendations provided.

The review was conducted online and the data collection have taken place at the end of April and during May 2022. The consultant maintained close communications and exchange of information with the ILO country staff and has received effective and efficient support in contacting the potential evaluation respondents.

3. Criteria and Questions

As mentioned above, the review is based on OECD-DAC established quality standards for development evaluation. Through the documentation analysis and interviews with the relevant stakeholders, the consultant explored if the DWCP has been relevant and coherent for the context in Montenegro, and has been consistent with the original DWCP document. The review of the DWCP's effectiveness provided answers about the extent to which the DWCP has achieved its objective, the level of the achievements based on the targets for each outcome, triangulated with the feedback from the stakeholders and documentation analysis of implemented interventions including projects supported by other sources.

⁷ <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>

Further to this, the review provided answers if adequate technical and financial resources have been provided to fulfil the DWCP outcomes and the level of efficiently used resources to achieve established targets. The approach of involving relevant stakeholders into the review process assisted the consultant in evaluating whether and to what level the ILO partners are using the outputs and the level of sustainability of achievements.

Finally, in reviewing the above-mentioned criteria, the influence of the Covid-19 pandemic on the programme and the response have been taken into consideration. Gender equality and non-discrimination have been explored within each of the criteria and discussed where applicable. The review also looked at if and to what extent the DWCP design has integrated targets and indicators to capture gender equality and non-discrimination, how they were measured and what were the outcomes. Last, but not least, the review considered potential factors that have facilitated and/or limited DWCP's contribution to gender equality and non-discrimination.

The cross-cutting themes covered by the review include primarily tripartism and social dialogue as well as the implementation of International Labour Standards (ILS). These themes have been examined in each of the evaluation criteria when/if applicable to assess the contribution of the DWCP to the relevance achieved through the social dialogue, but also the contribution of the social dialogue to the effectiveness of the interventions. In addition, the review assessed if and to what degree the DWCP efficiency affected the social dialogue and to what extent have its achievements been reinforced by social dialogue. Whenever applicable, the review examined the contribution of the DWCP in the implementation of ILS in Montenegro.

The evaluation questions were formulated in the TOR and are summarized further in the text:

Table 3: Evaluation Questions

| Evaluation Criteria | Questions to be addressed |
|--|--|
| Relevance (Is the programme doing the right things?) | To what extent do the ILO interventions in the country address the beneficiaries' needs? |
| | What has been the impact of the COVID-19 crisis on the implementation of the programme and if/and how well has the ILO adapted to the crisis? |
| Coherence (How well does the intervention fit?) | To what extent are the ILO interventions in the country aligned with the national priorities (policies and strategies) |
| | To what extent are the ILO interventions in the country aligned with the ILO priorities in the region? |
| | To what extent are the ILO interventions in the country aligned with the SDG's goals? |
| | To what extent did the programme contribute to SDGs fulfilment? |
| | To what extent was the cooperation with other UN entities contributed to the achievement of specific outcomes? |
| Effectiveness (Is the programme achieving its objectives?) | What is the level of progress towards the outcomes under the DWCP priorities? |
| | Are the stakeholders satisfied with the quality of results? |
| | To what extent the results are addressing both men and women? |
| | Are there better ways of achieving the results? |
| | What was the context of implementation? What was the level of commitment and engagement of constituents? |
| | To what extent have the intervention results been monitored and reported in terms of their contribution to specific SDGs and targets (explicitly or implicitly)? |
| Sustainability (Will the benefits last?) | What is the level of sustainability of achievements? |
| | To what extent the ILO partners are using the outputs? |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Are there any emerging priorities that need to be addressed to be taken into account in the planning of new activities? |
| Efficiency (How well are resources being used?) | Have adequate technical and financial resources been provided to fulfil the programme outcomes? If not, what other kinds of resources may have been required? |
| | How efficiently have resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds, etc.) been allocated and used to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader project objectives? |
| | Assess how the management and governance arrangements contributed to the program implementation? |
| | Did the programme provide efficient arrangements for delivery during the COVID-19 pandemics? |
| | Were good partnerships and cooperation provided, with relevant national and local level government authorities, donors and other relevant stakeholders, including the implementation partners to achieve the outcomes? |

4. Review Methodology and Limitations

The review focused on collecting data and analyzing documents related to programme implementation, to obtain information to answer the key evaluation questions, but also to address the cross-cutting issues for all evaluation criteria as requested by the TOR. Additional findings not envisioned or captured through the evaluation questions are also discussed and presented in this review report below in Section 7 – Findings by evaluation criteria.

The review methodology adheres to the ILO Evaluation Policy⁸, UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation⁹, as well as 2020 Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation¹⁰.

The review process applied a participatory approach to include all relevant stakeholders in the review, gathered objective information, explored the cross-cutting issues (gender equality, non-discrimination, social dialogue and international labour standards) and answered the evaluation questions stated in the TOR. Data have been disaggregated by sex to the extent possible. Furthermore, the consultant applied flexibility in order to meet the availability and the capacity of all stakeholders and to satisfy the review request.

The ILO Montenegro team provided a list of potential evaluation respondents and provided continuous support in contacting the respondents and scheduling the interviews. The selection of various groups of stakeholders to be included in the review aimed to obtain different views and perspectives on the DWCP interventions implementation, but also the contribution of the interventions to changes in each of the programme priorities. In total, 30 stakeholders (22 female and 8 male) responded to the invitation by the consultant to participate in the review. The evaluation respondents represented 10 stakeholder groups as presented in the Table below. The full set of individuals consulted to provide evidence for the review is detailed in Annex 3.

Table 4: Number of respondents according to stakeholder groups

| Nr. | Stakeholder Group | Number of respondents |
|-----|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Ministry of Economic Development | 6 |
| 2 | Ministry of Education | 2 |
| 3 | Social Council | 1 |

⁸ <https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationpolicy/lang--en/index.htm>

⁹ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

¹⁰ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866>

| | | |
|---------------|---|-----------|
| 4 | Employers' and Workers' Organizations | 3 |
| 5 | UN and Donors' Representatives | 3 |
| 6 | Agency for Peaceful Resolution of Labour Disputes | 1 |
| 7 | Judicial Training Center | 3 |
| 8 | Administration for Inspection Affairs of Montenegro | 1 |
| 9 | Consultant | 1 |
| 10 | ILO Staff | 9 |
| Total: | | 30 |

The DWCP was designed in a wide consultative process taking into consideration the complexity of the issues tackled, the complex environment and the range of stakeholders to be consulted/involved in implementation. Baseline data wherever applicable were presented in the DWCP document in order to measure the progress toward achieving the targets. This provided a solid basis for programme implementation and achievement of outcomes. The outcomes were ambitious, but realistic given the resources and timeframe of the programme.

The logical framework matrix (LFM) is detailed, and includes SMART¹¹ indicators, means of verification and expected deliverables. There was a sufficient number of indicators on the outcome level to track the progress. Baseline data are also included in the LFM. There is a combination of quantitative and qualitative indicators to capture the changes on outcome level as a result of the interventions. A couple of indicators' definitions are closer to output definitions, which might be challenging for measuring. Targets are defined for each indicator and are a mix of quantitative and narrative targets. Additional findings related to the influence of the monitoring and evaluation process on the effectiveness of the programme are discussed in Section 7.3 – Effectiveness.

The review included both qualitative and quantitative data collection. To ensure objectivity and high quality of the review, the findings were triangulated through the use of different methods of data collection. The following evaluation methods were used:

1. Document analysis – The consultant conducted a comprehensive review of various programme documents, analyses, reports, studies, projects documents and reports from interventions funded by third parties. In addition, relevant national strategies, policies, and UN relevant documents on Montenegro were consulted to collect data. Websites of relevant stakeholders were also explored. The consulted documents in the context of the review are listed in Annex 4. Findings from the document analysis contributed to the answers to the evaluation questions related to relevance, sustainability and coherence. In addition, findings from document analysis contributed to assessing the progress made in line with the provisions of the relevant International Labour Standards.
2. Key Informant Interviews (KII) – The implementation of this method assisted the consultant to gather more in-depth information on perceptions, insights, attitudes and experiences of relevant stakeholders related to all five evaluation criteria. Data collected through this method assisted in the identification of the individual differences between respondents' experiences and outcomes and their reflection on the programme (Data collection instrument can be seen in Annex 5)
3. Group Interviews – These interviews involved program participants that share similar experiences or represent the same institution, and were structured similarly to the KII and included the

¹¹ SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-based

participation of two or more people in each group. Through this method, additional feedback was collected about participants' experiences and insights around programme effectiveness and efficiency. Questions for KII were also used to collect the data through this method.

The evaluation framework was presented in the inception report as a matrix of detailed evaluation questions, indicators and sources of verification (see Annex 1).

One limitation related to the implementation of the review was the Covid-19 pandemic and respondents' willingness to engage in online interaction with the consultant. The consultant conducted the data collection using the ZOOM online platform.

Another identified risk by the consultant was the availability and interest of potential participants to be involved in the review process. The consultant was flexible to adjust to the availability of the respondents to ensure that data was collected while at the same time preferences of respondents are respected.

At the time of data collection, a new Government in Montenegro was voted, the re-establishment of the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare was ongoing, changes in the ministries' positions have already started and several potential evaluation respondents have not accepted the invitation to participate due to the position changes or due to very busy period for them.

III. PROGRAMME STATUS

5. Review of Implementation

The Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) 2019-2021 for Montenegro was developed through an extensive consultative process that included the tripartite national constituents and ILO, reflects the priorities agreed upon among the constituents and supports the national development priorities outlined in the Montenegro Development Directions 2018–2021. In addition, the DWCP advances on the national SDG priorities, especially SDG 8, and defines the ILO contribution to the Integrated UN Programme for Montenegro (2017-2021), particularly Result Area 3 on Social Inclusion. The DWCP was signed in March 2019. The aim of the DWCP is to create employment, extend social protection, guarantee rights at work, and promote social dialogue as key components of economic and social policies.

The DWCP was jointly implemented (including support, funding and monitoring) by the constituents and the ILO. The ILO support is done through technical cooperation projects, advisory missions, and seminars for information dissemination and capacity building. A tripartite Overview Board was established with a clear role to promote the DWCP and monitor its implementation. The Board met twice during the DWCP implementation to review the progress and achievements and suggested necessary adjustments. The ILO National Project Coordinator prepared annual progress reports.

DWCP for Montenegro consisted of three priorities and seven outcomes (three in the first and second priority and one in the third priority). For each outcome, a different number of indicators are defined and the success of the programme is measured through the achievement of 13 indicators.

Table 5: Montenegro DWCP Priorities and Outcomes

| Priority | Outcome |
|---|---|
| 1. Strengthening social dialogue mechanisms and collective bargaining | 1.1 Increased relevance of the Social Council as a dialogue platform |
| | 1.2 Stronger employers' and workers' organizations |
| | 1.3 New labour legislation is in line with International Labour Standards and the EU acquis |
| | |
| 2. Creation of favourable conditions for employment and sustainable entrepreneurship | 2.1 Reduced skills mismatch and in particular among youth |
| | 2.2 Improved efficiency of labour market institutions |
| | 2.3 Enabling environment for sustainable enterprises promoted |
| | |
| 3. Formalization of informal economy | 3.1 Improved public interventions facilitating the transition to the formal economy |
| | |

6. Results and Achievements by Outcomes

In this section, the findings from the desk research and the fieldwork are presented according to the structure of the DWCP – priority, outcome and indicators, including the level of achievements by indicators and examples. The achievements of DWCP by evaluation criteria are discussed in Section 6 – Findings by Evaluation Criteria.

6.1. DWCP Priority One: Strengthening Social Dialogue Mechanisms and Collective Bargaining

Table 6: DWCP Priority One and Outcomes

| Priority | Outcome |
|---|---|
| Strengthening social dialogue mechanisms and collective bargaining | 1.1 Increased relevance of the Social Council as a dialogue platform |
| | 1.2 Stronger employers' and workers' organizations |
| | 1.3 New labour legislation is in line with International Labour Standards and the EU acquis |
| | |

The first priority of the DWCP aimed to strengthen the social dialogue mechanisms and collective bargaining to support effective and efficient collaboration among the social partners. There are three outcomes for this priority, and the progress toward achieving the outcomes, including the priority is measured through six indicators as stated in the Log Frame Matrix.

