



International Labour Organization

iTrack

Evaluation Unit (EVAL)

ILO - EVALUATION

- **Evaluation Title:** “2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme funded projects in ASEAN, Thailand, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam”
- **ILO TC/SYMBOL :** RAS/17/50/KOR-RAS/17/51/KOR-RAS/17/53/KOR
- **Type of Evaluation:** Independent Final Evaluation
- **Country:** ASEAN countries
- **Date of the evaluation:** June-July 2020
- **Name of consultant(s):** Pierre Mahy
- **Administrative Office:** Regional Office for Asia & the Pacific (ROAP)
- **Technical Backstopping Office:** DWT-Bangkok
- **Date project ends:** December 2020
- **Donor: country and budget** Ministry of Employment and Labour of the Republic of Korea (US\$ 3,000,000)
- **Evaluation Manager:** Rattaporn Pongpattana
- **Key Words:** skills, OSH, social protection, Cambodia, Lao, Myanmar, Vietnam

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO’s evaluation policies and procedures. It has been quality controlled by the ILO Evaluation Office

Table of Contents

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
2 PROGRAMME BACKGROUND - INTERVENTION LOGIC.....	8
3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS.....	12
3.1 PURPOSE, SCOPE AND BENEFICIARIES OF THE EVALUATION	12
3.2 EVALUATION QUESTIONS (EQ)	<u>1314</u>
3.3 METHODOLOGY	<u>1415</u>
3.4 LIMITATIONS	<u>1617</u>
4 FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	<u>1819</u>
4.1 RELEVANCE AND DESIGN	<u>1819</u>
4.2 COHERENCE AND STRATEGIC FIT	<u>2122</u>
4.3 EFFECTIVENESS	<u>2324</u>
4.4 EFFECTIVENESS OF MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENT	<u>2930</u>
4.5 EFFICIENCY OF RESOURCE USE	<u>3233</u>
4.6 IMPACT	<u>3334</u>
4.7 SUSTAINABILITY	<u>3536</u>
4.8 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES	<u>3738</u>
4.9 COVID-19	<u>3839</u>
5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	<u>4041</u>
5.1 OVERALL ASSESSMENT	<u>4041</u>
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	<u>4041</u>
6 LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES	<u>4546</u>
6.1 LESSONS LEARNED	<u>4546</u>
6.1 GOOD PRACTICES	<u>4647</u>
APPENDICES	<u>4749</u>
APPENDIX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION	<u>4850</u>
APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PERSONS AND ORGANISATIONS INTERVIEWED	<u>6769</u>
APPENDIX 3: LIST OF DOCUMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS CONSULTED	<u>6971</u>
APPENDIX 4: SATISFACTION SURVEY REPORT	<u>7072</u>
APPENDIX 5: LESSONS LEARNED	<u>7678</u>
APPENDIX 6: GOOD PRACTICES	<u>7880</u>

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

AMS	ASEAN Member States
AQRF	ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
CLMV	Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Vietnam
DWT	(ILO) Decent Work Team
EQ	Evaluation question
GS-NSPC	General Secretariat of the National Social Protection Council
HQ	Headquarters
ILO	International Labour Organization
ILS	International Labour Standards
LFM	Logical Framework Matrix
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOEL	(ROK) Ministry of Employment and Labour
MOHS	(Myanmar) Ministry of Health and Sports
MOL	(Thailand) Ministry of Labour
MOLIP	(Myanmar) Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population
MOLSW	(Lao PDR) Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare
MOLVT	(Cambodia) Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training
MRA	Mutual Recognition Agreement
MRS	Mutual Recognition of Skills
NSSF	(Cambodia) National Social Security Fund
OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicator
PAC	Project Advisory Committee
ROAP	(ILO) Regional Office for Asia and Pacific
ROK	Republic of Korea
RSTWG	Regional Skills Technical Working Group
SME	Small- and Medium-sized Enterprise
SSB	(Myanmar) Social Security Board
SSTC	South-South and Triangular Cooperation
TESDA	(Philippines) Technical Education and Skills Development Authority
TOR	Terms of Reference
TOT	Training of Trainers
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
UN	United Nations
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group

1 Executive Summary

The cooperation between the ILO and the Republic of Korea (ROK) started in 2003 and has since then provided valuable contributions to Decent Work outcomes in the Asia/Pacific region, focusing on Skills, Social Protection, Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) and Public Employment Policy.

Having passed the 15 years mark of cooperation in 2018, new approaches were defined for a further 3-year cycle to increase programme efficiency and long-term development policies. This resulted in a stronger focus on three areas (Skills, Social Protection and OSH) with tailor-made technical assistance, as well as a focus on a number of selected countries (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam – the CLMV countries) and closer ties with Korean Partner institutions.

The new arrangement signed by both parties for the 2018-2020 cycle (GLO/17/01/ROK) covers 5 projects, of which 3 for the Asia/Pacific region:

- Promoting ASEAN initiatives in TVET and Skills for inclusive future (US\$ 800.000) specifically targeting ASEAN, Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar
- Supporting the implementation of sustainable social protection floors for the workers and their families in ASEAN – phase II (US\$ 900.000) focusing on Cambodia, as well as Myanmar and Vietnam
- Establishing and Enhancing an Overall OSH framework in Myanmar and Lao PDR (US\$ 300.000)

Scope, clients and methodology of the evaluation

The evaluation covers all three Asia-Pacific Regional projects. The scope of the Evaluation is from the project start until May 2020. It was carried out from June 8 to July 22, 2020 by independent consultants in accordance with the ILO evaluation policy based on the UN Evaluation Norms and Standards, following ILO Evaluation Guidelines and Support Guidance Documentation.

The primary clients of this evaluation are the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme team, the ILO Regional Office for Asia and Pacific (ROAP), the Decent Work Team-Bangkok, and the Ministry of Employment and Labour/ROK. Secondary clients are tripartite constituents, the project counterparts, and partner institutions in Korea.

The evaluation involved a desk study and Skype interviews with informants who could not be met in person due to the COVID-19 situation. A set of evaluation questions was proposed in the Terms of Reference, which the evaluators have slightly edited and completed during the Inception phase. The evaluation also undertook a satisfaction survey among constituents in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Thailand for which a self-administered survey tool using a purposive sampling technique was developed to assess the degree of satisfaction of constituents on the different aspects of the programme (design, communication, needs and priorities, results, etc.).

Key findings of the evaluation

Relevance, strategic fit and design

After 15 years of ILO/Korea partnership, the 2018-2020 programme was again based on the mutual interest of the ILO and the Republic of Korea to renew their cooperation for another 3-year cycle with a strong focus on Skills, Social Protection and OSH, while targeting in priority Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar which all three are among Korea's priority partner countries.

The focus on Skills, Social Protection and OSH responds to the global and country policies and priorities of both the Republic of Korea and the ILO, and the three projects fall in line with the countries' respective strategic policies and development plans, as well as with the Decent Work

Country Plans. All constituents recognize the relevance of the projects, which address their needs and their respective agendas.

The projects are surrounded by other projects operating in the same thematic areas, in particular in the field of Social Protection and OSH. Several formal and/or informal coordination mechanisms have been set up by the ILO and/or government institutions to promote synergies and interlinkages while avoiding overlaps, but for the Programme as a whole, little coordination or synergies have been found between the three projects.

In terms of design, the evaluation of the 2015-2017 programme pointed out the lack of clear indicators and assumptions in the project documents, suggesting that they should be better defined in future projects, in particular in the Monitoring & Evaluation tools (Logical Framework, Theory of Change and Risk analysis). Only the Social Protection project followed the suggestion and provided a good Risks and Assumption analysis with well-defined indicators.

Effectiveness

Overall, the project RAS/17/50/KOR (Skills) makes good progress towards planned results and mutual recognition of skills has been put on the agenda of several ASEAN countries, besides those involved in the pilot scheme. Technically the project is expected to achieve its planned results, but further developments on skills recognition will require political engagement of countries involved, especially at the receiving end.

The project RAS/17/51/KOR (Social Protection) consolidates and develops further the achievements of the previous phase in Cambodia and in Myanmar where multiple consultations workshops with social partners have been organized, strengthening tripartite dialogue aiming at further policy developments. New programmes and the extended coverage of social protection confirm the progress made in Cambodia. The IT reform in Myanmar is also particularly important and fits in the general reform programme going on in the country. The engagement with ASEAN has been rather limited and would benefit from stronger linkages. Output 3 covering Vietnam appears somewhat disconnected from the other activities.

Considering the small budget allocated to the project RAS/17/53/KOR (OSH), realistic progress has been made which provides a modest but useful contribution to the OSH developments in both countries, mainly driven by several other projects of the ILO and other donors with much larger budgets.

All three projects have directly or indirectly contributed to policy developments; they are clearly praised for their contribution to capacity building and institutional development, as reflected in the satisfaction survey undertaken in the framework of this evaluation. The projects are also commended for their adequacy to meet needs and priorities of constituents as well as national priorities. Only a few weaknesses have been highlighted among which the limited ability of projects to encourage beneficiaries to build on achievements without external support, and the low level of impact they are expected to achieve.

Efficiency

Financial data provided by the project team shows that only 44.5% of the total budget has been disbursed up to 31/12/2019 while 64% of the implementation time has been consumed.

The disbursements on project basis are 36.7% for RAS/17/50/KOR, 47.2% for RAS/17/51/KOR and 50.4% for RAS/17/53/KOR.

The funds engaged so far have allowed to deliver against the expected outputs in a satisfactory way, though the projects are now facing delays in implementation due to the COVID-19 pandemic which puts on hold many activities. Updated financial information has not been made available.

Impact and Sustainability

The status of implementation in all three projects can be summarized as “work in progress”:

- The Skills project will have an impact once the MRS pilot is completed and joint recognition between Thailand and the CLM countries has been technically achieved and politically endorsed
- The Social Protection project will impact on final beneficiaries once laws and decrees developed with the support of the project will be implemented
- The OSH project, despite its limited resources provides added value to the much larger projects in Myanmar and Lao PDR.

In summary, impact has yet to come. Indicators are pointing in the right direction, but more time (and support) is needed to consolidate and finalize the “construction sites” of the projects and hence achieve social and economic impact.

Sustainability strategies differ from one project to another. The proposed sustainability strategy for the Skills project is adequate. All governments involved in the pilot MRS are eager to succeed and reach full recognition of skills in the selected occupations. Ministries have taken full ownership of the activities, though further external technical support is needed. The Social Protection project has provided the necessary support to lay the foundations both in Cambodia and in Myanmar where the legal framework is now in place. The project has promoted the convergence of interests of tripartite constituents and the challenge is now for governments to proceed with implementation of the legal framework. The OSH project does not explicitly refer to any sustainability strategy or option.

The COVID-19 pandemic affects the implementation of the projects and delays the delivery of activities. New priorities have emerged at short notice for governments and social partners in order to assist thousands, if not millions, of people affected by the economic downturn, but the world is expected to return to normal sooner or later and work will resume with however a stronger commitment of all parties to pay more attention to safety, health and social protection.

Recommendations

1. Consider extending the project for at least 6 months; alternatively shift balance of activities not implemented to new projects under the next programme cycle
2. Define more precise indicators of achievement for all three projects
3. Boost the support to beneficiaries in Lao PDR to address their demand for urgent external assistance
4. Strengthen relationship with ASEAN Secretariat to better link with regional priorities and needs and collaborate with the new ASEAN-Korea TVET project to strengthen TVET regional mechanism
5. Strengthen ownership of projects among beneficiaries
6. Prepare exit strategies of all three projects in preparation of a possible new cycle
7. Define options for future projects under a new 3-year cycle
8. Enhance expertise of Korea in further projects
9. Emphasize gender mainstreaming when designing the next programme

Good practices

Good practices identified during the evaluation are:

1. The formal coordination mechanisms set up for the OSH project in Myanmar and Lao PDR to promote synergies and interlinkages while avoiding overlaps with other projects
2. The structured approach to progress on MRS by means of a Roadmap for implementing a pilot scheme endorsed and followed by all beneficiaries

Lessons learned

The lessons learned emerging from the evaluation of the programme are:

1. A long-term partnership offers the best perspective to achieve meaningful results
2. Independent evaluations are not sufficiently taken into consideration

2 Programme background - intervention logic

The following sections briefly describe the environment surrounding the programme, its objectives and planned outputs as defined in the projects design documents, as well as an overview of the management and implementation arrangements.

Partnership background

The cooperation between the ILO and the Republic of Korea started in 2003, when both parties signed a Memorandum of Understanding opening the way for a close partnership. In 2004 funds were provided by the Ministry of Employment and Labour to initiate the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme.

Since then, the cooperation between the two parties has provided valuable contributions to Decent Work outcomes in the Asia/Pacific region, focusing on Skills, Social Protection, Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) and Public Employment Policy.

Having passed the 15 years mark of cooperation in 2018, new approaches were defined for a further 3-year cycle to increase programme efficiency and long-term development policies. This resulted in a stronger focus on three areas (Skills, Social Protection and OSH) with tailor-made technical assistance, as well as a focus on a number of selected countries (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam – the CLMV countries) and closer ties with Korean Partner institutions.

The new arrangement signed by both parties for the 2018-2020 cycle (GLO/17/01/ROK) defines Employment and Labour Policy, Social Protection, Human Resource Development and OSH as the Programme areas.

The new programme covers Global projects (managed by ILO Headquarters) as well as Asia/Pacific Regional projects (managed by ILO-ROAP):

Global projects:

- Strengthening Public Employment Services in English Speaking Africa (US\$ 600.000).
- Upholding sustainable delivery mechanisms to promote OSH in small and medium-sized enterprises (US\$ 400.000)

Asia/Pacific Regional projects:

- Promoting ASEAN initiatives in TVET and Skills for inclusive future (US\$ 800.000)
- Supporting the implementation of sustainable social protection floors for the workers and their families in ASEAN – phase II (US\$ 900.000)
- Establishing and Enhancing an Overall OSH framework in Myanmar and Lao PDR (US\$ 300.000)

With regard to fostering closer ties with Korean institutions, the new arrangement defines a list of eligible institutions including HRD Korea, the Korea Occupational Safety and Health Agency (KOSHA), the Korea Workers' Compensation and Welfare Service (COMWEL), the Korea Employment Agency for the Disabled (KEAD), the Korea University of Technology and Education (KOREATCH), the Korea Research Institute for Vocational Education and Training (KRIVET), the Korea Labour Institute (KLI), the Korea Employment Information Service (KEIS), the Korea Labour Foundation (KLF), and the Korea Polytechnics (KOPO).

Programme and projects

In line with the decision to focus on Employment and Labour Policy, Social Protection, Human Resource Development and Occupational Safety and Health, the three projects for the Asia/Pacific region have been defined as follows:

RAS/17/50/KOR

Building on the achievements and progress of the Mutual Recognition of Skills (MRS) promoted by the ILO since 2014 with the support of the Republic of Korea and on ILO's work to promote skills in CLM countries, the project has been defined with a focus on three specific objectives:

- The strengthening of ASEAN's regional dialogue and network to facilitate the region's capacities to move forward with the MRS implementation and other key AQRV-TVET agenda
- The facilitation of decent work for national and migrant workers in the ASEAN sub-region through the coherent strengthening of assessment, certification, and accreditation frameworks
- The increase of knowledge and experience in enhancing the employability of low-skilled workers in the face of increased automation and computerization

The project's time frame was defined from 1 April 2018 to 31 December 2020 (33 months).

It is expected to contribute to ILO's P&B Outcome 1 (More and better jobs for inclusive growth and improved youth employment prospects) and specifically targets ASEAN, Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar.

A Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) specifying activities for each outcome with relevant targets, indicators, means of verification and assumptions is attached to the project document, as well as a detailed Implementation Plan.

RAS/17/51/KOR

Social protection already was one of the specific areas of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2015-2017 and resulted in several achievements both at regional level, as well as at country level in Cambodia and Myanmar. The final evaluation of the 2015-2017 programme recommended further supporting the different priorities identified.

The new project builds on the achievements of the first phase, while also building on lessons learned from other projects implemented by the ILO in the framework of which networks of policy makers, scheme administrators, research institutes and technical officials of various implementing agencies were established. It aims at strengthening these networks and leverage on past achievements in the target countries and in the ASEAN region while promoting linkages with other Korean funded projects.

The design and reform of social protection schemes as well as the improvement of schemes operations have been defined as focus areas for the project, with Cambodia being the main country beneficiary due to the achievements of the first phase.

The project has been defined with a focus on four specific objectives:

- Effective, efficient, accountable and sustainable gender responsive social protection delivered with an increased coverage in Cambodia
- Effective, efficient, accountable and sustainable gender responsive social protection delivered with an increased coverage in Myanmar
- Effective, efficient, accountable and sustainable gender responsive social protection delivered with an increased coverage in Viet Nam
- ASEAN countries are increasingly knowledgeable about relevant practices to extend social protection to all, including vulnerable and unprotected groups.

The project's time frame was defined from 1 April 2018 to 31 December 2020 (33 months).

It is expected to contribute to ILO's P&B Outcome 3 (Creating and extending social protection floors) and specifically targets Cambodia, as well as Myanmar and Vietnam.

The project document does not include a Logical Framework Matrix; only a short Implementation Plan is provided.

RAS/17/53/KOR

It is universally recognized that good OSH conditions positively impact on businesses. Both workers and enterprises benefit from adequate OSH regulations and procedures. Over the years, the ILO has supported the development of OSH in the region through several initiatives, including the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme, which in 2015-2017 provided support mainly in Myanmar. The final evaluation of the 2015-2017 programme recommended to further continue the work in Myanmar where support was provided to draft OSH legislation.

The new project (2018-2020) aims at increasing the capacity to formulate, implement, monitor, review, enhance and enforce a modern OSH policy and legal framework in Myanmar and Lao PDR, while also increasing OSH knowledge, capacity and cooperation in the ASEAN region.

The project has been defined with a focus on three specific objectives:

- Improvement of occupational injuries and diseases reporting system and raised awareness on OSH issues in Myanmar
- Improvement of the Legal and Institutional Framework on OSH in Lao PDR
- Increased OSH knowledge, capacity and collaboration in the ASEAN sub-region

The project's time frame was defined from 1 April 2018 to 31 December 2020 (33 months).

It is expected to contribute to ILO's P&B Outcome 7 (Promoting safe work and workplace compliance including in global supply chains) and specifically targets Myanmar, Lao PDR and ASEAN.

A Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) specifying indicative activities for each output with corresponding indicators and means of verification is attached to the project document, as well as an Implementation Plan; no assumptions are mentioned.

Organisational arrangements for implementation

Management and Implementation Team

The agreement signed between the two parties states that the coordination of the programme will be done by ILO Headquarters and by the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, to which officers of the Ministry of Employment and Labour of the Republic of Korea will be detached.

The mandate defined for these officers was "to provide support for the implementation and/or coordination of the projects, and to facilitate dialogue and consultations between the MOEL/ROK and the ILO on important issues of mutual interest, in accordance with their Terms of Reference". Besides the Programme Manager, two other Korean officials have been detached to the ILO.

Regarding the administration of the contribution, the agreement signed between the two parties states that the responsibility lies with the ILO, in accordance with its regulations, rules and directives.

While the contractual period of implementation has been set for 3 years, the agreement allows for an extension of up to six months in case of delays due to unavoidable circumstances. In this regard, the COVID-19 crisis most likely will have affected the timely implementation of activities.

The agreement also states that the ILO will, in accordance with its rules and regulations, endeavour to maximize opportunities that facilitate recognition of the MOEL/ROK's contribution to the programme, i.e. ensure the visibility of the MOEL/ROK.

Programme funding arrangements

The programme budget is US\$ 3.0 million provided by the Government of the Republic of Korea. US\$ 2.0 million are allocated for the 3 regional projects in the Asia/Pacific region.

Monitoring

The Partnership agreement states that progress and performance of the projects will be assessed on annual basis on basis of specific performance indicators which would be included in the implementation plans of the different projects. Such indicators were intended to address issues like “conformity with the schedule, efficiency of budget execution and visibility for the donor”.

3 Evaluation Methodology and Evaluation Questions

3.1 Purpose, scope and beneficiaries of the evaluation

Purpose

The main purpose of the independent final evaluation is for accountability (measure the process, progress, outcome, learning and the achievement of the project in terms of the expected and stated results) and learning for improvement. The evaluation reviews the approach and design implemented in achieving and/or progress towards outcomes, as well as assess factors (in design and implementation) that have contributed to or impeded achievement of outcomes. The evaluation examines the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the project. The evaluation also assesses the extent to which project activities have so far contributed towards the achievement of anticipated outcomes (in comparison with the expected KPI as per the project's log frame), and draws out and document key lessons learnt as well as provides a set of recommendations to inform future directions of the ILO/Korea programme and to inform better allocation of resources.

The Terms of Reference define the specific objectives of the evaluation as follows:

- a. Assess the satisfaction of tripartite constituents and the project counterparts on the processes and procedures and the services delivered by the three projects under the 2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme, using a standardized satisfaction assessment questionnaire,
- b. Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the three ILO/Korea-funded Asia-Pacific Regional projects, including the progress in achieving results vis-à-vis their original plans (including intended and unintended, positive and negative results), the challenges affecting the achievements so far, and the effectiveness of management arrangements,
- c. Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of overall performance of the 2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme,
- d. Identify factors that influenced (positively or negatively) the sustainability of the interventions of the three ILO/Korea-funded Asia-Pacific Regional projects,
- e. Identify good practices at the Programme and project levels that can and should be replicated, and
- f. Identify lessons learned that should be reflected in the design and implementation of similar projects and programmes in the future.

Scope

The evaluation covers the three priority areas administered by ROAP and implementation of all three-funded **Asia-Pacific Regional projects**. The evaluation covers all the geographic coverage of the three projects, including Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar (CLM), Vietnam, Thailand, and ASEAN with, however, the CLMV countries being the main targets.

Beneficiaries

The primary clients of this evaluation are the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme team, ROAP, DWT-Bangkok, and MOEL/ROK. Secondary clients are tripartite constituents, the project counterparts, and partner institutions in Korea.

The full Terms of Reference of the evaluation are set out in Appendix 1.

3.2 Evaluation Questions (EQ)

The Evaluation questions suggested in the Terms of Reference have been edited in the Inception Report. Additional questions suggested by the evaluators have been approved by the Evaluation Manager.

Relevance and design

- EQ1: Do the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change?
- EQ2: To what extent have the three projects under the 2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme addressed the needs of the tripartite constituents in the target countries?
- EQ3: Overall, are project assumptions realistic; did the project undergo a risk analysis and design readjustment when necessary?

Coherence and strategic fit of the intervention

- EQ4: How well does the project complement and fit with programmes and priorities of the constituents?
- EQ5: To what extent are synergies and interlinkages between the project interventions and other interventions carried out by ILO, Government and social partners in place?
- EQ6: Are the indicators and milestones useful in assessing the project's progress and achievements?

Effectiveness

- EQ7: To what extent have the three projects and the 2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme made sufficient progress towards planned results (including intended and unintended, positive and negative)?
- EQ8: To what extent has gender mainstreaming been addressed by the design and implementation of the three projects and the 2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme?
- EQ9: What evidences exist to demonstrate the three projects and the 2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme have contributed to policy formulation and capacity building in the target countries?
- EQ10: How well has each project comparatively performed as assessed through the satisfaction of the tripartite constituent project partners and beneficiaries? To what extent are the tripartite constituents and the project counterparts satisfied with the services and deliverables and outputs delivered by each of the regional projects?
- EQ11: Has the capacity building approach of the projects been successful so far?

Effectiveness of management arrangements

- EQ12: To what extent are the tripartite constituents and the project counterparts satisfied with processes and procedures and the services delivered by each of the three regional projects?
- EQ13: To what extent have stakeholders, particularly workers' and employers' organizations been involved in projects implementation?
- EQ14: How effectively have the projects delivered core services to project counterparts and relevant stakeholders?

- EQ15: To what extent are the ILO/Korea funded projects working effectively with other ILO development cooperation projects in order to maximize impact and minimize duplication of efforts?