Table 7: DWCP Priority 1 - Indicators and Level of Achievement

| Priority 1: Strengthening social dialogue mechanisms and collective bargaining | | |
|--|---|---|
| Indicators | Progress | Achievements |
| 1.1.1 Number of recommendations of the Social Council on draft policies, laws, or regulatory and administrative changes | Highly satisfactory Target: 8 recommendations | The Social Council issued 22 recommendations |
| 1.2.1 Number of quality recommendations developed by employers' and workers' organisations on economic, social and labour policies | Highly satisfactory Target: 2 new policy position papers | Employers' and workers' organizations developed 3 position papers |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| including those that take gender aspects into account | | |
| 1.2.2 Number of new or revised services introduced by employers' and workers' organisations | Highly satisfactory Target: 2 new services/products | 3 customized training developed and delivered to employers' and workers' organizations' members Workers' organizations established online platforms for reporting irregularities in employment |
| 1.2.3 Revisited and revised governance and strategic documents of the employers' organisation and program documents of the trade | Highly satisfactory Target: New strategic document developed by the employers' organization | The employers' organization adopted new strategic documents |
| 1.3.1 Legislations taking on board a % of ILO comments adopted, including comments related to gender and disability discrimination, equal pay, sexual harassment, maternity protection, parental leave | Highly satisfactory Target: Adopted Labour Code and Law on Amicable Settlement of Labour Disputes include 60% of ILO comments | 63% of ILO comments adopted in the Labour Code 90% of ILO comments adopted in the Law on Amicable Settlement of Labour Disputes |
| 1.3.2 ILO support to MLSW and social partners to ensure improved application of international labour standards to ensure full compliance with the observations of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR) regarding the application of ratified conventions and recommendations | Satisfactory Target: No target was developed for this indicator as it was added at a later stage in the Log Frame | List of the worst forms of child labour and legal instrument drafted C190 Convention in process of ratification |

Overall, the targets established under Priority 1 were overachieved through the various interventions implemented and/or supported by ILO in collaboration with the social partners.

6.2. DWCP Priority Two: Creation of favourable conditions for employment and sustainable entrepreneurship

Table 8: DWCP Priority Two and Outcomes

| Priority | Outcome |
|---|---|
| Creation of favourable conditions for employment and sustainable entrepreneurship | 2.1 Reduced skills mismatch and in particular among youth |
| | 2.2 Improved efficiency of labour market institutions |
| | 2.3 Enabling environment for sustainable enterprises promoted |
| | |

The second priority of the DWCP aimed to support the creation of favourable conditions for employment and sustainable entrepreneurship. In particular, this priority targeted the skills mismatch reduction specifically among young people, supported labour market institutions to improve their efficiency, and promoted the enabling environment for sustainable enterprises. Three outcomes have been identified for this priority and their achievement is measured through six outcome indicators.

Table 9: DWCP Priority 2 - Indicators and Level of Achievement

| Priority 2: Creation of favourable conditions for employment and sustainable entrepreneurship | | |
|--|---|---|
| Indicators | Progress | Achievements |
| 2.1.1 Adaptions to the dual TVET system carried out based on the recommendations of the evaluation study | Highly satisfactory Target: At least 60% per cent of the recommendations taken on board | Evaluation Study completed and published; 14 recommendations developed; Recommendations incorporated in the Draft Strategy for the Development of Vocational Education in Montenegro (2020-2024) |
| 2.1.2 Tracking system introduced to monitor school to work transition by the Ministry of Education | Highly satisfactory Target: 1 system introduced | Tracking system model for monitoring school to work including road map completed and introduced in 2021 |
| 2.1.3 Number of new or revised prison training and labour market insertion programmes | Unsatisfactory Target: At least 5 programmes | Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, this intervention was not implemented |
| 2.2.1 Percentage of beneficiaries participating in active measures who are employed at follow up | Somewhat unsatisfactory Target: 50% increase of beneficiaries employed at follow-up across all programmes. For the new programmes, employment at follow up rates are within a 15% range of comparable programmes in the new EU member states | A comprehensive intervention has started in the Employment Agency structure, but due to structural and management changes in the Agency achievements are delayed |
| 2.2.2 Number of performance measurements of active labour market measures | Satisfactory Target: A yearly performance measurement of programmes is conducted | Evaluation of the comprehensive Graduate Program Evaluation with recommendations rolled out |
| 2.3.1 Number of recommendations of the national tripartite Enabling Environment for Sustainable Enterprises (ESEE) assessment adopted by the Social Council and in line with the "Programme of Economic Reforms 2019-2021" | Satisfactory Target: Minimum of 3 reform measures adopted by the Social Council based on recommendations of the new ESEE report, of which at least one should be gender-responsive | Progress review of the Enabling Environment for Sustainable Enterprises Programme in Montenegro demonstrates that a number of recommendations have been adopted by the Social Council including the Labour Code, reducing the burden on salaries and minimum wage |

In general, the majority of the targets were in this priority were achieved, except those related to Outcome 2.2., about improved efficiency of labour market institutions, in particular the Employment Agency.

6.3. DWCP Priority Three: Formalization of the informal economy

Table 10: DWCP Priority Three and Outcomes

| Priority | Outcome |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Formalization of the informal economy | 3.1 Improved public interventions facilitating the transition to the formal economy |
| | |

The third priority was intended to improve public interventions and facilitate the transition to the formal economy. In the DWCP, this priority was addressed with one outcome and three indicators.

Table 11: DWCP Priority 3 - Indicators and Level of Achievement

| Priority 3: Formalization of the informal economy | | |
|--|---|--|
| Indicators | Progress | Examples |
| 3.1.1. Government of Montenegro has adopted an integrated gender-responsive programme to reduce informality in line with EU practices | Unsatisfactory Target: Programme has been published | Consultations with stakeholders on potential formalization packages completed The interventions were cancelled due to the Covid-19 pandemic |
| 3.1.2 Ambitious target set for the integrated gender-responsive programme to reduce informality | Highly unsatisfactory Target: Up to 10% of people in informal employment are targeted by the programme | The interventions were cancelled due to the Covid-19 pandemic |
| 3.1.3 Gender-responsive campaign on promoting the transition from informal to formal economy carried out to support the implementation of the "Action Plan for combating the grey economy" | Highly unsatisfactory Target: One national campaign conducted on promoting the transition from informal to formal economy delivering 3 key messages, out of which one is gender-responsive | The interventions were cancelled due to the Covid-19 pandemic |

The targets have not been achieved in this priority due to the Covid-19 pandemic and refocus of the national counterparts on other priorities.

7. Findings by Evaluation Criteria

7.1. Relevance

To assess the relevance, the consultant examined ILO beneficiaries' and partners' perceptions of how and to what extent ILO support reflected their needs. In this part of the analysis, the consultant also explored the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the DWCP implementation and how well the ILO adapted its assistance to respond to emerging needs.

Finding 1: The ILO DWCP in Montenegro addressed beneficiaries' needs based on what has been agreed upon during the development of the DWCP, but also to new emerging needs that were not envisioned in the DWCP such as the COVID-19 pandemic

Feedback received from the national constituents demonstrated that support provided by ILO was highly relevant as it addressed their needs to tackle issues and challenges that have contributed to finding the most convenient solutions. The relevance of the provided support according to evaluation respondents was essential in guiding the national counterparts in the developing and/or changing the legislation such as the Labour Code, the Law on Social Council in accordance with the EU legislation and the implementation of the International Labour Standards (ILS). Moreover, the capacity-building interventions for the members of the Social Council helped for better positioning of the Council and increased the relevance of its opinions and recommendations. The support provided to the employers' and workers' organizations in developing public relations and visibility strategies is considered crucial and relevant by the evaluation respondents from the social partners as it assisted them to be better positioned in communicating with their members, but also relevant government stakeholders and the general public.

The identified needs and the majority of the planned interventions related to the third priority of the DWCP - The formalization of the informal economy had to be postponed due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in shifting the priorities on the government side in this area.

Social partners' representatives expressed their views that ILO managed to balance the support provided to all constituents and that their needs have received adequate attention. Some of the government representatives voiced that while ILO has made efforts to respond to their needs and requests for support, the responsiveness of their institutions and fulfilment of their obligations were obstacles to rolling out the implementations and caused delays in addressing the needs.

Finding 2: ILO consultations with constituents and other stakeholders have been proactive and extensive despite the pandemic and changes in the Government structures

Without exception, all evaluation respondents reported that the ILO approach in consultations to identify, discuss and address their needs both during the development of the DWCP and its implementation were extensive and proactive. The ILO has responded to all their requests timely and professionally. The presence of national ILO representatives in Montenegro and their responsiveness and engagement in the consultations are highly valued and praised by the stakeholders. As one government representative has pointed out, the physical presence of ILO representatives literally in their building helped them to consult them on a daily basis and receive responses to their requests and inquiries fast. The ILO input is considered very relevant for making informed decisions on various issues related to the implementation of the DWCP. The availability and support of the ILO technical specialists assisted national counterparts to discuss extensively their needs and concerns and address them by using the most suitable approach for the Montenegro's context.

Due to the changes in the Government institutional structures after the parliamentary elections and, the DWCP Overview Board experienced an alteration of representatives from the government

institutions, but according to the evaluation respondents, it has not affected the engagement and commitment of the Board toward the implementation of the DWCP.

Finding 3: COVID-19 pandemic delayed and/or postponed the implementation of interventions envisioned in the DWCP and ILO provided various types of assistance to help Montenegro counterparts deal with the pandemic impact.

The COVID-19 pandemic significantly impacted the interventions in the DWCP Priority 3 – Formalization of the informal economy and the interventions in Priority 2 – Creation of favourable conditions for employment and sustainable entrepreneurship related to prison training and labour market insertion programmes. All these interventions were partially or completely cancelled. Other interventions experienced delays in the implementation and wherever possible were conducted online such as meetings, training and other events due to lockdowns and travel restrictions.

The evaluation respondents valued the support provided by ILO from the very beginning of the pandemic and according to them, the ILO adapted fast and responded to the constituents' needs and concerns related to the new circumstances of lockdowns and modalities for continuing the work process in the new setting. The stakeholders articulated a variety of COVID-19-related risks or concerns that had affected the country's progress against DWCP objectives such as the closure of companies, job losses and shrinking of national and international markets and investment. According to discussions with the stakeholders, there are more concerns that need to be addressed aside from the immediate needs needed during the first two years of the pandemic, new needs emerge that should be addressed in the upcoming years such as slow economic recovery in some sectors, labour market restructuring and risk of reoccurring crisis. The documentation analysis demonstrated that ILO responded to the concerns of its national counterparts with a variety of actions.

The Montenegrin Social Council invited EBRD/ILO Task Force to provide support for the development of policy responses against the pandemic and the economic consequences. A Rapid Assessment Report on the impact of COVID-19 on employment and the labour market in Montenegro was developed and offered six policy options for the country for supporting companies, jobs and incomes during the reactivation phase. ILO provided support to the employers' organization to conduct two rapid assessments during 2020, to develop guidelines for companies on managing the workplace during COVID-19 and working from home. In addition, ILO provided support to the employers' organization to develop guidelines on business continuity and step-by-step instructions on how to design a business continuity plan. Based on the findings from the assessments, the employers' organization proposed support measures for companies to the government, some of which have been incorporated in the COVID-19 response package adopted by the Government such as wage subsidies and deferral of income taxes and social contribution, reduced value-added tax (VAT) for the hospitality sector and increased threshold for VAT registration.

Based on the early assessments conducted and supported, ILO in collaboration with relevant institutions have implemented interventions to address COVID-19 impact such as Mitigating the impacts of COVID-19 in the world of work in Montenegro, World of work in Montenegro: paving the road to recovery funded by the UK's Good Governance Fund, Increased capacities for labour market inclusion of disadvantaged women as COVID-19 response measure financed by the European

Commission, and Integrated social protection and employment to accelerate progress for young people in Montenegro supported by the Joint SDG Fund.