Efficiency of resource use

- EQ16: To what extent have the projects and the programme delivered value for money? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically and efficiently to achieve expected results? Could they have been allocated more effectively and if so, how? Where possible, analyze intervention benefits and related costs of integrated gender equality (or not).

Impact

- EQ17: To what extent has the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme through its funded projects had social, economic, and environmental effects in each of the targeted countries and ASEAN?
- EQ18: To which extent was there a change observed as regards to the beneficiaries' knowledge of skills, social protection and OSH, and have the results of the projects influenced practices in the respective countries?

Sustainability

- EQ19: What strategies have the three projects put in place to ensure continuation of mechanisms/tools/practices provided, if the support from the ILO/Korea Programme ends? To what extent are these strategies likely to be effective?
- EQ20: How effective have the three projects been in establishing and fostering national/local ownership?
- EQ21: How can the projects' key partnerships contribute to the sustainability of the initiatives under the projects and to what extent? Are other partnerships worth considering and, if so, which ones?

Cross-cutting issues

- EQ22: To what extent have gender equality and non-discrimination, International Labour Standards (ILS), social dialogue, tripartite processes, and constituent capacity development and environmental sustainability been addressed in the design and in the implementation of the ILO/Korea projects? And what interventions have been applied to address these issues?

COVID-19

- EQ 23: How does the COVID-19 pandemic affect the Programme and the individual projects with regard to relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability? What could be the consequences for the ILO/Korea current and future partnership programmes?

3.3 Methodology

The Evaluation was carried out in accordance with the ILO evaluation policy based on the United Nations Evaluation Norms and Standards, following ILO Evaluation Guidelines and Support Guidance Documentation. It fully adheres to ILO evaluation norms, standards and ethical safeguards.

The evaluation has been conducted by Mr. Pierre Mahy, Independent Evaluator, from 8 June 2020 to 22 July 2020. Due to the situation resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, all interviews

have been conducted online, however with the support of three national experts (Mr. Sitha Aum in Cambodia, Ms. Min Min Han in Myanmar, and Ms. Kongchay Vixatthep in Lao PDR) who were able to be physically present with the informants for part of the interviews.

The work of the Evaluation took place over three phases:

Phase	Activities and outputs	Tentative schedule
Preparation/Desk Phase	Review of documents Submission Inception Report	8-12 June 12 June
Data collection (online) phase	Virtual meetings by International Expert and face-to-face interviews by National Experts (see Appendix 2 for complete list of persons interviewed)	15 June – 8 July
Synthesis and Reporting Phase	Synthesis and preparation draft evaluation report Submission draft report ILO comments to evaluator Preparation of Final Report Submission of Final report with Executive Summary and Annexes	10 July – 21 July 22 July 5 August 2-3 September 4 September

The evaluation tools employed were documentary analysis, identification of relevant evaluation questions and sub-questions, semi-structured interviews to elicit the facts relevant to the evaluation questions and synthesis of findings, conclusions and recommendations. Findings were validated by means of various cross-checks with stakeholders whenever possible.

Organizations to be interviewed were mostly selected by the programme team; the number of informants (43) interviewed in each country/organization is as follows:

	Government	Workers' organizations	Employers' organizations	Others (ILO staff, specialists and external informants)
Cambodia	5	2	1	3
Lao PDR	3		1	3
Myanmar	3	5		2
Thailand	2			
Philippines	3			1
Vietnam				1
ILO ROAP & Geneva				13

A self-administered survey tool using a purposive sampling technique was developed to conduct a survey aimed at assessing the degree of satisfaction of constituents on the different aspects of the programme (design, communication, needs and priorities, results, etc.). The survey allowed to collect 21 responses in the countries covered by the programme and allowed to draw conclusions which are presented below (section 5.3 – EQ10), but which should not be considered as representative to the entire beneficiary population. The template used for the survey as well as the detailed survey report are presented in Appendix 4.

3.4 Limitations

The main limitation for this evaluation comes from the working conditions resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic (travel restrictions, work from home, etc.) and the decision of the ILO to undertake a remote evaluation. Despite the involvement of national consultants, the number of interviews was limited to a few informants. Interviews with groups of beneficiaries were not possible, e.g. with participants in capacity building activities (trainings, workshops, etc.), hence limiting the opportunity to fully address certain evaluation questions, e.g.:

- EQ11: Has the capacity building approach of the projects been successful so far? Visual observations which would have allowed to assess progress on the ground of the MRS pilots, could also not be undertaken as part of the evaluation.
- EQ18: To which extent was there a change observed as regards to the beneficiaries' knowledge of skills, social protection and OSH, and have the results of the projects influenced practices in the respective countries? Informants have reported changes in working practices (e.g. new vision of labour inspectors on OSH or improved methods for assessors, quality assurance and certification) but this cannot be verified with no field visit.

Linked to the same limitations prohibiting field visits, it has not been possible to identify additional informants which could have been detected while visiting certain institutions. Very often, unexpected guests attend meetings and provide valuable information.

In order to undertake "remote" evaluations, the ILO has prepared specific COVID-19 operating procedures providing guidelines for remote or hybrid evaluations.

These guidelines indeed provide practical tips on adapting to the situation, but more hitches have to be taken into consideration than those suggested by these procedures. The difficulties which have emerged during this evaluation could be considered as lessons learned for future "remote" evaluations if this will become the "new normal":

- Connections can be so bad that interviews are not possible at all (this has been the case on two occasions in Myanmar and in Cambodia); the in-country presence of a national expert could partly compensate for this technical problem
- The time allocated for the interviews is insufficient to follow all recommended procedures (e.g. brief interviews with stakeholders initially identified should be followed by a second round of interviews to provide detailed input)
- Assessing the benefits of capacity building activities requires physical contact with beneficiaries; statements about changing attitudes or working procedures require visual verification in the field, hence the involvement of national experts in country
- Basic communications systems like Skype or Zoom are not known by all informants ("I do not know how to use Skype" has been heard during this evaluation)
- Informants connected via Skype or Zoom do not always pay full attention to the interview (informants working from home and are often distracted by different interferences like family, unexpected phone calls, somebody ringing at the front door, and even performing other tasks while on the call)
- Interviews are mostly limited to informants suggested by the programme team; not being present in the field excludes the possibility to encounter unexpected informants which often can provide valuable information.

Compensating (at least partly) for the above weaknesses can only be done in involving national consultants/experts who can physically interact with informants and/or compensate for technical hiccups is of prior importance; the time allocated to these in-country experts however should be much longer than 2 or 3 days.

The number of working days allocated for the “field” phase during the current evaluation indeed did not allow sufficient time for the two-staged approach for data collection (brief interviews with stakeholders initially identified followed by a second round of interviews to provide detailed input) suggested by the ILO Operating procedures “Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO”.

Considering that the evaluation covers 3 projects, more time would have been necessary to allow more in-depth investigations. The national consultants in particular should have been allocated at least 10 working days to be able to collect more useful data.

4 Findings of the Evaluation

The presentation of the following sections (5.1 – 5.9) is based on the evaluation questions provided in the Terms of Reference of the evaluation (edited in the Inception Report).

4.1 Relevance and design

Relevance to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities (EQ1)

Do the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change?

Beneficiaries

The needs of the **final beneficiaries** (population of the countries covered by the programme) have been taken into consideration by the respective governments in preparing their national development policies. The intervention objectives respond to the needs of the beneficiaries.

Programme partners

The **Republic of Korea** joined the ILO in December 1991 and has since then ratified several fundamental, technical and governance conventions, some of which causally relate to the nature of the programme (e.g. C155 on OSH, C144 on Tripartite Consultation, etc.). Since 2003, the ILO and the Republic of Korea have engaged in a long-term partnership cooperation which has celebrated its 15th anniversary in 2018.

During all these years, the ROK has demonstrated its commitment to promoting Decent Work through voluntary contributions to the ILO development cooperation programme. The cooperation with the ILO focuses primarily on *occupational safety and health, skills development, social protection* and labour market governance.

The 2018-2020 programme was again based on the mutual interest of the ILO and the Republic of Korea to renew their cooperation for another 3-year cycle with a strong focus on Skills, Social Protection and OSH, while targeting in priority Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar which all three are among Korea's priority partner countries.

With the overall mandate of promoting social justice and internationally recognized human and labour rights as a contribution to poverty reduction, the **ILO** has developed an agenda for the community of work looking at job creation, rights at work, social protection and social dialogue, with gender equality as a crosscutting objective. ILO's Decent Work Agenda focuses on four strategic objectives:

- Set and promote standards and fundamental principles and rights at work
- Create greater opportunities for women and men to decent employment and income
- Enhance the coverage and effectiveness of social protection for all
- Strengthen tripartism and social dialogue

In the framework of these strategic objectives Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP) define the specific priorities on which the ILO and the respective governments in each country agree to cooperate.

In Cambodia, the priorities for the 2019-2023 DWCP are:

- ✓ Priority 1: promoting employment and sustainable enterprise development

- ✓ Priority 2: strengthening and expanding social protection, including OSH
- ✓ Priority 3: improving industrial relations and rights at work

In Lao PDR, the priorities for the 2017-2021 DWCP are:

- ✓ Priority 1: promote employment and technical/vocational skills development in line with market demand
- ✓ Priority 2: promote ratification and implementation of International Labour Standards
- ✓ Priority 3: strengthen and expand social protection
- ✓ Priority 4: strengthen tripartite cooperation and social dialogue

In Myanmar, the priorities for the 2018-2021 DWCP are:

- ✓ Priority 1: promoting employment, decent work, and sustainable entrepreneurship opportunities
- ✓ Priority 2: improve labour market governance in applying fundamental principles and rights at work
- ✓ Priority 3: expand social protection coverage, especially for vulnerable workers and population

The focus on Skills, Social Protection and OSH of the 2018-2020 Partnership Programme responds to the global and country policies and priorities of both the Republic of Korea and the ILO. It also contributes to the ILO Programme & Budget (P&B).

Since the programme was designed, the priorities remain largely untouched, despite recent important developments related to COVID-19 pandemic (see section 4.9). The relevance of the programme and of the individual projects, as well as the projects objectives remain unaffected by the new circumstances created by the pandemic. Similarly, tools developed by the project (e.g. OSH framework) remain relevant, though they may need to be revised with new temporary conditions implied by the pandemic, which eventually will come to an end in the near future. Though opinions about COVID-19 vary from “a long lasting problem” to a “hoax which will be sorted out soon”, the design of future projects should not be misled by the current situation and focus on the core issues of the programme.

Projects vs. needs of tripartite constituents (EQ2)

To what extent have the three projects under the 2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme addressed the needs of the tripartite constituents in the target countries?

The Programmes and Priorities of the governments are defined in the countries’ respective strategic policies and development plans, which are:

- the National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP) and the Rectangular Strategy Phase III of the Royal Government of **Cambodia**, which seek “to continue to develop and to strengthen the social protection system with concentration, consistency and effectiveness”. The NSDP for 2019-2023 dedicates an entire chapter on the Development of the Social Protection System, while defining priorities and challenges to be addressed in line with the ASEAN Declaration on Social Protection. It also refers to the important role of the NSSF in the process, while pointing out the lack of resources to support the NSSF.

Besides the NSDP and solely focused on Social Protection, priorities are defined in the National Social Protection Policy Framework 2016-2025 approved by the Council of Ministers in March 2017.

The NSDP also refers to the importance of skills recognition for outgoing and returning migrant workers, though not much is defined on how to go about it. Priorities for skills

development are defined in Cambodia's new Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) Policy 2017–2025.

The assistance provided by the ILO/Korea Social Protection project therefore is especially important, while the Skills project contributes to the need to the priorities defined in the TVET policy.

Employers' and Workers' organizations are involved in both areas and fully recognize and endorse the contribution of the projects to the national agenda as well as to their own priorities. Future technical support is needed for training and workshop related to the pension fund, but also health care as well as support for a feasibility study to establish a rehabilitation centre for disabled people.

- The five-year National Socio-Economic Development Plan (NSEDP 2016-2020) in **Laos PDR** as well as the Vision 2030 in which skills development and upgrading is defined as one of the key government priorities, both for the domestic market and for a better integration in the ASEAN countries. Skills recognition with other countries is therefore relevant and fits in the priorities of all constituents.

Occupation Health & Safety is not given much attention in the NSEDP but is mentioned in the Labour Law. The new OSH Law drafted with the support of the ILO/Korea OSH project meets the interests and priorities of all tripartite constituents, strongly involved in the development work of the OSH framework, and also represented in the OSH Project Advisory Committee. Further support would be welcome to do refresher training for trainers and extend to other sectors.

- Similarly, as for the other countries, the **Myanmar** Sustainable Development Plan (MSDP 2018-2030) declares Social Protection as a strategic priority area (strategy 4.3) with a focus on the expansion and strengthening of social protection programmes. Priorities for Social Protection are also specifically defined in the earlier Myanmar National Social Protection Strategic Plan 2014.

Skills development is much less included in the strategies of the MSDP, but covered in other strategic documents, e.g. the National Education Strategic Plan 2016-2021.

OSH in Myanmar is a relatively new concept which the new OSH Law, developed in tripartite consultations, is expected to boost once enforced. Employers' and workers' organizations are eager to move forward on safety and health at the workplace.

- As **Thailand** is a key partner in the Skills project, it is also worth mentioning that the MRS process falls in line with the 12th National Economic and Social Development Plan (2017-2021) suggesting "coordination with neighboring countries" in the field of skills.

In relation to the COVID-19 pandemic, tripartite constituents do not express any specific need which would be relevant to the ILO or to Korea, as this is thought to be more pertinent for the World Health Organization.

Assumptions and Risks (EQ3)

Overall, are project assumptions realistic; did the project undergo a risk analysis and design readjustment when necessary?

The evaluation of the 2015-2017 programme pointed out the lack of assumptions in the project documents, suggesting that they should be better defined in the future projects, in particular in the M&E tools (Logical Framework, Theory of Change and Risk analysis).

In the 2018-2020 programme, assumptions and risks have been considered in different ways for the three projects:

- For the Skills project (RAS/17/50/KOR), most of the assumptions presented in the Logical Framework refer to the continued interest and commitment of all parties involved (ASEAN Secretariat, Governments, Constituents); these assumptions are rather understandable and repetitive for all objectives and outputs.
- For the Social Protection project (RAS/17/51/KOR), the project document refers to a specific “Assumptions and Risks Analysis” (Annex 3) which is very detailed in analyzing development assumptions, implementation assumptions and management assumptions at different risks levels on a scale from 1 to 9. Risks are described for each of the 3 years of implementation with corresponding mitigation measures. This is precisely what the previous evaluation recommended to do and should be taken as an example for future projects as it provides a clear vision on how to deal with risks when they materialize; such a well-defined analysis furthermore prepares all parties concerned, avoiding time to be wasted on defined strategies to deal with problems when they arise.
- For the OSH project (RAS/17/53/KOR), nothing is mentioned with regard to assumptions or risks.

Besides for the Social protection project for which a good assumptions and risks analysis has been made, it is not possible to comment on the overall assumptions made for the programme. The programme could have benefited from a comprehensive “Assumptions and Risks Analysis” similar to the one made for the Social Protection project for all three projects at the design stage.

4.2 Coherence and strategic fit

Coherence with programmes and priorities of constituents (EQ4)

How well does the project complement and fit with programmes and priorities of the constituents?

The section on EQ2 has already addressed the coherence of the projects with the programmes and priorities of the constituents.

Governments, employers’ and workers’ organization largely recognize that the programme meets their priorities in all three projects.

Synergies (EQ5)

To what extent are synergies and interlinkages between the project interventions and other interventions carried out by ILO, Government and social partners in place?

Several formal and/or informal coordination mechanisms have been set up by the ILO and/or government institutions to promote synergies and interlinkages while avoiding overlaps.

With regard to OSH:

- In Lao PDR where 2 OSH projects are being implemented a Project Advisory Committee has been put in place.
- In Myanmar where 3 ILO OSH projects and 1 Danish bilateral OSH project are being implemented, a Project Consultative Committee has been set up to deal with coordination.

Both are united platforms which in addition to coordination aim at making the implementation of activities participatory, effective, efficient, and transparent with full involvement of governments and social partners.

With regard to Skills:

- The main coordination mechanism covering all the countries directly involved in the project and beyond is the RSTWG, while the planned ASEAN TVET Council is expected to become the multi-sectoral/cross-sectoral body that will provide a platform for coordination, research and development on innovations and monitoring regional programmes that support the advancement of TVET in the region. The Council is also expected to be coordinating further developments in MRS.

With regard to Social Protection:

- In Myanmar: tripartite “Social Dialogue meetings” are organized by the ILO to discuss issues related to Social Protection
- In Cambodia the main coordination function at government level is the National Social Protection Council of which the Secretariat is supported by the ILO.

With regard to the Programme as a whole, little coordination or synergies have been found between the three projects. The only interconnection identified during this evaluation relates to OSH and Social Protection where the OSH project has provided opportunities to social protection information to be disseminated. Improving synergies should be the responsibility of the Programme Manager who has an overall view of all projects. He/she could for example organize regular (six-monthly) coordination meetings during which he/she would present opportunities for synergies identified by him/her, rather than leaving it to the projects to identify such possible synergies.

Indicators and milestones (EQ6)

Are the indicators and milestones useful in assessing the project’s progress and achievements?

The evaluation of the 2015-2017 programme pointed out a weakness of the Logical Frameworks of the projects and recommended to systematically develop them for future projects while defining Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs), also pointing out the need for more specific gender indicators.

The project documents for RAS/17/50/KOR (Skills) and RAS/17/53/KOR (OSH) both included a Logical Framework specifying indicative activities for each output with corresponding indicators and means of verification. Indicators for RAS/17/51/KOR (Social protection) were presented in the form of a Performance Plan without a Logical Framework.

The indicators defined for the Skills project are generally adequate, though sometimes generic (e.g. “increased collaboration among ASEAN member states”). This however has been sufficiently compensated in defining the respective OVIs (e.g. existence of action plans or agreed guidelines for MRS implementation, which would confirm the increased collaboration). Progress reports have referred to these indicators in comparing them to baseline and defining end of project targets, while also delivering a good narrative on progress made.

The indicators proposed for the Social Protection project in the Performance Plan are mostly activity-based: number of trainings, number of missions, number of participants, etc. Such indicators can only reflect that activities have been implemented without reference to what they have achieved.

For the OSH project, the proposed indicators are rather weak and mainly reflect activities (e.g. number of workshops, number of participants, number of consultations) for which the OVIs do not compensate (minutes of meetings, etc.). Progress reports have not referred to the indicators but provide a much better description of progress made with baseline data, milestones (planned against actual) and end of project targets.

In conclusion, though the recommendations of the previous evaluation have been partly followed, the need for more consistency in presenting LFM’s and more useful results-based indicators across the programme remains. Better linkages of such indicators to DWCP outcomes would provide additional value.

4.3 Effectiveness

Progress in implementation (EQ7)

To what extent have the three projects and the 2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme made sufficient progress towards planned results (including intended and unintended, positive and negative)?

As the level of activity has decreased since January due to the COVID-19 outbreak, the progress of the three projects mostly remains as reflected in the last technical progress reports for 2019, of which the key achievements are the following:

RAS/17/50/KOR (Skills)

O1: The strengthening of ASEAN's regional dialogue and network to facilitate the region's capacities to move forward with the MRS implementation and other key AQRF-TVET agenda

- Two meetings of the Regional Technical Skills Working Group (July 2018, September 2019) which, among other important issues related to AQRF, MRA and TVET, primarily allowed to move the MRS work from preparation to implementation. Summary reports of the RSTWG meetings also hint towards the recognition of strengthened dialogue and networking aiming at further discussions on skills recognition and its relation to employment and migration. This is an important step towards widening the discussion on skills recognition to other countries than those involved in the pilot phase.
- The organization of the ILO/Korea TVET Forum (November 2018) provided a platform to share experiences and perspectives from governments, workers, employers, development partners, TVET institutions and experts from 12 countries in Asia and the Pacific. Besides the RSWG meetings, the forum also provided the framework for strengthened regional dialogue on Skills and TVET, which eventually facilitated the MRS to take off with the definition of a Roadmap for implementation in seven steps and the initiation of a pilot scheme between Thailand and the CLM countries
- The MRS pilot in 3 corridors (Thailand – CLM) initiated the implementation, hence confirming the willingness of participating countries to go ahead
 - Bricklaying and Plastering (Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar)
 - Building Electrical Wiring (Cambodia)
 - Sewing Machine Operator (Myanmar)
- The publication of the report *“Skills and the Future of Work: Strategies for Inclusive Growth in Asia and the Pacific”* supported by the project is also an important contribution to knowledge sharing and capacity development as it presents discussions and analysis which aim to contribute to future policy dialogue.
- Support was also provided provided to implement the Mutual Recognition Arrangement (MRA) of tourism professionals within the AEC

O2: The facilitation of decent work for national and migrant workers in the ASEAN sub-region through the coherent strengthening of assessment, certification, and accreditation frameworks

- The three MRS pilot schemes between Thailand and the CLM countries are progressing according to plan and were due to be evaluated early 2020. This however has now been delayed due to the COVID-19 situation. Several statements made by informants however state that the work is in line with plans and expectations as defined by the Roadmap. Progress is however slow in Lao PDR.
- The assessment on the comparability of the skills/competency standards, assessment methods and certification systems were conducted in 2019 and allowed the identification of the capacity building needed to upgrade and narrow the gap with Thailand. As a result, the CLM countries have started work on upgrading assessment and

certification systems, for which however further capacity building is needed, in particular in Lao PDR.

- The objective to have Joint Statements of Recognition of Competency Assessment and Certification System in the selected occupations between the Department of Skills Development in Thailand and each CLM country ready for signature as a result of the pilot scheme is likely to be achieved with two of the three countries upon closure of the current programme cycle. More time will be needed for Lao PDR to reach the required levels matching Thailand.
- Improved skills, standards, assessment methods, certification systems and the recognition of skills pave the way to potentially better working conditions of national and migrant workers, hence “facilitate” or better support the request for decent work, which also depends on the conditions of the employment market.

O3: The increase of knowledge and experience in enhancing the employability of low-skilled workers in the face of increased automation and computerization

- The project initiated the launch of a study with the Institute of Labour Science and Social Affairs in Vietnam which aims at assessing the impact of automation on low skilled workers in Vietnam (work in progress). The plan is to showcase the result of the study at a knowledge sharing forum, which would also contribute to regional dialogue and networking (as per above O1). How the study will enhance the employability of low-skilled workers however remains to be established.

Overall, the project RAS/17/50/KOR makes good progress towards planned results and mutual recognition of skills has been put on the agenda of several ASEAN countries, besides those involved in the pilot scheme. Technically the project is expected to achieve its planned results, but further developments on skills recognition will require political engagement of countries involved.

RAS/17/51/KOR (Social protection)

O1: Effective, efficient, accountable and sustainable gender responsive social protection delivered with an increased coverage in Cambodia

- A new Social Security Law drafted with the support of the project was approved in November 2019 which includes the extension of coverage to the informal sector and creates the legal conditions for the launch of a pension scheme
- The modernization project of the National Social Security Fund has been launched aiming at increasing efficiency and quality of services for its members
- Better technical understanding of social security concepts has been promoted, which reinforces the acceptance by all tripartite constituents to further develop social protection
- Capacity building on Social Health Insurance has been provided, as well as capacity building on pensions
- A draft sub-decree on Pension for private sector employees has been drafted; its implementation will increase the number of beneficiaries especially in the informal sector of the economy; more than increasing coverage, it will increase the scope of the social security system as pensions don't exist yet in Cambodia
- Contributions to the draft Guidebook on the governance and management of Employment Injury Social Security Systems

O2: Effective, efficient, accountable and sustainable gender responsive social protection delivered with an increased coverage in Myanmar

- IT reform has been further supported for the Social Security Board in preparing and launching the tender for a new Management Information System, preparing training materials and delivering capacity building workshops
- Awareness raising on social protection has been promoted
- Exchange programmes with Thailand and Indonesia (Knowledge sharing on Social Protection) have been organized to complement the work on IT which will deliver, once finalized, more effective and efficient social protection

O3: Effective, efficient, accountable and sustainable gender responsive social protection delivered with an increased coverage in Viet Nam

- The revision of the Social Security Law has been supported to align with international standards

O4: ASEAN countries are increasingly knowledgeable about relevant practices to extend social protection to all, including vulnerable and unprotected groups.