7.2. Coherence

The coherence and design validity of the ILO's interventions have been evaluated through an assessment of the DWCP alignment with national policies and its contribution to Montenegro's ability to meet its commitments to regional and international development frameworks. The consultant also assessed the DWCP alignment with ILO priorities in the region and SDGs goals including the contribution to the fulfilment of the SDGs. Moreover, cooperation with other UN entities was explored.

Finding 4: ILO interventions are aligned with Montenegro's national priorities, ILO priorities in the region and international development frameworks including the SDGs

Based on document review and key informant interviews, the evaluation found the DWCP design well linked to Montenegro's overall national economic and social development framework, as well as to specific policy frameworks in areas including labour market governance, and employment services and skills development, and social protection. DWCP has contributed significant inputs to these policy frameworks, leveraging the ILO's research, technical advisory capabilities and pilot project outcomes to influence policy and legal framework reforms.

DWCP supported the national development priorities as informed by the Montenegro Development Directions 2018-2021. One of the key economic priority policies in the Directions is the implementation of systematic solutions in the direction of improving the business environment, financial and institutional support for the development of entrepreneurship, improvement of labour legislation and higher efficiency and productivity of the state administration. These priorities have been incorporated into all three DWCP priorities. The DWCP addresses the reform priorities included in all four Montenegro Economic Reform Programmes developed for the period from 2019 until 2024 in the area of employment and labour market and education and skills.

The DWCP is also well aligned with two regional ILO interventions in the Western Balkans in the period of the implementation of the DWCP - Promoting Inclusive Labour Market Solutions in the Western Balkans and Employment and Social Affairs Platform. Interventions implemented in Montenegro included support to the Employment Agency of Montenegro, but also tackling informal employment, supporting the labour inspection and enhancing the social dialogue.

The DWCP contributed to the Integrated UN Programme for Montenegro (2017-2021), especially Result Area 3 on Social Inclusion¹² and Result Area 4 on Economic Governance¹³. The DWCP outcomes contribute to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals, and in particular Goal 8 (Decent

¹² Result area outcome: By 2021, the population has improved access to quality, equitable, inclusive and mutually reinforcing systems of health, education, protection and decent work.

¹³ Result area outcome: By 2021, the people of Montenegro are benefitting from an enabling institutional and regulatory framework for sustainable and inclusive economic growth based on innovation, entrepreneurship and competitiveness.

Work and Economic Growth), SDG target 8.1¹⁴; 8.3¹⁵; 8.5¹⁶; 8.6¹⁷; and 8.8¹⁸, but also SDG target 4.4¹⁹. The data from the 2021 UN Country Results Report Montenegro²⁰ are showing that 11% of all available funds in Montenegro were invested in achieving the SDG Goal 8. There is regular communication and coordination with the UN Resident Office in sharing information and achievements. According to the UN representative participating in the evaluation, the ILO National Project Coordinator is very proactive and resourceful. Her current status within the ILO structure limits the opportunities for better positioning of the ILO within the UN Country Programme and limits the ILO influence to maintain and increase its relevance within the UN agenda in Montenegro.

Finding 5: The DWCP has clearly defined priorities and outcomes that include indicators and targets, thus contributing to better measurement of the achievements.

This is the second iteration of DWCP in Montenegro and is built upon the review of the previous DWCP, and the participation of all relevant national counterparts. The DWCP monitoring framework includes in majority tangible outcomes and targets. The framework is related directly to planned ILO assistance, rather than proposing general indicators. The benchmarks are achievable, representing results that can be planned and how to be achieved. Progress in meeting targets appears to be more easily tracked for some indicators than others, in particular for indicators that are defined as outcomes. As an example, the indicator ‘2.1.1 Adaptions to the dual TVET system carried out based on the recommendations of evaluation study’ has a clear measurable target, but its definition is closer to defining an outcome and not an indicator. A more clear definition would have been ‘Share of recommendations from the evaluation study incorporated in the adaptations to the dual TVET system’. Reporting the achievements by measuring the indicators on occasions does not reflect the target defined and are only output statements such as ‘report completed and published’.

Monitoring frameworks of the development cooperation projects implemented are clearly connected to the DWCP priorities and outcomes, but they lack clear alignment to the indicators. The review of the monitoring frameworks of the development cooperation projects showed missed opportunities to provide more evidence of the projects’ contribution to the achievements of the DWCP outcomes.

The Overview Board is a very useful mechanism for monitoring and reporting on the progress of the DWCP. The Board during meetings has discussed the progress and the achievements, although from the documentation available and discussions with the evaluation respondents members of the Board it is more evident that the discussions of the Board are more focused on the implementation, rather than the achieved results.

¹⁴ SDG target 8.1 Sustain per capita economic growth in accordance with national circumstances and, in particular, at least 7 per cent gross domestic product growth per annum in the least developed countries.

¹⁵ SDG target 8.3 Promote development-oriented policies that support productive activities, decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and encourage the formalization and growth of micro, small and medium sized enterprises, including through access to financial services

¹⁶ SDG target 8.5 By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value

¹⁷ SDG target 8.6 By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value

¹⁸ SDG target 8.8 Protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers, in particular women migrants, and those in precarious employment

¹⁹ SDG target 4.4 By 2030, substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship

²⁰ https://montenegro.un.org/sites/default/files/2022-04/2021-UN-Country-Results-Report-Montenegro-ENG_0.pdf

7.3. Effectiveness

To evaluate the effectiveness, the consultant explored the level of progress toward the outcomes under the DWCP priorities, the satisfaction of the stakeholders with the quality of results, overarching success factors and constraints, integration of gender equality, commitment and engagement of the constituents and intervention contributions toward specific SDGs and targets.

Finding 6: ILO and national constituents made noteworthy progress toward the outcomes under the DWCP priorities

The log frame of the DWCP includes 15 indicators to measure the progress toward the achievement of the outcomes in each of the three priorities. The findings from the documentation analysis demonstrate that 10 of the established targets have been achieved, although for some of the indicators the achievements are approximate due to the lack of exact documenting of achievements. Three of the targets are partially achieved, while two of the targets have not been achieved. The main constraint that has contributed to the partial and/or non-achievement is the COVID-19 pandemic and the postponement or cancellation of interventions. Evaluation respondents confirmed that given the circumstances in the country – the pandemic, change of the Government and restructuring of the government institutions, in particular, the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, the achievements are the most that could have been accomplished and for many of them go beyond the expectations. The progress toward the achievement of the DWCP outcomes could have been stronger if the development cooperation projects monitoring frameworks were more explicitly connected with the DWCP indicators.

Priority 1 (Strengthening social dialogue mechanisms and collective bargaining) achievements have been in the most advanced stage. The relevance of the Social Council has been improved based on the law adopted in 2018 by increasing the government institutions' representation at the ministerial and state secretaries' level. The introduction of a rotating presidency of the Council on annual basis, according to the evaluation respondents contributed to increased ownership of the social partners and improved their engagement and commitment. As one respondent reported, it is different when you are a member of the Social Council than when you are leading the presidency as with the second role you got to see the volume of work on a daily basis, the level of engagement required and you appreciate more the activities of the Council. Despite the pandemic restrictions and reduced possibilities for meetings, the Council issued 22 recommendations on relevant issues within its mandate.

The Labour Law and the Law on the Amicable Settlement of Labour Disputes have been adopted by the Parliament and a significant share of ILO recommendations have been integrated into both laws²¹. Evaluation respondents believe that the support and expertise of ILO were crucial in the development of legislation that takes into consideration the international labour standards. The ILO C190 - Violence and Harassment Convention is in the process of ratification.

²¹ 60% of the ILO recommendations have been incorporated in the Labour Law and 85% in the Law on Amicable Settlement of Labour Disputes

Capacity-building activities and support provided to the employers' and workers' organizations strengthened their advocacy capacities and active engagement in proposing and discussing measures related to the pandemic. For the workers' organizations representatives, the training events on project proposals development open their prospects for diversification of funding and improving the services to their members.

In Priority 2 (Creation of favourable conditions for employment and sustainable entrepreneurship), targets have been also achieved to a significant level, except for the interventions that as a consequence of the pandemic and shift in the focus of the national constituents had to be cancelled, or as in the case of the support the Employment Agency Montenegro due to the government change, the pandemic and challenges within the institution the achievements have not been yet fully accomplished. The ILO, jointly with the European Training Foundation (ETF) conducted an evaluation study on dual vocational education to address the skills mismatch and recommendations have been incorporated in the draft strategy for the development of vocational education in the country. A tracking system model for monitoring school-to-work transition has been introduced by the Ministry of Education and supported by the ILO. Evaluation respondents stressed the importance of the ILO expertise and support in identifying and developing the most appropriate tracking model. The progress review of the Enabling Environment for Sustainable Enterprises Programme found that a number of recommendations have been adopted by the Social Council such as reducing the burden on salaries and minimum wage. In addition, ILO supported EAM to implement interventions aiming to increase the capacities for labour market inclusion of disadvantaged women as a COVID-19 response measure.

Priority 3 (Formalization of informal economy) has been significantly affected by the COVID-19 as the focus of Government institutions shifted toward addressing the pandemic impact on the jobs and economy overall. Interventions for enhancing the performance of the Montenegro Administration for Inspection Affairs in tackling undeclared work were implemented as well, thus addressing relevant issues related to the formalization of the informal economy.

Finding 7: ILO's positive relationship with the stakeholders enhances the likeliness of their commitment and engagement

Overall, the findings from the discussions with the evaluation respondents demonstrate a high level of satisfaction with the quality of results achieved in collaboration and support by ILO. Without exception, evaluation respondents praised the ILO approach to responding to the needs of the stakeholders and finding suitable modalities to address the needs – whether through training, support by the ILO technical specialists, or support in developing proposals, and policy positions. Many of the respondents, value that ILO has involved them in the process of addressing their needs, thus giving them the opportunity to understand different options and engage in the selection of the most suitable solution for the institution/organization given the context in Montenegro.

ILO maintained open communication with all stakeholders, which according to evaluation participants was extremely important during the COVID-19 pandemic when so many issues needed attention in a short time period. Many of the government representatives reported that at times they wished their side to respond more effectively in the process of collaboration with ILO, but the decision-making processes in the government setting usually involve more levels and take more time.

For the employers' and workers' organizations, the ILO approach and support helped them to strengthen their capacities to participate in the social dialogue, but also to be more responsive to the needs of their members and provide better services to them. Both organizations were actively engaged in proposing and discussing the government measures in relation to the COVID-19. The workers' organization established online platforms for reporting irregularities in employment. For the employers' organizations, the ILO's support in providing evidence-based policy proposals to the Government for combating the consequences of the pandemic on the companies has been of immense importance.

Finding 8: DWCP interventions incorporated and promoted gender equality, and other cross-cutting themes and contributed to specific SDGs

The DWCP document itself has incorporated gender equality in the definition of targets wherever applicable, such as recommendations/opinions issued by the Social Council to include a gender perspective or gender perspectives to be included in the policy positions developed by the employers and workers' organizations. The third priority of the DWCP as originally planned would have directly contributed to gender equality through the interventions planned for the adoption and integration of gender-responsive programmes by the Government to reduce the informality. Due to the pandemic, the focus of the Government shifted. However, ILO supports the Employment Agency of Montenegro to pilot an innovative active labour market programme specifically designed to overcome gender-specific barriers in Montenegro as a COVID-19 response measure.

Six out of eight members of the DWCP Overview Board are women. When planning interventions such as training events the balanced number of men and women are considered. Prepared assessments, and studies reports are always addressing the gender perspective to the extent possible. For instance, in the rapid assessment done by ILO/EBRD the aspect of the level of vulnerability in the employment as a result of the COVID-19 for women was analysed and women in various sectors exposed to vulnerability were mapped.

International labour standards have been incorporated and promoted effectively through the capacity-building activities as in the case of providing support to the Judiciary Training Centre to help the stakeholders to incorporate the international labour standards in the labour-related disputes. Also, ILO provided a comparative analysis of the Montenegro legislation in relation to the ILO Convention 190, but also an analysis of the ILO Convention 154.