- The project contributed to the development of a Global Guide on Employment Injury Insurance Protection
- Better knowledge on Employment Injury Insurance and Employment Insurance has been promoted

The project RAS/17/51/KOR consolidates and develops further the achievements of the previous phase in Cambodia and in Myanmar where multiple consultations workshops with social partners have been organized, strengthening tripartite dialogue aiming at further policy developments. New programmes and the extended coverage of social protection confirm the progress made in Cambodia. The IT reform in Myanmar is also particularly important and fits in the general reform programme going on in the country. The engagement with ASEAN has been rather limited and would benefit from stronger linkages. Output 3 covering Vietnam appears somewhat disconnected from the other activities.

RAS/17/53/KOR (OSH)

O1: Improvement of occupational injuries and diseases reporting system and raised awareness on OSH issues in Myanmar

- A new OSH law drafted with the support of the project was enacted (March 2019) and is now waiting for enforcement.
- Awareness raising campaigns, tripartite consultations and various workshops have been organized to prepare for an improved reporting system (planned for 2020)

O2: Improvement of the Legal and Institutional Framework on OSH in Lao PDR

- A new OSH decree drafted with the support of the project was signed in February 2019 and is awaiting implementation. The new decree improves the legal framework.
- The preparation of an OSH profile has been initiated for the development of a national OSH policy (work in progress, hence no contribution to the Outcome yet)
- Capacity building has been provided (2 workshops: TOT on Work Improvement for Small Construction Sites and training of labour inspectors).

O3: Increased OSH knowledge, capacity and collaboration in the ASEAN sub-region

- One fellowship training workshop “For adapting to the future of work: tackling current and future challenges on occupational health in ASEAN” was held in July 2019 in Korea. The event allowed to share good practices on OSH.

Considering the small budget allocated to the project RAS/17/53/KOR, realistic progress has been made which provided a modest but useful contribution to the OSH developments in both countries, mainly driven by several other projects of the ILO and other donors with much larger budgets.

For all three projects, an important number of capacity building workshops/seminars have been delivered, of which the topics and dates are mentioned in the progress reports. Capacity building improves the institutional capability in all countries.

Gender mainstreaming (EQ8)

To what extent has gender mainstreaming been addressed by the design and implementation of the three projects and the 2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme?

The only specific reference to gender in the Skills and OSH project documents is that “gender equality and non-discrimination will be mainstreamed throughout all interventions”, whereas the Social protection project document puts more emphasis on the gender issue, referring to gender responsive social protection, gender-sensitive evidence-based policy advice and/or gender-sensitive training programmes.

Nothing in the progress reports of the Skills and of the OSH projects mentions any specific reference to gender issues, which however have been brought up once during the 4th RSTWG meeting by ATUC and ACE suggesting that more attention be dedicated to gender issues. The ILO/Korea TVET Forum in 2018 paid more attention to gender issues, referring to a gender gap in labour participation. No reference to gender is made in the MRS concept note.

The social protection project in Viet Nam does consider gender as the important area. A gender impact assessment of the social protection system in Vietnam has been completed, highlighting the gender gaps in participation in and benefiting from the social protection system, and provide recommendation for revision in the social insurance Law.

The gender impact assessment used Korea Fund to work on data collection and conduct a costing of the measures to improve gender equality in the Social Insurance Law”.

Gender has been considered in social protection programming in Vietnam “the Korea fund in Vietnam contributed to the gender impact assessment in the social protection system.”

“Korea-funded data collection activities produced the data that were used for several purposes. These include (1) gender impact assessment, (2) Actuarial assessment; (3) Social Pension costing.

Contribution to policy formulation (EQ9)

What evidences exist to demonstrate the three projects and the 2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme have contributed to policy formulation and capacity building in the target countries?

The contribution of the projects to policy formulation varies from one country to another as well as from one project to another:

The **Social Protection project** supported the Government of Cambodia in reviewing the legal framework and identifying policy gaps to be addressed in the Social Security Law. The project also organized technical training for policy makers, in particular for the members of the executive committee of the National Social Protection Council. In working directly with the Secretariat of the NSPC, the project is in an ideal position to influence the policy on Social Protection in Cambodia. In Vietnam, the project contributes to the revision of the Social Security Law in supporting the alignment of the legal framework to international standards, which eventually could result in policy reforms. In Myanmar, having focused on policy issues in the previous phase, the project is now more focused on technical issues rather than on policy,

though the work done strategically fits in the overall administrative reform programme of the country, which to some extent can also be considered as an indirect policy issue.

Both in Myanmar and in Lao PDR, the **OSH project** has directly contributed to policy formulation, particularly in bringing together tripartite constituents to discuss the development of the new laws and decrees. The new OSH law in Myanmar and the new OSH Decree in Lao PDR discussed and agreed by all tripartite constituents are tangible achievements of the projects at policy level, and consolidate the relationship between the constituents in view of further discussions regarding implementation of these laws.

The **Skills project**, though mainly working on technical issues, has engaged with policy makers both at national level and at regional level at the ILO/Korea TVET Forum. Outcome 3 of the project is bit more oriented towards policy making as the study undertaken in Vietnam (“assessing the impact of automation on low-skilled workers in Vietnam” conducted by the Vietnamese Institute of Labour and Social Affairs) will feed into a forum to share experiences and good practices which may lead to policy suggestions.

As for Thailand, though the Skills project has been able to gain the commitment of the Ministry of Labour to fully engage in the MRS process, it is unlikely that the project will, as confirmed by the Ministry, have any influence on policy making. The Royal Thai government usually defines its policies autonomously without external pressure as observed again in relation to the COVID-19 crisis.

Satisfaction of constituents (EQ10)

How well has each project comparatively performed as assessed through the satisfaction of the tripartite constituent project partners and beneficiaries? To what extent are the tripartite constituents and the project counterparts satisfied with the services and deliverables and outputs delivered by each of the regional projects?

The survey undertaken during this evaluation aimed at assessing the degree of satisfaction of the tripartite constituent project partners and beneficiaries has delivered the following results:

Satisfaction rates for ILO/Korea Projects (composite score)

	Cambodia	Laos	Myanmar	Thailand
Social protection Project	3.2	n/a	3.2	n/a
Skills Project	3.4	4.4	4.3	4.1
OSH Project	n/a	4.3	3.6	n/a
Overall satisfaction	3.3	4.4	3.9	4.1

5=excellent 4=good 3=average 2=fair 1=poor

Comparison 2018-2020 vs. 2015-2017

	Cambodia	Laos	Myanmar	Thailand
Social protection Project	3.7	n/a	3.6	n/a
Skills Project	3.7	2	4	4
OSH Project	n/a	4.5	4	n/a
Country average	3.7	3.7	3.7	4

(5= significant improvement in respect of all criteria; 4= partly improved; 3=no difference between the 2 programmes; 2=no major improvement; 1= overall less adequate)

As can be seen from the composite scores, the degree of satisfaction differs from one country to another and from one project to another. The more detailed tables (see annex 4) show that the degree of satisfaction on a given criteria can sometimes go from 5 to 1 which makes it difficult to draw conclusions. Poor ratings (1) sometimes reflect frustration of constituents related to specific issues rather than a genuine dissatisfaction with the project.

The highest ratings across the board have been given to:

- The adequacy of projects to needs and priorities of constituents as well as to national priorities, and
- The contribution of the projects to capacity building and institutional development

At the other end of the rating scale (between 3 and 1), the most challenging areas are:

- The ability of projects to encourage beneficiaries to build on achievements without external support, and
- The ability of projects to make a significant impact.

Without disclosing the ratings given by each individual constituent, it is however worth mentioning that the inclination to go for lower grades mostly comes from the workers' organizations.

Communication of the programme and visibility of the projects have generally been found to be good (average combined ratings of 3.7) in line with the overall degree of satisfaction for all other criteria.

Overall, the 2018-2020 projects are found to be improved (3.6 to 4) compared to 2015-2017. The comparison between the two programmes reflects the level of satisfaction with one exception (i.e. the Skills project in Lao PDR highly rated on most criteria with an average rating of 2.0 defined as not showing any major improvement). The reason behind this would need to be further investigated, but since there is only 1 survey questionnaire related to Skills in Lao PDR making it easy to identify where this comes from, the evaluator attributes this assessment to be self-disappointment of that particular constituent in the progress made.

Capacity building (EQ 9 & EQ11)

Has the capacity building approach of the projects been successful so far?

Capacity development has been (and still is) an important part of the projects; it is an integral part of many activities and is essential to ensure the benefits of the intervention in all areas covered by the projects.

All three projects have organized multiple training/capacity development seminars and workshops, among which:

- Several training workshops related to the MRS under the Skills project (technical skills, accreditation, etc.)
- Regional training workshops on Employment Injury Insurance (EII) and Employment Insurance (EI) in collaboration with the Korean Partner Institutions under the Social Protection project
- Training for the General Secretariat of the NSPC and line ministries in Cambodia organized in Vietnam in November 2019, as well as several knowledge sharing workshops on Social Protection
- Several training workshops on OSH, including the ILO-Korea fellowship training workshop for ASEAN participants held in Korea.

Full details of the different workshops are provided in the progress reports.

Capacity development is in general, according to the information given by informants, well perceived by all participants¹. The information provided is found to be of high quality and extremely useful (e.g. newly recruited staff of GS-NSPC in Cambodia had absolutely zero understanding of Social Protection when they went to the training; similarly the training for labour inspectors on OSH delivered a different vision of labour inspection typically rather superficial in Lao PDR).

More is however expected from the projects to further enhance knowledge on technical issues, especially in areas in which Korea can provide know-how and examples of best practices. This is in particular the case for both Social Protection and OSH in which Korea is considered to be a good model.

All the capacity building activities undertaken in 2019 are due to be continued in 2020 but have for now been put on hold due to the COVID-19 situation.

4.4 Effectiveness of management arrangement

Processes and procedures (EQ12)

To what extent are the tripartite constituents and the project counterparts satisfied with processes and procedures and the services delivered by each of the three regional projects?

The programme team states that *“all ILO/Korea projects follow the ILO Development Cooperation Manual. The programme does not have its own operation manual particularly for projects funded by ILO/Korea”*. A specific operations manual describing processes and procedures is not available.

The 2015-2017 Evaluation suggested that *“each and every project must have a comprehensive Results-Based Monitoring system which must be coordinated among the three projects. It must include complete Log Frames with clear assumptions, OVIs and milestones, as well as a Theory of Change and a Risk Analysis”*.

¹ Participants were not interviewed directly by the evaluators, but this statement is based on internal reports made by the participants to their superiors.

Following this recommendation would have allowed to monitor the satisfaction of tripartite constituents and counterparts in a structured and organized way. Every project however has defined monitoring in different ways, as described in the progress reports:

Skills Progress Report: for all activities, the Skills & Employability Specialists provide technical guidance and advisory against the implementation plan whilst the programme staff monitor progress against M&E plan. The annual Executive Committee Meetings and the annual technical progress report are other means of assuring that progress is monitored and tracked.

Social Protection Progress Report: progress is monitored based on the administrative and financial records of the Project, minutes of meetings and briefing note of each event. The fact that the Project design and work plans are regularly discussed with national partners also allows an additional element to monitor the impact of the Project. In addition, the ILO monitors also information based on the data associated with the monitoring of the SDG indicator 1.3, which measures countries progresses in terms of the extension of social protection coverage.

OSH Progress Reports: major intervention and activities were shared with relevant constituents and stakeholders in the countries through OSH discussion platforms consisting of relevant tripartite constituents' members in Myanmar and Lao PDR. This system allows the OSH project team to obtain feedback and inform progress.

With 3 different approaches to monitor progress in the programme in absence of structured operational procedures, it is not possible to comment on satisfaction of the parties involved other than through the satisfaction survey undertaken as part of the present evaluation (see above EQ10).

Involvement of stakeholders in implementation (EQ13)

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

Due to the “remote” nature of the evaluation, it is very difficult to provide a comprehensive analysis of all stakeholders' engagement with or in the project, but not all organizations appear to be satisfied with the way in which they are involved in implementation.