The ILO contributed to the reporting of the SDGs on an annual level. The DWCP outcomes contributed to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals, and in particular Goal 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth). The following Table presents the linkages of the DWCP with SDGs and the interventions' contribution to the achievement of the specific SDG targets.

Table 12: DWCP linkages to SDGs and contribution to the achievement of targets

| Type of interventions | SDG |
|---|---------------|
| Technical and vocational education and training (TVET) | 4.4; 8.6 |
| Better environment for workers and businesses | 8.1; 8.3; 8.8 |
| Social Council influence in shaping the national policies | 8.3; 8.5 |
| Improvements in labour legislation | 8.8 |
| Stronger capacities of labour market institutions | 4.4; 8.3; 8.6 |
| Transition to formal economy | 4.4; 8.3; 8.6 |

7.4. Sustainability

To assess the sustainability prospects of the DWCP interventions, the consultant analysed the level of sustainability of achievements, and the utilization of outputs by the national counterparts. In addition, emerging priorities were discussed with all evaluation respondents.

Finding 9: ILO interventions are highly sustainable, but long-term investments are required

Respondents in the DWCP review were broadly optimistic regarding the sustainability of the DWCP achievements and according to their views, the results coming out of the DWCP interventions would be sustained. The document analysis also yielded results that many of the interventions implemented have been largely sustained by the national stakeholders. These include adopted legislation such as the Law on Labour and the Law on Amicable Settlement of Labour Disputes, or the adaptation to the dual TVET system. Stakeholders believe that the DWCP interventions' contribution to laws, policies and strategies support lasting change because once adopted these legal and policy instruments became a relatively permanent reference point for stakeholders' activities. Workers' and employers' organizations' representatives highlighted that participatory formulation processes supported by ILO, although at times long, have created national ownership. Yet, frequent turnover among the decision-makers and at times lack of political will might limit the follow up of achievements in some cases.

In addition, ILO's contribution to institution-building is perceived by the respondents as an implicit sustainability strategy. Many of the DWCP related interventions have integrated capacity-building for constituents, including training their staff and members and introducing new methodologies, models and tools. Such a positive example is the training provided on local employment partnerships (LEPs) to five municipalities that increased the interest of the participating municipalities for further collaboration in implementing local employment partnerships.

Finding 10: Outputs from the DWCP interventions are used and valued by the national constituents

Evaluation respondents expressed satisfaction with the opportunity to use the outputs that resulted from the DWCP interventions either as a guideline for their work or as a basis to further address the issue tackled by developing new activities. The stakeholders highlighted the value of the guidelines, assessments, and analysis related to overcoming the issues caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and found them extremely helpful in addressing the problems. The evidence from the assessments and studies assisted social partners to formulate and propose policy measures in support of the economic recovery in Montenegro.

In the discussions with the respondents, they brought up the need for developing and introducing new activities that will address the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in all three priorities of the DWCP, which they believe will remain relevant for the next iteration as well.

The employers' and workers' organizations are utilizing the outputs from the DWCP interventions as they are contributing to further improvements of their work and engagement with their members, but also influencing the policies. Workers' organizations are utilizing the online platform for reporting irregularities in employment. Employers' organization utilized findings from analysis to develop evidence-based proposals for business environment improvement and advocate for them.

7.5. Efficiency

To assess efficiency, the consultant focused its analysis on administrative, financial and human resources management-related issues, examining stakeholder feedback, but also management and governance arrangements, level of efficiency during Covid-19 pandemics and established partnerships and coordination.

Finding 11: Technical and financial resources were efficiently utilized to achieve the DWCP outcomes

ILO expertise and technical support according to evaluation respondents were essential in achieving the planned outcomes, accompanied by obtained financial resources from different sources, aside from the ILO budget mechanisms. The role of the ILO technical specialists in providing efficient and useful input, facilitation and guidance is highly valued by the stakeholders. Many of the planned interventions required raising additional financial resources, which has been successfully done. The role of the ILO National Project Coordinator (NPC) is considered crucial for maintaining open communication between the national counterparts and ILO technical specialists and other technical resources and as many respondents highlighted, she was available for all their questions, requirements and concerns. Besides ILO in-house technical expertise, whenever needed national, regional and international experts were engaged to support the implementation of the interventions. The DWCP Overview Board has experienced changes in the membership due to the changes in the Government and restructuring of the Ministries. Interventions, achievements, concerns and challenges have been discussed by the Board, although it seems that more guidance and frequency of meetings could have been adequate support for the ILO country team and involved national stakeholders to deal with the challenges in a time of COVID-19 pandemic and changes in the Government structures.

Regional ILO projects and initiatives such as the Employment and Social Affair Platform (ESAP) were also utilized to support the achievement of the DWCP outcomes in various forms: direct support in the implementation, capacity-building activities, knowledge sharing and networking.

The available resources in terms of funds, technical expertise, staff time and knowledge were more evenly distributed among the first and second priority, while the third priority due to the shifted focus of the Government received little attention. The ILO country team has been quite stretched to support the implementation of all interventions, having in mind that interventions supported by third parties required different dynamics of implementation and reporting. According to the evaluation of respondents involved in the third parties' funded interventions, more adequate human resources would increase the efficiency of the implementation.

The DWCP Overview Board agreed on six months extended duration of the DWCP, which gives an opportunity to ILO to complete many of the interventions that were postponed.

Finding 12: Current management and governance structures were used wisely to support the implementation

The implementation of the DWCP interventions has been faced with external hindering factors that affected the efficiency of the processes. Changes in the structure of the Government influenced the functioning of the Overview Board as there was a process for nominating new representatives as

Board members. The Government changes also slowed down the implementation of many interventions due to changes in public officials in the management structures of the institutions and the delay in the decision-making. The lack of willingness by the management structures in the Employment Agency of Montenegro (EAM) to engage in the planned reform caused delays in the achievement of the outcomes. The change in the approach by ILO and shifting the focus on engaging and collaborating with EAM offices on the local level contributed to reducing the bottleneck and moving toward the achievement of the outcomes. The ILO country team, whenever needed has put efforts to overcome the slow response of the institutions by being persistent and using different channels of communication.

Representatives of the donors' organizations and the UN in Montenegro expressed their concerns about the need for more people involved in the management and implementation of the project interventions to increase efficiency. Also, the respondents noted that the current ILO structure for the decision-making on the country level also affects the efficiency, as the NPC does not have responsibilities to make decisions and at times the communication within ILO takes more time. NPC share of information, provision of inputs on joint initiatives and any other requests and communication with the UN office in Montenegro is praised and valued.

The ILO country team is small, compact and highly dedicated to coordinating the interventions within their scope, as confirmed by all evaluation respondents. The documentation analysis, in particular, monitoring and documenting the achievements in a more systematic manner suggest that either different scope of work would have been supportive of these processes, or aligning the reporting processes across different interventions and partners to receive more uniform data and information on achievements. The perception of the consultant is that much more has been achieved than is captured in the various reports. The ILO country team received adequate support, both technical and administrative from the ILO Budapest Office.

Finding 13: The COVID-19 pandemic affected the efficiency of the DWCP implementation

Due to the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic, the DWCP implementation experienced delays, and cancellations, while adding new ad-hoc interventions to respond to the needs of the national counterparts. The lockdowns and online work of the relevant stakeholders significantly affected the efficiency. Yet, ILO adapted quickly and efficiently to the new circumstances and from the very beginning responded to the emerging needs and priorities in the country. Rapid assessments conducted at the very beginning of the pandemic were extremely helpful according to the evaluation respondents to plan the measures and interventions based on evidence and to focus the energy on addressing the needs of the most vulnerable target groups and beneficiaries. The guidelines provided by the ILO related to coping with the crisis were found useful and helpful by the respondents and assisted them to proceed with their work. ILO's fast responsiveness to requests by the relevant stakeholders is highly valued and has significantly decreased the bottlenecks resulting from the COVID-19.

The ILO utilized the evidence from the conducted assessment to obtain funding from third parties to address the pressing issues and maintain the implementation of the DWCP interventions, thus contributing toward the achievement of the outcomes. All involved stakeholders noted that without

the fast response and support received from the ILO, it would have been difficult to continue with the processes and interventions from the DWCP.

8. Lessons Learned

The review process contributed to the surface of the following lessons learned:

1. COVID-19 increased the relevance of some programme areas - The pandemic underlined ways the ILO could assist Montenegro to manage medium- and longer-term recovery needs and cope with future crises more effectively. The ILO personnel, constituents and partners highlighted that the pandemic had reinforced the relevance of some of the ILO's ongoing work in Montenegro in the following areas:

- the relevance of the Social Council as a dialogue platform and the capacity and ability of the Council to be consulted on all important issues from legislation to policies;
- employment skills to help people to enter the workforce and find employment, in particular, the most vulnerable; and
- formalizing the informal sector by creating programmes to create safety nets to remediate the effects of the present and future crises on workers.

2. Diversification of resources to support the implementation of the DWCP is valuable, but it requires a support structure for effective and efficient implementation – ILO and national partners have been very successful in obtaining funds from third parties to support the implementation of the DWCP interventions. Six initiatives have been funded by third parties, with a limited engagement of staff that influenced the efficient and effective implementation. Proper planning of needed personnel for implementing such initiatives is very important having in mind the volume of interventions, the reporting requirements by the funders, and the need for documenting the achievements that will explicitly demonstrate the contribution toward the achievement of the DWCP outcomes and targets. The documentation analysis showed numerous achievements accomplished from these interventions, but it was difficult to identify the attribution toward the accomplishment of the DWCP Outcomes.

3. Changes in the approach while working with beneficiary institutions are important for ensuring continuity in the implementation and reaching the outcomes – the example of the slow response on the behalf of the Employment Agency Montenegro in the interventions related to the improved efficiency of labour market institutions and their importance as one of the key stakeholders demonstrated that alternative approaches were explored by the ILO. Introducing the interventions on the local level with the (EAM) offices shows the commitment to continue with the support of the reform processes by involving additional beneficiaries that can enhance the potential for reaching the planned outcomes.

9. Conclusions

Conclusion 1: The relevance of ILO interventions to national stakeholders' needs was high overall. The DWCP has been developed in a participatory manner and based on the discussions among relevant stakeholders to ensure that all needs and concerns are heard and stakeholders agreed upon the priorities defined. All three priorities identified with the DWCP are still relevant to the Montenegro context. Only for the third priority, as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic the approach toward formalizing the informal economy needed to be changed to meet the stakeholders' needs.

ILO's approach to conducting extensive participatory consultations with all relevant stakeholders and readiness to provide support within its mandate has created an environment for collaboration that stakeholders appreciated. The Social Council as a dialogue platform has increased its relevance and requires attention to maintain its status. The ILO response to the COVID-19 pandemic included timely and well-targeted interventions to help national counterparts face their immediate challenges emerging from the pandemic, but also to plan to address medium and long-term recovery needs.

Conclusion 2: The ILO interventions are well-aligned with the national priorities, ILO priorities in the region, SDG goals and broader UN development objectives for Montenegro. The interventions implemented by the ILO are in the areas where the ILO has the expertise and comparative advantage, which is also reflected in the UN country development framework. Regional initiatives implemented by the ILO in the Western Balkans have been utilized to contribute to the achievements of the DWCP outcomes, but also served as a platform for sharing knowledge and good practices among the stakeholders in the region. The initiatives implemented with funds from third parties had been well linked with the DWCP outcomes and assisted the ILO and national counterparts to work more in-depth on particular issues and address the needs of the most vulnerable. Each of the outcomes in the DWCP has been linked with the SDGs (mainly SDG 8) and the achievements contributed to the achievements of the SDG targets.

The DWCP outcomes are clearly defined and include defined targets and indicators that have provided valuable data (quantitative and qualitative) for measuring the progress, although reporting on some indicators has not been well formulated. Monitoring frameworks of the development coordination projects do not always have a clear alignment with the indicators in the DWCP, thus affecting the actual achievements. The existence of different reporting formats for various interventions including the development coordinating projects contributed to the lack of consolidated evidence on accomplishments and gaps.

Conclusion 3: The clearly defined outcomes accompanied with indicators and targets have guided the ILO and national counterparts to carefully plan the interventions and make progress toward the achievements of the DWCP outcomes. Not in all three priorities equal level of achievements is noted, mainly due to changed circumstances caused by the pandemic and to a lesser extent due to the changes in the Government structures. It is important to be recognized that ILO demonstrated flexibility in providing support beyond the planned interventions to address the needs of the constituents that have resulted from the pandemic but still take into consideration the priorities in the DWCP. The ILO country team and technical specialists provided support whenever asked by the national constituents and facilitated discussions and consultations on the bipartite and tripartite levels. DWCP interventions contributed substantially to building the capacities of key labour market institutions, improvements in the national and policy frameworks and increased capacities of the Social Council and employers' and workers' organizations.

Conclusion 4: ILO's positive relationship with all relevant stakeholders has created an environment that motivated the majority of the stakeholders to be committed and engaged in the implementation and contribute toward the achievement of the outcomes. The ILO activities such as technical expertise, training, and research activities provided the national counterparts with evidence and guidelines to improve the working conditions. Through the technical expertise, the ILO delivered new

knowledge and understanding of the topics to the stakeholders but also has given space to the counterparts to explore the applicability of the potential solutions in the Montenegro context.

Conclusion 5: The DWCP was effective in incorporating and promoting the cross-cutting themes. Gender mainstreaming and gender-focused interventions were included in the interventions, although the pandemic has constrained planned interventions in the third priority related to reducing the informal work with a special focus on women. Through a development cooperation project, the ILO piloted an active labour market programme for women as a response to the pandemic. International labour standards (ILS) have been promoted through the support provided to judges to incorporate the ILS in court proceedings related to labour disputes. The ILO has also contributed to the achievement of the SDG targets for the Decent Work and Economic Growth by linking the interventions/outcomes with a specific SDG target.

Conclusion 6: The interventions implemented by the ILO are sustainable as in most cases relevant government institutions are involved as partners and/or as beneficiaries. The prospects of the achievements such as laws and policies once included in the system to be sustained are very high as in a way they are a reference point for future activities. Other achievements such as capacity-building require more efforts to become sustainable as more representatives need to participate in such interventions to build the institutional memory and take into consideration the turnover in the government institutions. The new services developed by the employers' and workers' organizations once tested and offered to their members can become sustainable, but regular feedback should be collected for their usefulness or the need for changes/upgrade. At the same time, national stakeholders are using the outputs from the DWCP interventions to promote their work, develop new interventions, or formulate policy positions and advocate on behalf of their members.

Conclusion 7: The ILO has been successful in securing funds for the implementation of the DWCP from third parties and to implement joint interventions with other UN agencies. Taking into consideration that ILO's financial resources are limited, they were efficiently used. The same conclusion is valid for human resources – the ILO country team is small but very efficient in performing its tasks. At times, in particular, in the implementation of development cooperation projects, the lack of human resources is evident and noted by the donor representatives. In addition, the level of responsibility and decision making power of the National Project Coordinator reduces the efficiency of the ILO in providing inputs, feedback or influencing the policies and role of the ILO in the UN system in Montenegro.

10. Recommendations

The following recommendations are drawn based on conclusions and lessons learned:

Recommendation 1: Continue to strengthen the social dialogue by building the capacities of the Social Council

The achieved level of relevance of the Social Council in shaping the national policies needs to be sustained and further increased by building the support structures for the Council and increasing the involvement of the Council in policy making. The occasional consultation of the Council on legislation and policies within its mandate should become a regular practice, which is also highlighted in the EU Progress Report for Montenegro 2021 (*Linked to Conclusion1*)

| Addressed to | Priority | Resources | Timing |
|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| ILO Regional Office, ILO country team, SC | High | Medium | Short-term |

Recommendation 2: Develop interventions that are essential for medium-term socio-economic recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic

Based on the evidence from interventions and research related to the influence of the COVID-19 pandemic, new interventions should be developed to address in particular the needs of the vulnerable population such as models and incentives for the workers from worst-affected sectors, women, youth and in geographical regions that were hardest hit by the pandemic. *(Linked to Conclusion 1 and Lesson Learned 1)*

| Addressed to | Priority | Resources | Timing |
|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| ILO Regional Office, ILO country team, social partners | High | High | Short-term |

Recommendation 3: Improve monitoring of the progress of DWCP

It is essential that all achievements on output or outcome levels are documented to measure the progress and are clearly linked with the indicators. This is, in particular, valid for the third party funded interventions, for which different types of reporting formats are used. Wherever possible include a relevant number of indicators from the DWCP in the development cooperation projects to feed the monitoring framework with relevant data. Consider involving the national counterparts in the reporting by introducing templates to ensure uniform data collection on a quarterly basis to support the preparation of annual progress reports. *(Linked to Conclusion 2)*

| Addressed to | Priority | Resources | Timing |
|---|----------|-----------|-------------|
| ILO Regional Office, ILO country team, Overview Board | High | Low | Medium-term |

Recommendation 4: Strengthen the capacities of the employers' and workers' organizations for responding to crisis situations based on COVID-19 experiences

The ILO experience of response and adaptation to the new circumstances resulting from the pandemic should be utilized to support the social partners in developing risk management plans and mitigation measures to reduce the effects of future crises and respond to the emerging needs of their members. *(Linked to Conclusion 3)*

| Addressed to | Priority | Resources | Timing |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| ILO Regional Office, ILO country team | Medium | Low | Short-term |

Recommendation 5: Provide opportunities for the national counterparts to share their achievements among themselves by creating a platform for knowledge sharing and networking to maintain their commitment and engagement

The events organized by the ILO or national counterparts as part of the DWCP interventions, whenever possible and appropriate could be enriched with a session for sharing experiences, networking or even

looking for potential collaborators. National stakeholders are frequently focused only on their priorities and needs, are rarely informed about the activities of others and could benefit from receiving information about others' achievements and efforts that could be implemented in their context. *(Linked to Conclusion 4)*

| Addressed to | Priority | Resources | Timing |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| ILO Regional Office, ILO country team | Low | Low | Medium-term |

Recommendation 6: Consider the level of ILO representation in the country

The current representation of the ILO in Montenegro at the level of National Project Coordinator limits the influence that the ILO can have on country planning processes and the role of the ILO. It is necessary that the representation level is increased for a couple of reasons: to increase the perception of the ILO's commitment to its work performed in Montenegro, to strengthen the ILO role in the country's UN representation, but also in the interactions with the Government, and to contribute to improved efficiency and effectiveness of the ILO work in Montenegro, as well as the sustainability of the achievements. *(Linked to Conclusion 5)*

| Addressed to | Priority | Resources | Timing |
|---------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| ILO Regional Office | High | Medium | Long-term |

Recommendation 7: Plan the engagement of human resources for the implementation of development cooperation projects according to the volume of interventions

When developing proposals for development coordination projects or participating in joint initiatives, the level of effort required to perform the tasks and achieve the targets needs to be planned according to the interventions envisioned. The ILO should utilise the opportunity to engage enough people for smooth implementation. Development coordination projects are of limited time, accompanied by challenges and proper distribution of tasks to project staff significantly increases the prospect for successful and on-time implementation. This is even more important when working with government institutions on a national and local level. *(Linked to Conclusion 7 and Lesson Learned 2)*

| Addressed to | Priority | Resources | Timing |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| ILO Regional Office, ILO country team | High | Low | Long-term |

Recommendation 8: Continue to diversify the work with the social partners and other national counterparts on the local level

The ILO support needs to be further extended to national counterparts on the local level as well in particular in relation to creating conditions for employment and sustainable entrepreneurship, formalization of the informal work, but also to further strengthen the social dialogue on the local level and support the implementation of the labour-related legislation on the local level.

| Addressed to | Priority | Resources | Timing |
|---------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| ILO Regional Office | High | Medium | Long-term |

11. Annexes

Annex 1: Evaluation Framework

Matrix of Evaluation Questions and Data Sources

| Evaluation Questions | Measure(s) or Indicator(s) | Data Sources | Data Collection Methods | Stakeholders/ Informants | Analysis and Assessment |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| Relevance | | | | | |
| 1. To what extent do the ILO interventions in the country address the beneficiaries' needs? | Objectives and strategy of the DWCP to support national priorities The interventions support priorities identified in DWCP of the country | DWCP document Projects and evaluations reports Relevant national documents ²² | Document analysis Structured Interviews | Representatives of tripartite constituents ILO country team ILO technical staff UN agencies and EU institutions' representatives | Identification of relevant national policies and DWCP document Triangulation of data from various sources to assess if the interventions are addressing the beneficiaries' needs |
| 2. What has been the impact of the COVID-19 crisis on the implementation of the programme and if/and how well has the ILO adapted to the crisis? | Number of identified problems/constraints Perception of respondents about the responsiveness to Covid-19 | Program documents Program partners and stakeholders Program partners and stakeholders | Document analysis Structured Interviews | Representatives of tripartite constituents ILO country team ILO technical staff UN agencies and EU institutions' representatives | Identification of problems as a result of the pandemic and activities undertaken to address the problems Assessment of the views of different stakeholders regarding the activities undertaken |
| Coherence | | | | | |