In Lao PDR, the employers' organization (LNCCI) declares being involved both in the OSH project and in the Skills project through participation in all tripartite meetings, as well as in several workshops organized by the projects. Their engagement with the projects is said to be in line with their expectations.

In Cambodia, the employers' organization (CAMFEBA) expressed some disappointment about its limited involvement in consultations during the preparation of the Social Security Law, which was presented to their members as a “fait accompli”. CAMFEBA indeed states that they were not invited by the government to participate in the discussions leading to the formulation of the Social Security Law² for which they were eager to provide expertise. CAMFEBA however provided feed-back to the NSSF with which it is now actively working on preparing the relevant sub-decrees to implement the law. With regard to the skills project, CAMFEBA is supportive of the work on MRS and is eager to provide support to obtain political commitment to achieve recognition of skills.

The major dissatisfaction comes from the workers' organizations in Cambodia, claiming that their contribution in providing information on social protection has left them without feed-back or follow-up from the government. Both Skills and Social Protection are important topics in

² This information could not be verified

which the workers' organizations want to have a saying. The representatives of the workers' organization suggested that their working relation with the ILO has always been "fruitful due to communication, formation, coordination, commitment and supporting".

In Myanmar workers' organizations, more focused on social protection than on skills or OSH, endorse the work of the ILO/Korea project but not always get involved in accordance with their expectations. This is particularly the case for the Agriculture and Farmer Federation claiming to be "left aside by the project". The employer's organizations interviewed during this evaluation had noticeably little information about the way in which the project interacts with the SSB, though he is a member of the management board. Having been participating himself in the study visit Thailand and Indonesia he seemed not to be aware that this was funded by the ILO/Korea project. Employers however support the work being done by the government with regard to developing Social Protection.

Delivery of core services (EQ14)

How effectively have the projects delivered core services to project counterparts and relevant stakeholders?

Overall, the delivery of core services has been well received by the beneficiaries, especially regarding training activities. The knowledge of Korean experts in combination with ILO expertise is considered to be useful for both the OSH and the Social Protection projects. The three projects are aligned with national priorities in all countries covered by the programme and activities fall in line with the agendas of all stakeholders.

Despite some weaknesses in communication and in the contribution of the projects to gender equality and environmental issues (ratings on the contribution of the projects to gender equality (3.2) and environmental issues (3.0) are rather low compared to other criteria), the stakeholders rate the ILO/Korea partnership rather high as confirmed by the satisfaction survey (results presented in section 5.3 – EQ10). The added value of Korea in sharing their experience is highly valued as is the contribution of the project to capacity building (rated 4.1)

Synergies and cooperation (EQ15)

To what extent are the ILO/Korea funded projects working effectively with other ILO development cooperation projects in order to maximize impact and minimize duplication of efforts?

In **Lao PDR**, besides the ILO/Korea project on OSH, the ILO implements the Vision Zero Fund project "Safety and Health in Lao PDR supply chains" funded by the European Union with a much higher budget of 1.2 million \$. The two projects have implemented joint activities, e.g. the training workshop for strengthening labour inspectors' capacity on OSH in June 2019. Coordination to avoid overlaps and duplication of efforts is done through a joint Project Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting once a year as well as in committee meetings organized by the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare. Joining efforts with a much larger project maximizes the potential impact as it allows, for example, to reach out to larger audiences.

With regard to the Skills project, synergies have been sought with the TRIANGLE in ASEAN project funded by Australia and Canada which also contributed technically and financially to the RSTWG meetings, hence also benefiting to Cambodia and Myanmar.

In **Cambodia**, the ILO/Korea programme has cooperated and plans to further cooperate with other ILO projects, both to secure additional resources to co-fund staff and/or to undertake joint co-funded activities, mainly in relation to Social Protection. This is for example the case for:

- The ILO/UNDESA project (funded by China) for the organization of a cost-shared joint workshop with NSSF related to the modernization of the NSSF
- The TRIANGLE in ASEAN project as per above
- The OSH project in the construction sector (funded by Japan) which provided an opportunity for the Social Protection project to introduce social protection concepts in the construction sector
- The UN Joint SDG Fund (ILO/UNICEF/WHO) working on Social Protection Floors
- The EU/ILO/UNICEF/GCSPF programme on improving synergies between social protection and public finance management, which started in December 2019 and covers 8 priority countries around the world, including Cambodia.

The Social Protection project also managed to secure additional resources from non-ILO projects, e.g.

- From the regional project “Support to the extension of Social Health Protection in South-East Asia” funded by the Government of Luxemburg to fund the participation of 2 officials from NSSF and GS-NSPC in a regional workshop on health insurance in Vietnam
- From the French NGO Auchan’s Foundation Weave our Future to fund the preparation of NSSF’s communication campaign strategy.
- From the Agence Française de Développement (AFD) to contribute funds to a study on Pension³

The different initiatives to develop synergies with other projects and complement the programme with additional resources, rather than working in isolation, are likely to improve the impact of the projects as they benefit from others and become part of a more global effort to achieve results in issues of common interest.

In **Myanmar**, the projects mainly cooperated with the South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC) project, with which training materials on Social Protection have been jointly prepared and with which the “Knowledge Sharing workshop on Social Protection” was organized together with Thailand’s Social Security Office (SSO) and the National Health Security Office (NGSO) of Thailand in Myanmar.

Knowledge Exchange Study Trips to Thailand and Indonesia’s Social Security organizations to promote awareness of delivery mechanisms, IT solutions and extension of social protection coverage were also jointly organized with SSTC.

As for the other countries, the skills project also indirectly benefited from the support of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN project and so did the OSH and Social Protection projects from the Zero Fund project.

Other projects are in the pipeline for the coming years providing further opportunities for synergies and cooperation, among which mainly large ADB and WB projects.

4.5 Efficiency of resource use

Value for money (EQ16)

To what extent have the projects and the programme delivered value for money? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically and efficiently to achieve expected results? Could they have been allocated more effectively and if

³ Information provided by one informant only and not verified – no evidence provided in the reports

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

Financial data provided by the project team shows that only 44.5% of the total budget has been disbursed up to 31/12/2019 while 64% of the implementation time has been consumed.

Total expenditures are as follows (in US\$):

Year	RAS/17/50/KOR Skills	RAS/17/51/KOR Social Protection	RAS/17/53/KOR OSH	Total
2018	86,465	119,936	50,943	257,344
2019	206,829	304,865	100,288	611,982
Total	293,294	424,801	151,231	869,326

The disbursements on project basis are as follows:

- RAS/17/50/KOR: 36.7%
- RAS/17/51/KOR: 47.2%
- RAS/17/53/KOR: 50.4%

The Partnership Programme is managed by an official of the MOEL/KOR detached to the ILO; he is assisted by two national officers based in the ROAP and national project officers for the 3 projects. The technical implementation of the projects is carried out by ILO technical specialists as well as by two officials detached from Korea.

The total costs of national professional staff, local support staff, international and national consultants amount to 56.2% of total expenditures; training and seminars account for 21.1%, which also includes consultancy fees.

The project funds only cover the two staff in the ROAP office and the national project officers. Staff funding, based on a new rule set by the Korean government, is now limited to 35% of the budget. The Programme Manager is funded by other budgets and therefore not included in this ceiling.

This budgetary limitation has forced the programme to make two national project officers redundant during implementation, with the result that there is no more national project officer for OSH in Lao PDR. Considering the absence of the Korean official from KOSHA due to COVID-19 travel restrictions, this leaves the OSH project without any human resource in Lao PDR, hence stalling most if not all activities and follow-up on previous actions. Similarly, in Cambodia, the Social Protection project is left without any dedicated staff in place since December 2019 when the Programme Officer's contract ended.

The funds engaged so far have however allowed to deliver against the expected outputs in a satisfactory way, though the projects are now facing delays in implementation due to the COVID-19 pandemic which puts on hold many activities.

The low disbursement rate is therefore not expected to improve in the immediate future.

4.6 Impact

Social, economic and environmental impact (EQ17)

To what extent has the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme through its funded projects had social, economical, and environmental effects in each of the targeted countries and ASEAN?

Despite being a continuation of previous engagement of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme in the countries covered by the present 2018-2020 cycle, the status of implementation in all three projects can be summarized as “work in progress”:

- The Skills project will have an impact once the MRS pilot is completed and joint recognition between Thailand and the CLM countries has been achieved; meanwhile the immediate effect of the project is that standards in the CLM countries are being reviewed and upgraded, while a good understanding and working relationship has been established between the governments of Thailand and CLM countries. Ultimately, the real impact will materialize once MRS will go beyond technical recognition and hit the employment market when employers will endorse the recognition of skills of migrant workers.
- The Social Protection project will impact on final beneficiaries once laws and decrees developed with the support of the project will be implemented, which requires political commitment. It is expected that more workers both in the formal and informal sectors of the economy, including migrants, will benefit from better coverage, but this is unlikely to happen during the lifetime of the current project. Meanwhile, the immediate effect of the project is to have raised awareness about different social protection issues among employers and workers and enhanced the capacity of key stakeholders to develop the necessary tools and mechanisms to achieve better protection of workers.
- The OSH project, despite its limited resources, provides added value to the support provided by ILO technical specialists during several years and to the much larger projects implemented in Lao and Myanmar. Joining efforts with the Vision Zero Fund projects provides a contribution to the impact of the global approach of both projects (as mentioned in above EQ15).

In summary, impact has yet to come. Indicators are pointing in the right direction, but more time (and support) is needed to consolidate and finalize the “construction sites” of the projects and hence achieve social and economic impact.

How the ASEAN Secretariat views the potential impact of the projects could not be established as an interview with the evaluator was denied. ASEAN Member States however state that the exchange of information at ASEAN level facilitated by the meetings and workshops organized by the project are greatly beneficial for all countries.

Changing practices (EQ18)

To which extent was there a change observed as regards to the beneficiaries’ knowledge of skills, social protection and OSH, and have the results of the projects influenced practices in the respective countries?

As stated above, work is in progress to achieve a tangible impact, but it can be assumed that the multiple training activities delivered by the projects have enhanced the knowledge and skills of those involved in the different workshops and seminars. This is confirmed by all stakeholders and reflected in the satisfaction survey, in which “the contribution of the projects to capacity building” has been rated as excellent and/or good by all respondents.

As mentioned above (see “limitations”), assessing to which extent enhanced knowledge and skills are converted into changing attitudes/behaviours would have required a different approach than a “remote” evaluation. Informants have reported changes in working practices

(e.g. new vision of labour inspectors on OSH or improved methods for assessors, quality assurance and certification) but this could not be “remotely” verified.

4.7 Sustainability

Sustainability strategies (EQ19)

What strategies have the three projects put in place to ensure continuation of mechanisms/tools/practices provided, if the support from the ILO/Korea Programme ends? To what extent are these strategies likely to be effective?

The **Skills** project document defines sustainability as follows:

“The intensified regional dialogue towards the actual pilot implementation of MRS in ASEAN (which is planned under Objective 1) will take place in close partnership with the focal point of skills development/TVET in each ASEAN countries and the ASEAN Secretariat. This will anchor the link between the project and the ASEAN-led initiative, and that the regional dialogue takes place as part of the ASEAN initiative on promoting mutual recognition of skills and development of ASEAN Regional Reference Framework (AQR) led by the ASEAN secretariat. It is expected that the close partnership with the ASEAN Secretariat and the project’s relevance in relation to the ASEAN’s workplan would significantly contribute to the sustainability and impacts of the project’s activities.

In terms of the capacity building work targeting CLM countries (Objective 2), the project will bring needed expertise to the formulation and implementation of skills development policies and programmes in the context of national dialogue in the three countries. These programmes are clearly anchored in national priorities and lead by relevant Ministries. National ownership and broad-based consultation will be key to attaining sustainable gender responsive social health protection reforms.

Ultimately, sustainability will be achieved by the laws, regulations, national policies and strategies and Government financial commitments over multiyear plans to implement key skills development programmes. The involvement of social partners and civil society, and the dissemination of information through media at large will be critical in ensuring understanding and ownership of national skills development and mutual recognition of skills”.