²² Identified relevant documents included in Annex 4

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3. To what extent are the ILO interventions in the country aligned with the national priorities (policies and strategies) | Level of compatibility with national priorities (policies and strategies) | DWCP document Other ILO documents, reports Projects and evaluations reports Relevant national documents Program partners and stakeholders | Document analysis Structured Interviews | Representatives of tripartite constituents ILO country team ILO technical staff UN agencies and EU institutions' representatives | Comparison of the relevant national priorities as defined in relevant national documents with the implemented interventions according to DWCP |
| 4. To what extent are the ILO interventions in the country aligned with the ILO priorities in the region? | Level of compatibility with regional priorities (policies and strategies) | Relevant ILO documents, reports Program partners and stakeholders | Document analysis Structured Interviews | ILO country team ILO technical staff UN agencies and EU institutions' representatives | Comparison of ILO priorities for the region and implemented interventions as part of the DWCP in Montenegro |
| 5. To what extent are the ILO interventions in the country aligned with the SDG's goals? | Level of compatibility with regional priorities (policies and strategies) | DWCP document Other ILO documents, reports Projects and evaluations reports Program partners and stakeholders | Document analysis Structured Interviews | ILO country team ILO technical staff UN agencies and EU institutions' representatives | Identification of SDGs that DWCP interventions should contribute to and assess if the implemented interventions are aligned with the selected SDGs |
| 6. To what extent did the programme contribute to SDGs fulfilment? | Number of DWCP interventions that contribute to SDGs fulfilment | DWCP document Projects and evaluations reports Program partners and stakeholders | Document analysis Structured Interviews | ILO country team ILO technical staff UN agencies and EU institutions' representatives | Assess if the interventions are contributing toward SDGs fulfilment based on the outputs and outcomes achieved |
| 7. To what extent was the cooperation with other UN entities contributed to the achievement | Number of interventions conducted in cooperation/collaboration with other UN entities | Projects and evaluations reports Program partners and stakeholders | Document analysis Structured Interviews | ILO country team ILO technical staff | Assess the interventions in which ILO cooperated and collaborated with other UN entities in Montenegro and |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| of specific outcomes? | | | | UN agencies and EU institutions' representatives | compare them with the achieved outcomes for each DWCP priority. |
| Effectiveness | | | | | |
| 8. What is the level of progress towards the outcomes under the DWCP priorities? | DWCP outcome level indicators targets | DWCP document Projects and evaluations reports Program partners and stakeholders | Document analysis Structured Interviews | Representatives of tripartite constituents ILO country team ILO technical staff UN agencies and EU institutions' representatives | Analysis of the outcomes and outputs and the level of reaching the established targets in the DWCP |
| 9. Are the stakeholders satisfied with the quality of results? | Level of satisfaction among program partners and stakeholders | Projects and evaluations reports Program partners and stakeholders | Document analysis Structured Interviews | Representatives of tripartite constituents UN agencies and EU institutions' representatives | Analysis of the input from different stakeholders involved and/or affected by the implementation of the DWCP and results achieved |
| 10. To what extent the results are addressing both men and women? | Level of consideration of gender equality Disaggregation of data by sex | DWCP document Other DWCP related documents Projects and evaluations reports Program partners and stakeholders | Document analysis Structured Interviews | Representatives of tripartite constituents ILO country team ILO technical staff | Analysis of the involvement of men and women in the interventions, as well as assessing the results if they have addressed both women and men |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| 11. Are there better ways of achieving the results? | <p>The flexibility of the DWCP in the implementation of interventions</p> <p>Alternative solutions to addressing the issues identified with the DWCP taken into consideration</p> | <p>Projects and evaluations reports</p> <p>Program partners and stakeholders</p> | <p>Document analysis</p> <p>Structured Interviews</p> | <p>Representatives of tripartite constituents</p> <p>ILO country team</p> <p>ILO technical staff</p> | <p>Analysis of the potential alternatives that might have emerged during the implementation and have been or have not been considered to achieve the results</p> |
| 12. What was the context of implementation? What was the level of commitment and engagement of constituents? | <p>Level of commitment and engagement of constituents in the implementation of DWCP interventions</p> | <p>Other DWCP related documents</p> <p>Projects and evaluations reports</p> <p>Program partners and stakeholders</p> | <p>Document analysis</p> <p>Structured Interviews</p> | <p>Representatives of tripartite constituents</p> <p>ILO country team</p> <p>ILO technical staff</p> | <p>Assessment of the context in which the interventions were implemented.</p> <p>Analysis of the constituents' commitment and actual engagement in the implementation of the interventions</p> <p>Triangulation of data based on the input from different review respondents</p> |
| 13. To what extent have the intervention results been monitored and reported in terms of their contribution to specific SDGs and | <p>Level of reporting about interventions contributing to the achievements of specific SDGs</p> | <p>Other DWCP related documents</p> <p>Projects and evaluations reports</p> <p>Program partners and stakeholders</p> | <p>Document analysis</p> <p>Structured Interviews</p> | <p>Representatives of tripartite constituents</p> <p>ILO country team</p> <p>ILO technical staff</p> <p>UN agencies and EU institutions' representatives</p> | <p>Analysis of the outputs and outcomes to identify the level of contribution toward specific SDGs and the level of achieving the targets</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| targets (explicitly or implicitly)? | | | | | |
| Sustainability | | | | | |
| 14. What is the level of sustainability of achievements? | Key stakeholders participate actively in the implementation of interventions and results | Other DWCP related documents Projects and evaluations reports Program partners and stakeholders | Document analysis Structured Interviews | Representatives of tripartite constituents ILO country team ILO technical staff | Assessment of the level of integration of achievements in the national policies and institutions, as well as the level of ownership over the achievements by the constituents |
| 15. To what extent the ILO partners are using the outputs? | Examples of outputs used by the ILO partners | Projects and evaluations reports Program partners and stakeholders | Document analysis Structured Interviews | Representatives of tripartite constituents ILO country team ILO technical staff | Analysis of the follow-up actions based on the outputs achieved by the constituents |
| 16. Are there any emerging priorities that need to be addressed to be taken into account in the planning of new activities? | Number of identified problems/constraints | Program partners and stakeholders | Structured Interviews | Representatives of tripartite constituents ILO country team ILO technical staff UN agencies and EU institutions' representatives | Identification of priorities that might have emerged after the adoption of DWCP that need to be addressed Triangulation of data received from different constituents |
| Efficiency | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| 17. Have adequate technical and financial resources been provided to fulfil the programme outcomes? If not, what other kinds of resources may have been required? | Number of identified problems/constraints related to technical and financial resources | DWCP document Other DWCP related documents Projects and evaluations reports Program partners and stakeholders | Document analysis Structured Interviews | Representatives of tripartite constituents ILO country team ILO technical staff | Assessment of the resources made available for the implementation of the DWCP interventions Identification of resources that are needed for more efficient implementation of the interventions |
| 18. How efficiently have resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds, etc.) been allocated and used to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader project objectives? | Level of compliance with intervention planning | Other DWCP related documents Projects and evaluations reports Program partners and stakeholders | Document analysis Structured Interviews | Representatives of tripartite constituents ILO country team ILO technical staff UN agencies and EU institutions' representatives | Assessment of the utilization of available resources in order to achieve the objectives of the programme and support provided to constituents |
| 19. Assess how the management and governance arrangements contributed to the program implementation? | Level of satisfaction by the program partners | Other DWCP related documents Projects and evaluations reports Program partners and stakeholders | Document analysis Structured Interviews | Representatives of tripartite constituents ILO country team ILO technical staff | Analysis of the management of the implementation in terms of the timely flow of information, open communication and utilizing the opportunities for collaboration to achieve results |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| 20. Did the programme provide efficient arrangements for delivery during the COVID-19 pandemics? | Measures taken to improve the implementation based on monitoring and evaluation and feedback from partners | Other DWCP related documents Projects and evaluations reports Program partners and stakeholders | Document analysis Structured Interviews | Representatives of tripartite constituents ILO country team ILO technical staff | Assess the measures undertaken to enable implementation of activities during the pandemics, but also measures undertaken to provide support during the pandemic |
| 21. Were good partnerships and cooperation provided, with relevant national and local level government authorities, donors and other relevant stakeholders, including the implementation partners to achieve the outcomes? | Number of established partnerships and collaboration in the implementation of interventions Perceived level of collaboration and coordination by key stakeholders | Other DWCP related documents Projects and evaluations reports Program partners and stakeholders | Document analysis Structured Interviews | Representatives of tripartite constituents ILO country team ILO technical staff UN agencies and EU institutions' representatives | Assess the partnerships and collaborations established, utilizing the expertise of partners and synergies among different interventions to support the achievements of the outcomes |

Annex 2: Terms of Reference

ILO Decent Work Team and Country Office for Central and Eastern Europe

Terms of Reference

Final Review of Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) of Montenegro 2019-2021

1) Introduction

The International Labour Organization (ILO) evaluation policy (2017)²³ set out the Office's commitment to the systematic use of internal and self-evaluation. The Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) review is part of the process of the DWCP progress monitoring, reporting and evaluation. It is to be carried out with the participation of the ILO constituents and other national partners, as appropriate. It enables the ILO and its constituents to review their joint performance in delivering planned outputs and supporting the achievement of outcomes.

The ILO Decent Work Technical Support Team and Country Office for Central and Eastern Europe (ILO DWT/CO Budapest) has prepared the Terms of Reference for the review of the DWCP for Montenegro in consultation with the Regional Office for EUROPE and in accordance with the guidelines of the Evaluation Office at the ILO headquarters in Geneva.

The review will be a means of assessing the evolving country context throughout the DWCP implementation and providing feedback on how well the ILO and the tripartite partners have been performing under the DWCP, highlighting good practices, lessons learned, and making recommendations on the next steps, i.e. for the new DWCP to be developed in 2022. Another use will be to improve the evaluability of future country programmes through close attention to the results matrices and recommendations regarding the DWCP monitoring system of the ILO DWT/CO Budapest. The review will be coordinated by the ILO DWT/CO Budapest and conducted by an external consultant.

2) Background and Context

Decent Work Country Programme

During the ILO Programme and Budget cycle 2018-19, the ILO DWT/CO Budapest jointly with the constituents developed the Decent Work Country Programme for Montenegro for the period from 2019 through 2021²⁴. The DWCP was signed March 2019.

The programme is focused on the following priorities identified for collaboration between the ILO and the tripartite constituents in the framework of the *Decent Work concept*, which refers to *policies promoting employment, which should be safe and secure, decently remunerated, ensure social protection of workers and their families, give voice to workers, and guarantee equal opportunities and treatment for all*:

²³ <http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationpolicy/lang--en/index.htm>

²⁴ https://www.ilo.org/budapest/what-we-do/decent-work-country-programmes/WCMS_676210/lang--en/index.htm

- Priority 1. Strengthening social dialogue mechanisms and collective bargaining**
- Priority 2. Creation of favourable conditions for employment and sustainable entrepreneurship**
- Priority 3. Formalisation of the informal economy**

The DWCP results framework, including outcomes, outputs, indicators, was developed as an internal document, discussed and amended as per constituents comments.. This Plan enables the Office to organise and monitor its work towards the achievement of a number of outcomes under three DWCP priorities, as follows:

Priority 1. Strengthening social dialogue mechanisms and collective bargaining

- Outcome 1.1: Increased relevance of the Social Council as dialogue platform
- Outcome 1.2: Stronger employers' and workers' organisations
- Outcome 1.3: New labour legislation is in line with International Labour Standards and the EU acquis

Priority 2. Creation of favourable conditions for employment and sustainable entrepreneurship

- Outcome 2.1: Reduced skills mismatch and in particular among youth
- Outcome 2.2: Improved efficiency of labour market institutions
- Outcome 2.3: Enabling environment for sustainable enterprises promoted

Priority 3. Formalisation of the informal economy

- Outcome 3.1: Improved public interventions facilitating the transition to the formal economy

In addition, an HQ-led semi-annual Outcome-Based Work Plan (OBW) review is another mechanism that allows to monitor the progress and status of the ILO assistance to a particular country in accordance with the ILO Programming Framework.

Resource base

The main resources for the implementation of the DWCP are being provided from the ILO Regular Budget, RBTC funding, development cooperation projects and cost-sharing by the national partners.

DWCP Management arrangements

The oversight function over the DWCP rests with the ILO and the tripartite constituents. The ILO National Coordinator in Montenegro is also in charge of monitoring the implementation of the programme and provides periodic updates on the status of implementation.

3) Clients of the review

The main clients of the review are the specialists and management of the ILO DWT/CO Budapest, ILO country staff, including development cooperation projects, ILO Regional Office for EUROPE, technical departments at the Headquarters, UN agencies, donors, tripartite constituents, and national implementing partners in Montenegro.

4) Purpose

The main purpose of the review is to contribute to programme improvement and learning. More specifically, it is to get feedback for improving further collaboration, taking stock of the results to date and proposing adjustments in the approach and strategy if necessary. It is also to ensure internal and external accountability.

The review will provide:

- assessment of the context of implementation and a summary of results and achievements per each of the outcomes
- an analysis of relative effectiveness under each outcome and areas for improvement
- assessment of the extent to which international labour standards were mainstreamed in the implementation of activities undertaken within the framework of the DWCP
- good practice examples and lessons learned
- assessment of how the programme has performed in regard to gender equality and non-discrimination
- recommendations for the next stage of cooperation, including possible recommendations on a) activities; b) strategies; c) design and implementation process, as relevant and appropriate.

The review results will feed into the decision-making by the ILO and the constituents regarding further DWCP implementation and planning. The findings will be used to see what progress has been achieved and what needs to be done next.

5) Scope

The review will cover all activities carried out under the Decent Work Country Programme from its start through completion. It will take into account the findings of the evaluation of the EU-funded project on social dialogue that was conducted back in 2021. The review will focus on the progress made on tangible outcomes directly resulting from ILO contributions (a total of seven outcomes under three DWCP priorities).

6) Criteria and questions

The evaluation will follow the OECD-DAC framework and principles for evaluation. For all practical purposes, this ToR and ILO Evaluation policies and guidelines define the overall scope of this evaluation²⁵.

Key criteria for the review are: 1) relevance and 2) coherence of the interventions 3) effectiveness in achieving outcomes and 4) sustainability of the results.

The review will seek answers to the following generic questions²⁶:

Relevance

- To what extent do the ILO interventions in the country address the beneficiaries' needs?
- What has been the impact of the COVID-19 crisis on the implementation of the programme and if/and how well has the ILO adapted to the crisis?

Coherence

- To what extent are the ILO interventions in the country aligned with the national priorities (policies and strategies)?
- To what extent are the ILO interventions in the country aligned with the ILO priorities in the region?
- To what extent are the ILO interventions in the country aligned with the SDGs goals?
- To what extent did the programme contribute to SDGs fulfilment?

²⁵ https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_571339.pdf

²⁶ The list of questions can be adjusted by the consultant in consultations with the ILO evaluation manager as relevant and appropriate.

- To what extent was the cooperation with other UN entities contributed to achievement of specific outcomes?