The proposed sustainability strategy is adequate. According to project reports, the involvement of the ASEAN Secretariat has been promoted but, unfortunately, the Secretariat’s engagement could not be assessed during this evaluation as an interview with the evaluator was not accepted despite multiple requests made by the project team. It is however clear that all ASEAN Member States support the initiatives of the project considering that plans are being made to set up an ASEAN TVET council (initiated by the Philippines) to facilitate and further intensify regional convergence on TVET, MRA and MRS.

All governments involved in the pilot MRS are eager to succeed and reach full recognition of skills in the selected occupations, which would be confirmed by Joint Declarations between the government of Thailand and the CLM countries. The project provides the requested support to achieve this recognition from a technical point of view but officially signing such declarations will require political commitment, especially from the Thai side.

The **Social Protection** project document defines sustainability as follows:

“The project will bring needed expertise to the formulation and implementation of social protection policies and programmes in the context of national dialogue in the three countries. These programmes are clearly anchored in national priorities and lead by relevant Ministries. National ownership and broad-based consultation will be key to attaining sustainable gender responsive social health protection reforms.

Ultimately, sustainability will be achieved by the laws, regulations, national policies and strategies and Government financial commitments over multiyear plans to implement key social health protection programmes. The involvement of social partners and civil society, and the dissemination of information through media at large will be critical in ensuring understanding and ownership of social protection reforms. When required, the project will assist in implementing national health protection monitoring gender responsive mechanisms that will assist countries in measuring progress in social health protection expenditure and performance (coverage, adequacy of benefits, efficiency, etc...)”.

Social protection is on the agenda of all governments, employers’ and workers’ organizations, though with different views and priorities. The project has provided the necessary support to lay the foundations both in Cambodia and in Myanmar where the legal framework is now in place. The project has promoted the convergence of interests of tripartite constituents and prepared the conditions for the governments to proceed with implementation of the legal framework.

Capacity development is being delivered by the project as well as technical expertise to finalize the necessary steps leading to implementation and furthermore expand the scope of social protection. In Myanmar capacity building linked to the IT reform is of utmost importance to ensure success and sustainability of the system.

The **OSH** project document does not explicitly refer to any sustainability strategy or option.

In Myanmar, awareness raising campaigns, tripartite consultations and various workshops have been organized to prepare for an improved reporting system. In Lao PDR work is still in progress to finalize the OSH profile and develop a national OSH policy; training of labour inspectors has also been delivered.

Both in Lao PDR and in Myanmar, the project works is parallel with the Vision Zero Fund project and with even more OSH projects in Myanmar. The budget is small compared to the other projects and expecting the project to be sustainable on its own is not realistic. The project has to be seen as a contribution to OSH developments for which sustainability will be ensured globally with all other initiatives. It would therefore be useful for the project to define an integrated sustainability approach during the remaining time of implementation.

Local ownership (EQ20)

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

Sustaining the work of the projects requires engagement and commitment of all beneficiaries, especially at the level of government institutions.

The **Social Protection** project is genuinely embedded in the SSB in Myanmar, which has financially contributed to cover expenses of the consultant providing support for the IT system. Such financial contribution is unique in Myanmar and can be seen as a clear confirmation of the commitment and ownership of the project by the government. The SSB is furthermore fully dedicated to finalizing the work as the IT Reform is key to the whole administrative reform process in Myanmar and therefore has to be successfully completed. Employers’ and workers’ organizations support the process, though some doubts have been raised about SSB’s capability by one of the workers’ organizations interviewed during the evaluation. In Cambodia, the NSSF views the project more as a contribution to the global support provided by the ILO rather than a self-standing project. Sustainability is seen in the context of further ILO support rather than in building by own means on what the ILO/Korea project has delivered, despite the fact that the NSSF provides financial means to the modernization project. NSSF clearly stated in the interview

“we are requiring and requesting ILO to continue its support furthermore on technical support and funding”.

As already mentioned, the **OSH** project added to the support provided by ILO specialists for several years despite its limited budget. The Lao PDR government is committed to develop OSH further and plans to create an “OSH Institute” which would have the mandate to draft policies and regulations, provide training, etc. This decision made by the Ministry most likely finds its roots in the support provided by the ILO through both the Vision Zero Fund project and the ILO/Korea Partnership project. The same applies for Myanmar where ILO/Korea Partnership and Vision Zero Fund, as well as other projects, have been working together to develop a sense of ownership among all constituents.

With regard to the Skills project, the different ministries involved in the MRS are very committed to finalize the process and achieve bilateral recognition of skills with Thailand, viewed by some as a first step towards a much larger multilateral recognition of skills at ASEAN level. While the interest of sending countries to achieve MRS is obvious, at the receiving side in Thailand the ministry has also taken ownership of the process, though the finalization will depend on the political commitment of the government as signing Joint Declarations of recognition will need the endorsement of the Cabinet.

Partnerships (EQ21)

How can the projects’ key partnerships contribute to the sustainability of the initiatives under the projects and to what extent? Are other partnerships worth considering and, if so, which ones?

The involvement of Korean partner institutions has allowed project beneficiaries to learn from Korea’s experience with social protection schemes, which are considered to be a good model for both Cambodia and Myanmar. The same applies for OSH despite the much smaller level of activities, but thanks to the support provided by the expert delegated by KOSHA.

Further support during the remaining implementation time and beyond is expected from the beneficiaries and is often taken for granted as the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme is seen as a long-term cooperation. None of the stakeholders would even think about ending this cooperation programme.

One of the weaker features of the programme is the link to ASEAN priorities and needs. Several initiatives/workshops have taken place at ASEAN level which may have been sufficient for now, but a stronger partnership with the ASEAN Secretariat could only be beneficial in a further project cycle.

Considering what has been mentioned above about the sustainability of the OSH, a stronger partnership with the Vision Zero Fund should be considered, beyond jointly organizing certain events or workshops. The Vision Zero Fund is an initiative of the G7, endorsed by the G20, and funded by the European Commission, France, Germany, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom and the United States. As the Fund is administered and managed by the ILO, the ROK might want to consider joining the Fund as a donor, rather than implementing activities without permanent presence of staff in Lao PDR and/or Myanmar. Being part of a much larger set-up, this would also provide better visibility to the ROK as the contribution would be highlighted in many more activities and events organized by the Fund, as well as in high profile G7/G20 meetings.

4.8 Cross-cutting issues

Gender equality, ILS, social dialogue, tripartite processes, capacity development and environmental sustainability (EQ22)

To what extent have gender equality and non-discrimination, international labour standards (ILS), social dialogue, tripartite processes, and constituent capacity development and environmental sustainability been addressed in the design and in the implementation of the ILO/Korea projects? And what interventions have been applied to address these issues?

The ILO's mandate is to advance social justice and promote decent work by setting international labour standards. The ILO promotes dialogue and cooperation between governments, employers, and workers and assists them to coordinate strategies for promoting decent employment and stands out as the lead UN agency for development cooperation in the field of skills and employment promotion, while also paying particular attention to value chain development, gender, disability and green jobs among other cross-cutting issues.

The technical support provided by the ILO to the project ensures that ILO's values are taken into consideration at all times, though the involvement of employers' and workers' organizations is sometimes limited to their participation in a few meetings.

The Social Protection project and the OSH project report having paid particular attention to bring together tripartite constituents, which however was somewhat downplayed by the workers' organizations in Cambodia suggesting that their involvement was rather limited.

The tripartite structure of the ILO and its efforts to promote the participation of all constituents in developing policies were furthermore recognized at the ILO/Korea TVET forum.

4.9 COVID-19

Covid-19 effects (EQ22)

How does the COVID-19 pandemic affect the Programme and the individual projects with regard to relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability? What could be the consequences for the ILO/Korea current and future partnership programmes?

The Covid-19 pandemic is impacting the delivery of many activities of the three projects. Both the Skills project and the Social Protection projects have already prepared revised workplans and/or contingency plans which call for a no-cost extension of the projects. The OSH project has not prepared any revised work plan at this time.

Besides delaying activities, the COVID-19 crisis has other implications which mainly relate to **Social Protection**. The economic fall-out has shifted priorities and attention from Social Protection initiatives to economic recovery with, e.g. priority given to "cash for the poor" programmes in Cambodia. Hundreds, if not thousands of factories have suspended their operations leaving thousands without any income. In the garment, footwear and travel good industry for example, 400 factories have closed leaving 150.000 workers jobless. The same applies for the tourism sector in which many jobs were suspended. The government is providing support for workers in the tourism and garment sectors with the backing of the NSSF. The crisis has reinforced the need to better social protection, in particular for the workers of the informal sector, which gives the workers' organization more leverage to negotiate with the government and employers' organizations. The government in Cambodia is determined to proceed with the plans, though with some delays, which employers' organization however tend to find too hurried. Launching the Pension Fund before the end of the year as now planned by the government is, for example, not found to be reasonable as the financial pressure on employers' will be too high, especially for hotel and restaurant business owners who may not see any improvements as long as mass tourism does not return, as well as for the garment sector largely depending on orders from foreign customers. The closure of many business also affects the

financial security of the NSSF as contributions do not flow as they used to. At short-term this is not a major issue for the NSSF, but in the long run this might become problematic and affect the services of the fund.

The situation in Myanmar and Lao PDR is no different, as thousands of migrant workers, mainly agriculture and construction workers, have returned from abroad and are now left without any revenue or social protection. Supporting the development of Social Protection has become more relevant than ever as all constituents recognize the need to advance in this field, despite different views on urgencies and timing.

The need for better **OSH** also “benefits” from the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic, in particular for the “H” part of OSH. While Safety (“S”) has always been the focus of labour ministries and labour inspectors, the health issue has now gained momentum with ministries of health reaching out to ministries of labour for a better coordination.

With regard to the **Skills** project, activities have been delayed and will be further delayed, including the planned regional events (i.e. the 6th RSTWG meeting) which will more likely be delayed to the next project cycle. The contingency plan suggests that savings made in postponing the RSTWG meeting could be re-allocated to other activities, especially capacity development activities. The suggestion will be welcomed by the project partners eager to see capacity development activities further increased.

Because of the prevention measures (i.e. social distancing, hygiene etiquette) imposed and/or recommended to prevent the spread of infections, the idea of developing online workshops and seminars has been brought up several times during the evaluation. Besides ensuring full protection in avoiding physical contacts of participants, such workshops would also offer the opportunity to reach out to larger groups of participants. The suggestion is certainly worth considering but requires adequate preparation for which the time may be too short for the current project cycle.

5 Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Overall assessment

Overall, as already mentioned, work is in progress. Activities are adequate and correctly implemented.

The Skills project makes good progress towards planned results and mutual recognition of skills has been put on the agenda of several ASEAN countries, besides those involved in the pilot scheme. MRS still is a learning process, but the project contributes to improve skills systems in the target countries. Political engagement at high level is needed to formalize recognition of skills and ultimately impact on employment.

The Social Protection project consolidates and develops further the achievements of the previous phase in Cambodia and in Myanmar while strengthening tripartite dialogue aiming at further policy developments.

The OSH project has made progress in providing a modest but useful contribution to the OSH developments in Lao PDR and Myanmar.

Due to delays in implementation resulting from the COVID-19 crisis, the current contractual end date of the projects needs to be reviewed in order to allow objectives to be met or closely met.

5.2 Recommendations

The final evaluation of the previous programme cycle made specific recommendations which have not always been followed, even though some of them already were repeat recommendations from previous evaluations.

Based on the above analysis and conclusions, the evaluator would like to present the following recommendations, some of which are again repetitive from the 2015-2017 evaluation:

	Recommendation	Justification
1	Consider extending the project for at least 6 months – alternatively shift balance of activities not implemented to new projects under the next programme cycle	As mentioned in section 5.9, the Covid-19 pandemic is impacting the delivery of many activities of the three projects. Not much has happened since January/February and at this time it is unclear how long this unfortunate situation will last. Two of the three projects have already prepared contingency plans and revised work plans which will become operational once activities will resume in full or under the “new normal”. The low disbursement rate of the projects (financial data is provided in section 5.5) provides sufficient room for a no-cost extension of the projects for at least 6 months. Once updated financial information is available, the option for a no-cost extension should be reviewed by the project management, also taking into consideration commitments already made until the end of the year. Should such a no-cost extension however technically be difficult to be implemented, the remaining and un-finished activities could be shifted to new projects under the new programme to avoid overlaps of the 2 programmes.