Effectiveness

- What is the level of progress towards the outcomes under the DWCP priorities?
- Are the stakeholders satisfied with the quality of the results?
- To what extent the results are addressing both men and women?
- Are there better ways of achieving the results?
- What was the context of implementation? What was the level of commitment and engagement of constituents?
- To what extent have the intervention results been monitored and reported in terms of their contribution to specific SDGs and targets (explicitly or implicitly)?

Sustainability

- What is the level of sustainability of achievements?
- To what extent the ILO partners are using the outputs?
- Are there any emerging priorities that need to be addressed to be taken into account in the planning of new activities?

Efficiency

- Have adequate technical and financial resources been provided to fulfil the programme outcomes? If not, what other kind of resources may have been required?
- How efficiently have resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) been allocated and used to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader project objectives?
- Assess how the management and governance arrangements contributed to the programme implementation?
- Did the programme provide efficient arrangements for delivery during the COVID-19 pandemics?
- Were good partnerships and cooperation provided, with relevant national and local level government authorities, donors and other relevant stakeholders, including the implementation partners, to achieve the outcomes?

7) Proposed Methodology

The review exercise is a participatory assessment of current practice. When conducting the review, in addition to the ILO Office, the tripartite constituents as well as other parties involved in the country programme and targeted for making use of the ILO's support will be asked to contribute and participate.

The gender dimension, social dialogue and International Labour Standards should be considered as a crosscutting component throughout the methodology and analysis. Both women and men should be involved in consultations and the review process. Data should be disaggregated by sex to the extent possible. The analysis should be gender-responsive and assess the relevance and effectiveness of outcomes and strategies for both women and men. The level of involvement of workers and employers organizations in implementation of activities, as well as the use of social dialogue as a decision-making process, should be assessed throughout the review. For each of the results achieved the evaluation should identify to what extent the progress made is in line with the provisions of the relevant International Labour Standards.

The review will apply a mixed methods approach. An external consultant will be hired to conduct the review. The external consultant will conduct a desk review of documentation, interview key

constituents and beneficiaries, conduct a few site visits if feasible and appropriate, analyse the data collected, draft the report, facilitate a presentation for the stakeholders or roundtable discussion of the main findings and prepare the final review report based on inputs received. If travel restrictions are not lifted at the time of the field research, interviews will be conducted remotely using phone/Skype or virtual meeting platforms, as relevant and appropriate (in accordance with EVAL Guidance on COVID-19 implications for evaluation).

Specialists from the ILO DWT/CO Budapest will be asked to contribute to the exercise.

8) Roles and responsibilities

1. DWT/CO Budapest with the help of the National Coordinator should compile relevant documents/sources (see Annex 3):

- Activity/performance reports, mission reports, surveys, studies, research materials produced, minutes of the tripartite constituents' meetings, policy documents, ILO technical comments on national legislation and other documents as relevant and appropriate (per outcome)
- Other relevant background information, including DWCP Implementation and Monitoring plan, DC project reports, reports of external consultants, evaluation reports, etc.
- Communication and media materials
- UNDAF, national development strategies

All the above information for each outcome should be provided to the consultant/reviewer prior to the planned actual review period.

2. The consultant will observe the following workflow:

- Collect DWT/CO input
- Review documents
- Conduct an assessment of the country context during the period of DWCP implementation as relevant for the DWCP outcomes
- Conduct stakeholder interviews
- Conduct site visits if feasible and appropriate
- Document and analyse the findings, prepare the first draft report in English
- Finalise the report in English based on comments received on the draft
- Facilitate a presentation or discussion of main findings with the stakeholders

3. The ILO National Coordinator in coordination with the DWT/CO should arrange a program of interviews for the consultant with the following (as appropriate):

- ILO staff in the country, including project staff
- Government (relevant Ministry)
- Workers' organisation
- Employers' organisation
- UN Resident Coordinator and other UN agencies, where applicable
- Implementing partners and beneficiaries (e.g., people who have received training and/or benefitted from other activities)

4. The consultant in coordination with the National Coordinator will arrange a presentation for the stakeholders, in order to share the findings of the review.

9) Outputs

- The review consultant should prepare a draft report in English and a presentation of the main findings;
- Based on the feedback from ILO staff and constituents, the review consultant should summarize all the findings and conclusions in a final bi-lingual report (English and Montenegrin), including documented good practice cases (see ILO template in Annex 1 to the ToR);
- The final report should provide summary findings for each DWCP outcome based on document reviews and the ILO and partners' comments. Each outcome should be scored against key performance categories, using the six-point scoring matrix (see template in Annex 2 to the ToR, Table 1. Scoring template for summarizing outcome-level findings of the review);
- A final section of the report should highlight overall conclusions and recommendations and recap major issues to be addressed;
- Draft Report will be submitted to the Regional Evaluation Officer for and ILO Regional Office for EUROPE for comments and endorsement, prior finalization;
- The final report should be shared with the ILO staff, tripartite constituents, and partners, who can react to the findings and issues raised, and plan next steps to address these.

10) Deliverables

- Inception Report (up to 15 pages)
- Review Report (up to 30 pages)
- 2-3 Good Practice cases (up to 3-5 pages)

10) Qualifications requirements for the external consultant

The external consultant should possess the following qualifications:

- university degree in economics or social sciences
- understanding of the ILO's values, tripartite foundations and Decent Work approach
- research, interviewing and report writing skills
- knowledge of the country/region
- fluency in English
- knowledge of the Montenegrin language
- ability to analyse and synthesise considerable amounts of information and to draw out the most important issues and points is essential.

11) Provisional work plan and tentative schedule

| Task | Time frame | Responsible person | Unit/ | Consultations |
|-----------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------|--|
| 1. Draft TOR prepared | February 2022 | DWT/CO manager | evaluation | DWT/CO management, Programme Officer, ILO National Coordinator in Montenegro |

| Task | Time frame | Responsible person | Unit/ | Consultations |
|---|--|--|-------|---|
| 2. Internal and external consultations to finalize terms of reference | February 2022 | DWT/CO, ILO National Coordinator in Montenegro | | RO EUROPE; constituents |
| 3. Identification of external consultant | February 2022 | DWT/CO | | ILO National Coordinator in Montenegro, Regional Evaluation Officer |
| 4. Preparation of background documents, materials, reports and studies by outcomes | February – March 2022 | National Coordinator, DWT/CO team, technical specialists | | |
| 5. Meetings scheduled for the reviewer to get inputs from national stakeholders (government, workers and employers' organization, UN agencies etc.) | April 2022 | National Coordinator; DWT/CO | | Constituents |
| 6. Inception phase (including desk review, revision of the methodology and drafting Inception Report) | End March 2022 [6 work days] | Consultant | | |
| 7. Interviews with stakeholders (including with relevant ILO staff) | April 2022 [5 work days, including interviews with the MoL, TUs, EOs and beneficiaries of ILO projects] | Consultant | | ILO National Coordinator in Montenegro; DWT/CO; national tripartite constituents, partners, UNRC, UN agencies |
| 8. Draft report | End April 2022 [10 work days] | Consultant | | ILO National Coordinator in Montenegro; DWT/CO |
| 9. Circulation of the draft report for comments: ILO staff, constituents and other stakeholders | End April 2022 [one week] <i>Deadline to be determined</i> | DWT/CO; Evaluation Manager; National Coordinator | | All the stakeholders (ILO Regional Office EUROPE, Evaluation Officer, internal and national stakeholders) |

| Task | Time frame | Responsible person | Unit/ | Consultations |
|---|--|--------------------|-------|---|
| 10.Finalization of the report based on comments | April 2022 [2 work days] <i>Upon receipt of consolidated comments from the ILO evaluation manager</i> | Consultant | | DWT/CO |
| 11.Outline of key findings (in Montenegrin) | April 2022 [1 work days] <i>To be determined</i> | Consultant | | |
| 12.Roundtable presentation of key finding to the constituents | [1 work day] <i>To be determined</i> | Consultant | | National Coordinator; DWT/CO; tripartite constituents |
| Total number of work days | 25 work days in total | Consultant | | |

12) Payment schedule:

The supplier shall be paid in two equal instalments, the first one following the competition of the inception and the draft report and the second upon the final evaluation report is delivered and approved.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1. ILO EMERGING GOOD PRACTICE TEMPLATE

| Project /programme Title: | |
|--|--------------|
| Name of Evaluator: | Date: |
| The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report. | |
| GP Element | Text |
| Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.) | |
| Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability | |
| Establish a clear cause-effect relationship | |
| Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries | |
| Potential for replication and by whom | |
| Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework) | |
| Other documents or relevant comments | |

ANNEX 2. SCORING CATEGORIES AND TEMPLATE

Based on the research done and feedback obtained from ILO staff and partners, the review consultant could summarize outcome-level findings using the template (see table below) based on the following scoring categories:

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| Highly unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Somewhat unsatisfactory | Somewhat satisfactory | Satisfactory | Highly satisfactory |

ANNEX 3: LIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR DESK REVIEW

- ILO DWCP for Montenegro 2019-2021
- DWCP 2019-2021 Results Framework
- Minutes of DWCP Steering Committees meetings
- ILO Mission reports
- ILO NC DWCP annual reports
- ILO NC quarterly reports for Montenegro
- ILO monitoring/progress and evaluation reports for technical projects
- Studies and other relevant outputs (e.g. guidelines etc.) elaborated within the frame of ILO technical projects implemented in/covering Montenegro
- ILO MNE country factsheet/website
- UNDAF Montenegro document
- UNDAF logical frameworks and reporting
- CCA and RF for the new UNCF
- Contacts of constituents, stakeholders and staff members/specialists who can be part of the interview and/or online survey.

Annex 3: List of Evaluation Respondents

| | | |
|----|-------------------|--|
| 1. | Jevrosima Pejović | MED, Director General of Directorate for Labour and Employment |
| 2. | Irena Joksimović | MED, Head of Directorate for Labour Relations |
| 3. | Larisa Zoronjić | MED, Independent Advisor, Department for Labour Relations |
| 4. | Marko Ćipović | MED, Independent Advisor, Department for Labour Relations |
| 5. | Ivana Šućur | MED, Department for EU integrations and IPA programming |

| | | |
|-----|--------------------|--|
| 6. | Danijela Šuković | MED, Head of Department for OSH |
| 7. | Filip Lazović | MEF, Legal Advisor |
| 8. | Ivana Mihajlović | UFTUM, Legal Advisor, Deputy Secretary General |
| 9. | Ljubica Nikolić | CTUM, Director of Professional Service |
| 10. | Zdenka Burzan | Agency for Peaceful Resolution of Labour Disputes, Director |
| 11. | Maša Adžić | Judicial Training Centre, Head of Department for In-service Training |
| 12. | Snežana Aleksić | Supreme Court, Judge |
| 13. | Ranka Vuković | Supreme Court, Judge |
| 14. | Marko Vukašinović | Ministry of Education, Head of Directorate for Planning and Implementation of EU Funds |
| 15. | Zora Bogicević | Ministry of Education, Head of the Directorate for Vocational Education |
| 16. | Natasa Vukašinović | Social Council, Secretary General |
| 17. | Zlatko Popović | Administration for Inspection Affairs of Montenegro, Labour Inspection Coordinator for OSH |
| 18. | Nina Krgovic | ILO National Project Coordinator |
| 19. | Ines Pajović | ILO National Project Coordinator |
| 20. | Ana Zec | UN Montenegro, Strategic Planning Officer/RCO Team Leader |
| 21. | Miguel Magro Gomez | EU Delegation to Montenegro |
| 22. | Steve Arrick | British Embassy Podgorica, Good Governance Fund |
| 23. | Cristina Mihes | ILO, Unit Head, Labour Law and Reform |
| 24. | Agnes Fazekas | ILO, Programme Officer |
| 25. | Daniela Zampini | ILO, Employment Specialist |
| 26. | Alessandra Molz | ILO, Skills Specialist |
| 27. | Iulia Drumea | ILO, Employers' Activities Senior Specialist |
| 28. | Kenichi Hirose | ILO, Social protection Senior Specialist |
| 29. | Magnus Berge | ILO, Trade Unions' Activities Senior Specialist |
| 30. | Irma Lutovac | Consultant |

Annex 4: Bibliography

| | |
|----|---|
| 1 | Decent Work Country Program (DWCP) for Montenegro 2019-2021 |
| 2 | Minutes of meetings of the Overview Board |
| 3 | Summary of the Findings and Recommendations from the ILO Functional Assessment and Time-Use Exercise Report of the Employment Agency of Montenegro (EAM) |
| 4 | Draft Version of Review of Education and Training Policies in Montenegro Relevant for Youth Guarantee Programme |
| 5 | Developing a new methodology (template) for issuing recommendations and opinions by the Social Council |
| 6 | Mitigating the impacts of Covid-19 in the World of Work in Montenegro – Concept Note |
| 7 | Mitigating the impacts of Covid-19 in the World of Work in Montenegro – Completion Report |
| 8 | Increased capacities for labour market inclusion of disadvantaged women as Covid-19 response measure – Development Cooperation Project Document |
| 9 | Strengthening the operational capacities of the EAM to deliver the active policy on employment of Montenegro through digitalisation (EAM 4.0) – related project documents |
| 10 | Activate! Integrated Social Protection and Employment to Accelerate Progress for Young People in Montenegro – related project documents |
| 11 | Measurement, Awareness-raising, and Policy Engagement (MAP) project to accelerate action against child labour and forced labour – related project documents |
| 12 | Improving labour market governance through effective social dialogue over labour reforms – related project documents |
| 13 | Rapid assessment of child labour in the field of child begging in Montenegro: Mitigation strategy |
| 14 | Impact evaluation of the Professional Training for Graduates (PTG) programme of Montenegro |
| 15 | Analysis of the ILO Convention No. 154 |
| 16 | Comprehensive Comparative Analysis of Montenegro's Current Legislation on Violence and Harassment and the Provisions of the ILO Convention No. 190 |
| 17 | National Occupational Safety and Health Profile for Montenegro |
| 18 | RBTC Request Forms for various interventions |
| 19 | Mission Reports |
| 20 | Integrated UN Programme for Montenegro 2017–2021 |
| 21 | UN Common Country Analysis - Montenegro |
| 22 | EU Country Progress Reports – Montenegro |
| 23 | Montenegro Development Directions 2018-2021 |
| 24 | UN Montenegro, Unravelling connections: EU Accession and the 2030 Agenda – case of Montenegro |
| 25 | Montenegro Economic Reform Program 2021-2023 |
| 26 | 2021 UN Country Report Results Montenegro |

Annex 5: Data Collection Instrument

| For ILO Montenegro Team | Note |
|--|------|
| What are some examples of ways ILO support has had a significant impact on policies, strengthening social dialogue mechanisms, building social partners' and partner institution's capacities, and raising awareness/building knowledge under each DWCP priority? (effectiveness) | |
| <p>In what ways, if any, has ILO built the capacity of tripartite partners to sustain positive results? What more, if anything, should ILO do to effectively transfer capacity to national counterparts to carry on, complete or scale its interventions? (sustainability)</p> <p>To what extent and how did the ILO design strategies to promote sustainability in its interventions?</p> <p>Which interventions were most effective in promoting sustainability? What were the good practices?</p> <p>To what extent and how was the ILO effective in creating national ownership for its programmes? Building the capacity of national institutions to continue key interventions without or with less ILO assistance? Finding alternative sources of funding after the assistance end?</p> <p>What were the financial, economic, social, environmental and institutional factors positively or negatively affecting sustainable results?</p> | |
| <p>How satisfied do you think social partners are with ILO's support in the last three years? What are some examples of ways they are satisfied? What are some examples of issues/areas of work on which they have expressed dissatisfaction? (relevance, coherence)</p> <p>What were the main gaps, if any?</p> <p>What might ILO have done to meet the constituents' needs better?</p> | |
| <p>What were the key factors that contributed to successful ILO interventions in Montenegro? (effectiveness)</p> <p>Were there any important good practices that might be replicated in Montenegro or elsewhere?</p> | |
| What were the main internal constraints or challenges that hindered progress? (coherence, effectiveness) | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>In what ways has the way ILO designs the interventions been effective? In what ways could it be improved?</p> <p>How effective was your communication/coordination with the colleagues that were implementing interventions related to DWCP? What were the main challenges? What were the lessons learned and/or good practices?</p> | |
| <p>What were the main external constraints or challenges that hindered progress? (relevance, coherence and effectiveness) To what extent did ILO identify and mitigate risks affecting programme performance? What were the lessons learned and/or good practices?</p> | |
| <p>To what extent and how has ILO's Covid-19 response been effective? (Covid-19 cross-cutting)</p> <p>In what ways, if at all, has ILO support contributed to the country's immediate response to the Covid-19 pandemic? To what extent has ILO support assessed and begun addressing the country's longer term recovery needs? What are the most important examples of each?</p> <p>In what ways did you facilitate an effective and coherent response to COVID-19 by the ILO in Montenegro?</p> <p>How has ILO adjusted the way it conducts its interventions to cope with Covid-19 restrictions? Have there been any lessons learned that might be useful when restrictions are lifted?</p> | |
| <p>How, if at all, has ILO integrated cross-cutting concerns related to International Labour Standards (ILS) social dialogue, gender and non-discrimination, into its intervention strategies? (effectiveness)</p> <p>Is there anything that ILO might do to promote ILS and social dialogue through its interventions more effectively? Is there anything that the ILO might do to address women's and girls' needs more effectively?</p> | |
| <p>In what ways have ILO interventions used available human and other resources efficiently? In what ways could the efficiency be improved? (efficiency)</p> | |
| <p>How satisfied are you with the support the DWCP has received from the DWT/CO?</p> <p>What are examples of positive contributions? What are your suggestions regarding how to make the contributions from this office more strategic/effective?</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| To what extent and how have you monitored progress against DWCP objectives? What role, if any have project and programme evaluations played in ILO effectiveness in Montenegro? (coherence, effectiveness) How could evaluations be made more useful to you? | |
| To what extent are the ILO interventions in the country aligned with the national priorities (policies and strategies)? With the ILO priorities in the region? With the SDGs goals? (coherence) To what extent did the programme contribute to SDGs fulfilment? | |
| Did ILO coordinate its efforts with other UN organizations effectively? With other International Development Cooperation partners? How? In what ways, if any, could ILO be more effective coordinating/collaborating with other international organizations to promote its Decent Work Agenda? (coherence, effectiveness) | |

| For ILO Technical Specialists | Note |
|--|-------------|
| What assistance did you provide? | |
| What were the main results? Were there any unexpected results? If so, what were they? | |
| What are some examples of ways your support has had a significant impact on policies, building partners' capacities, and raising awareness/building knowledge in your intervention area? What factors contributed to or hindered higher-level impact? (effectiveness) | |
| In what ways, if any, has ILO built the capacity of the social partners to sustain the positive results in your area of intervention? What more, if anything, should ILO do to effectively transfer capacity to national counterparts to carry on, complete or scale its interventions? (sustainability) To what extent and how did the ILO design strategies to promote sustainability in its interventions? Which strategies were most effective in promoting sustainability? To what extent and how was the ILO effective in creating national ownership for its programmes in your area of intervention? What were the financial, economic, social, environmental and institutional factors positively or negatively affecting sustainable results? | |

| | |
|---|-------------|
| How satisfied do you think social partners are with ILO's support in your intervention area in the last three years? What are some examples of ways they are satisfied? What are some examples of issues/areas of work on which they have expressed dissatisfaction? (relevance, coherence) What might ILO have done to meet the constituents' needs better? | |
| What were the main constraints or challenges (both internal and external) that hindered your effectiveness? (coherence, effectiveness) What were the lessons learned and/or good practices? | |
| To what extent and how has ILO's Covid-19 response been effective? (Covid-19 cross-cutting) In what ways did you contribute to the ILO's response to COVID-19 in Montenegro? How has ILO adjusted the way it conducts its interventions to cope with Covid-19 restrictions? Have there been any lessons learned that might be useful when restrictions are lifted? | |
| How, if at all, has ILO integrated cross-cutting concerns related to International Labour Standards (ILS), social dialogue, gender and non-discrimination, into its intervention strategies in your intervention area? (effectiveness) Is there anything that ILO might do to promote ILS and social dialogue through its interventions more effectively? Is there anything that the ILO might do to address women's and girls' needs more effectively? | |
| In what ways have ILO interventions used available human and other resources efficiently in your intervention area? In what ways could the efficiency be improved? (efficiency) | |
| In what ways, if at all, has the DWT monitored its contributions to achieving DWCP objectives in Montenegro? (coherence, effectiveness) | |
| Did ILO coordinate its efforts with other UN organizations effectively in your intervention area? With other International Development Cooperation partners? How? In what ways, if any, could ILO be more effective coordinating/collaborating with other international organizations in your intervention area? (coherence, effectiveness) | |
| For Social Partners, other institutions and beneficiaries | Note |
| To what extent did ILO align its assistance to your organization/institution's needs and priorities? Has ILO assistance been flexible enough to changing needs and priorities? | |

| | |
|---|--|
| How effectively did ILO engage with your organization/institution in developing the DWCP? | |
| To what extent has ILO support contributed to progress toward the DWCP objectives? What examples are there of significant impact on laws/policies, building capacities, raising awareness/building knowledge? How satisfied are you with the quality of results? (effectiveness) | |
| What were the main external constraints or challenges that hindered progress? (effectiveness) | |
| How effective was the ILO Montenegro team's communication/coordination with the constituents? What were the lessons learned and/or good practices? | |
| To what extent and how has ILO's Covid-19 response been effective? (Covid-19 cross-cutting) In what ways, if at all, has ILO support contributed to the country's immediate response to the Covid-19 pandemic? To what extent has ILO support assessed and begun addressing the country's longer term recovery needs? What are the most important examples of each? In what ways did the ILO Montenegro team facilitate an effective and coherent response to COVID-19 by the ILO in Montenegro? How did ILO try to shape country strategies to address the immediate and long-term effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on employers and workers? To what extent and in what ways was the ILO successful or may be successful? | |
| In what ways have ILO interventions used available human and other resources efficiently? In what ways could the efficiency be improved? (efficiency) | |
| Did ILO coordinate its efforts with other UN organizations effectively? With other International Development Cooperation partners? How? In what ways, if any, could ILO be more effective coordinating/collaborating with other international organizations to promote DWCP? (coherence, effectiveness) | |
| In what ways has ILO contributed to creating and sharing knowledge and/or raising awareness on issues affecting progress toward achieving the objectives of the DWCP? (effectiveness) | |
| In what ways, if any, has ILO built the capacity of social partners to sustain positive results? What more, if anything, should ILO do to effectively transfer capacity to national counterparts to carry on, complete or scale its interventions? (sustainability) | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>To what extent and how did the ILO design strategies to promote sustainability into its interventions? Which interventions addressing the DWCP priorities were most effective in promoting sustainability? What were the good practices?</p> <p>To what extent and how was the ILO effective in creating national ownership for the DWCP?</p> <p>What were the financial, economic, social, environmental and institutional factors positively or negatively affecting sustainable results?</p> | |
| <p>What are the ILO's overall strengths and weaknesses in Montenegro? (relevance, coherence)</p> <p>What were the lessons learned and/or good practices?</p> | |

| For Donor, Implementing partners, Other UN and International Organizations | Note |
|--|-------------|
| <p>In what ways have you and your organization collaborated with the ILO in Montenegro? What have been the main achievements coming out of your collaboration with the ILO?</p> | |
| <p>In what ways, if any, has ILO support had a significant impact on laws/policies, building social partners' capacities, and raising awareness/building knowledge in Montenegro?</p> | |
| <p>What factors in the country's enabling environment have helped or hindered progress in the areas where your organization and the ILO have collaborated?</p> | |
| <p>Based on your experience, what are ILO's strengths or comparative advantages in Montenegro? What are areas where ILO is less well adapted to provide effective assistance?</p> <p>What are some examples of interventions that illustrate ILO's key strengths and weaknesses?</p> | |
| <p>What suggestions do you have for the ILO? How might the organization be more effective coordinating/collaborating with other international organizations to promote its DWCP and/or to support progress toward the SDGs in Montenegro?</p> | |