		Addressed to the ILO/Korea Project Management – High priority – No financial resources required (no-cost extension)
2	Define more precise indicators of achievement for all three projects	<p>In order to facilitate a results analysis, it is important to update in very precise terms the indicators of achievement which will be reached upon closure of the projects (with or without extension). This goes beyond outputs and implies more than just showing numbers reached in order to prepare for a post-project impact evaluation which would pave the way for new projects under a further 3-year cycle.</p> <p>As mentioned in section 5.2, the indicators defined for the Skills project are mostly generic, those for the Social Protection project are mostly activity-based and those for the OSH project are weak. The previous evaluation already recommended to define more useful results-based indicators and to have more consistency in presenting logical frameworks. Considering that the ILO/Korea programme contributes to the DWCP, linking results-based indicators with DWCP outcome indicators would provide an added-value, though this is not the priority for a specific results-based framework for the programme itself.</p> <p>Activities already completed and further activities planned or initiated provide sufficient background information to clarify the indicators. Indicators should be realistic and causally relate to the activity and outcome they are defined for.</p> <p>Should the project team not have the time and/or the capacity to redefine indicators for the projects, the evaluator suggests to hire an external consultant with strong PCM/LFM background for 5 working days to review the current indicators and define the indicators for the next programme</p> <p>Addressed to Project Management – Medium priority – No financial resources required</p>
3	Boost the support to beneficiaries in Lao PDR to address their demand for urgent external assistance	<p>The Ministry of Labour has expressed the need to be supported for the finalization of the OSH profile which, according to the Ministry, cannot be done without external support. The departure of the ILO OSH Specialist and the absence of both the KOSHA expert and of the National Project Coordinator have stalled the work on the OSH profile.</p> <p>With regard to the Skills project, progress is slow mainly because of the lack of staff in the Ministry. External support would be welcome to make progress on the MRS Implementation Roadmap. Compared to progress in Myanmar and Cambodia, the work in Lao PDR is indeed less advanced. Further capacity building and training is needed for which the project might want to allocate additional resources in the framework of the revised workplan prepared in response to COVID-19.</p> <p>Addressed to Project Management – High priority – Financial resources to be re-allocated from savings made as a result of COVID-19 cancellations</p>
4	Strengthen relationship with ASEAN Secretariat to better link with regional priorities and needs and collaborate with the new ASEAN-Korea TVET project	<p>Several actions of the projects have taken place at ASEAN level, but the relationship with the ASEAN Secretariat is unclear. Besides the fact that the request for interview with the evaluator has never received an answer, the projects' progress reports are not specific about how they interact with the Secretariat and how they link with ASEAN needs and</p>

	to strengthen TVET regional mechanism	<p>priorities, except for the Skills project where the progress reports states that the Secretariat provided support in including the MRS in the ASEAN Labour Ministries Meeting’s work plan. For the OSH project and the Social Protection project, it is not clear how they link with the ASEAN guidelines for OSH and the ASEAN Declaration on Strengthening Social Protection. Developing a closer relationship with the Secretariat at Programme level would also increase visibility of the partnership. This can e.g. be done in synergy with the new ASEAN-Korea TVET project starting in 2021, focusing on training in Korea and NQF with a budget of 6.92 million US\$ over 3 years.</p> <p>Addressed to Programme Manager – Medium priority – No financial resources required</p>
5	Strengthen ownership of projects among beneficiaries	<p>Sustaining the work of the projects requires engagement and commitment of all beneficiaries, especially at the level of government institutions. The evaluation has revealed that ownership is often weak, and that sustainability is expected to come from further external support (see EQ20 – local ownership). The satisfaction survey has furthermore indicated that constituents consider the projects’ ability to encourage beneficiaries to build on achievements without external support is weak, hence the need to develop a stronger sense of ownership among some of the beneficiaries. Constituents however did not make any suggestion as to how the sense of ownership could be enhanced.</p> <p>Addressed to Programme Manager – High priority – No financial resources required</p>
6	Prepare exit strategies of all three projects in preparation of a possible new cycle	<p>In conjunction with the above recommendations, all three projects should develop an exit strategy which will pave the way for the definition of further projects under a new 3-year cycle of the partnership programme.</p> <p>These strategies should take into consideration realistic assumptions about ownership, time (policy changes take time to be implemented), financial limitations (in particular for the OSH project as mentioned in section 5.7) and options/possibilities for further support.</p> <p>Addressed to Programme Team – High priority – No financial resources required</p>
7	Define options for future projects under a new 3-year cycle	<p>Considering the different exit strategies for the three projects, as well as the further needs expressed by the stakeholders during this evaluation, the following options for future support would need to be considered:</p> <p>Skills:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Before considering extending the MRS approach to other countries (e.g. Malaysia as suggested by some stakeholders), consider a “consolidation” phase after completion of the pilot. This phase could also look at developing standard guidelines on how to deal with MRS at ASEAN level in consultation with the ASEAN Secretariat as per above recommendation 4

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In line with the above suggestion, consider establishing a close cooperation with the ASEAN TVET Council in order to boost MRS at political level - Political buy-in for up-scaling MRS can only be gained if it can be demonstrated that there is a skills demand in certain migrant dominated occupations, and skilled migration for those occupations becomes possible through e.g. MOUs. A closer cooperation with the TRIANGLE project should therefore be considered <p>Social Protection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Re-focus a new project in intensifying the support in Myanmar and Cambodia where more training is needed and where additional products could be developed (which one are unique in Korea which can be replicated in Myanmar?) - Establish linkages with ASEAN (what are their needs?) - Link social protection to employment protection in promoting active market policies - Avoid allocating funds to isolated activities (e.g. Vietnam in the current project) <p>OSH:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider financially supporting the Vision Zero Fund while further sharing Korean expertise (see recommendation 8) or - Intensify the support in one country only if the budget allocation remains small, in which case Lao PDR should be prioritized <p><i>Addressed to Programme Management – High/Medium priority – financial resources required</i></p>
8	Enhance expertise of Korea in further projects	<p>Korea is considered by stakeholders as a good model for OSH and Social Protection. The exchanges of information on their practices in sharing experiences and know-how has been well received and prompted the interest to know more about additional “products” which are unique to Korea.</p> <p>As opposed to European or other western models, Korea is considered to be more in line with the environment and way of thinking of ASEAN countries and further exposure to Korean experience would be welcomed by all beneficiaries.</p> <p>It would therefore be worth considering increasing the exchanges with Korean institutions in further projects.</p> <p><i>Addressed to Programme Management – Medium priority – financial resources required</i></p>
9	Gender mainstreaming should be given adequate attention when designing the next programme	<p>As mentioned in section 5.3 – EQ8, gender mainstreaming has been rather weak throughout the three projects with the exception of the gender impact assessment in Vietnam. The recommendation of the previous evaluation remains valid.</p>

		<i>Addressed to Programme Management – Medium priority – no financial resources required</i>
--	--	---

6 Lessons learned and good practices

6.1 Lessons learned

1. A long-term partnership offers the best perspective to achieve meaningful results

As stated above, the programme builds on previous interventions in the framework of a long-established partnership, in particular on the projects of the previous 2015-2017 cycle with a stronger geographical and thematic focus.

Enhancing Social Protection, achieving Skills recognition and improving OSH requires time and resources, both due to the number of steps involved to clear the technical issues, and to the political commitment required to implement and/or enforce decisions and laws. While the projects make good progress, it is clear that two or three years are insufficient to entirely complete the different processes involved and reach the final objectives.

Experience in many countries shows that many development partners typically engage in short-term support rather than in long-term partnerships, often leaving the results of projects uncompleted and hardly sustainable. Despite efforts made by all projects to develop beneficiaries' ownership of results, sustainability is frequently defined as "the next project" to take the work up where the previous project ended. This unfortunately is one of the realities of development cooperation.

The long-term partnership between the Republic of Korea and the ILO addresses this reality and offers a much better perspective to achieve meaningful results.

2. Independent evaluations are not sufficiently taken into consideration

The evaluation of the 2015-2017 evaluation made 12 recommendations, of which several were repeat recommendations from previous evaluations; 4 have not been taken into consideration:

- Maintain a high level of attention for Gender Mainstreaming in the country interventions and include it in all the M&E tools
 - Gender mainstreaming has not been given the level of attention expected. It is acknowledged that gender has been given attention in Vietnam, but this does not compensate for the lack of gender attention in the priority countries of the programme.
- Reach out more to the employers' and especially also to workers'
 - Several worker's organizations claimed that they have been left aside organizations (the next OHS project plans to delegate the OSH campaign activity to the employers and workers' organizations through ACT/EMP and ACTRAV with a budget of USD 30,000)
- Design three coordinated and comprehensive M&E systems with complete Log Frames
 - The Social Protection project is the only one which has developed results-based indicators
- Develop a proper exit strategy at the outset for all the three projects
 - None of the three projects has developed any exit strategy

Besides assessing the progress of projects, an important part of the evaluation is to formulate recommendations which aim to correct and/or improve weaknesses observed by the evaluators. While recommendations can be accommodated when they are deemed to be somewhat unrealistic, they should not be ignored.

6.1 Good practices

The evaluation has allowed to identify two good practices from the current programme cycle which are important to be mentioned:

1. The formal coordination mechanisms set up for the OSH project in Myanmar and Lao PDR to promote synergies and interlinkages while avoiding overlaps with other projects
2. The structured approach to progress on MRS by means of a Roadmap for implementing a pilot scheme endorsed and followed by all beneficiaries.

Details about these emerging good practices are provided in the ILO/EVAL templates presented in Annex 6.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Terms of Reference for the Evaluation

Terms of Reference

Independent Final Evaluation

The 2018 – 2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme funded projects in ASEAN, Thailand, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam

Project Titles	1) Promoting ASEAN Initiatives in TVET and Skills for Inclusive Future of Work 2) Supporting the Implementation of Sustainable Social Protection Floors for the Workers and their Families in ASEAN - Phase II 3) Establishing and enhancing an overall Occupational Safety and Health frame work in Myanmar and Lao PDR
ILO Project Code	RAS/17/50/KOR RAS/17/51/KOR RAS/17/53/KOR
Country	Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Vietnam and ASEAN
Administrative Unit in charge of the project	ROAP and DWT-Bangkok
Technical Backstopping Unit	SKILLS, SOCPRO and LABADMIN/OSH
Type of Evaluation	Independent
Timing of Evaluation	Final
Project Period	April 2018 – December 2020
Total Project Budget	US\$ 3,000,000
Funding Agency	The Ministry of Employment and Labour of the Republic of Korea (MOEL/ROK)
Evaluation Manager	Rattanaporn Pongpattana, M&E Officer

Introduction

This Terms of Reference for a final evaluation of the 2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme encompasses evaluation of the three Asia-Pacific Regional projects as follows:

1. Promoting ASEAN Initiatives in TVET and Skills for Inclusive Future of Work (RAS 17/50/KOR) implemented in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam (CLMV), as well as ASEAN and Thailand.
2. Supporting the Implementation of Sustainable Social Protection Floors for the Workers and their Families in ASEAN - Phase II (RAS 17/51/KOR) implemented in Cambodia, Vietnam and Myanmar
3. Establishing and enhancing an overall Occupational Safety and Health frame work in Myanmar and Lao PDR (RAS 17/53/KOR)

The final independent evaluation of the project is to be undertaken in line with the funding agreement between the Ministry of Employment and Labour of the Republic of Korea (MoEL/ROK) and ILO and complies with the ILO Policy Guidelines for Evaluation published in 2017. The final independent evaluation will be managed by the M&E Officer based in the ILO Regional Office-

Bangkok and will be conducted by a team of independent evaluators (an international and 3 national evaluators based in Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Myanmar) to be recruited by the evaluation manager. Key stakeholders, including tripartite constituents, donor, key partners and the technical specialists in the ILO regional office, will be consulted throughout the evaluation process. The evaluation process and report will follow ILO guidelines and the ILO Evaluation Office will approve the final evaluation report. The evaluation will comply with the United National Evaluation Group (UNEG)'s Evaluation Norms and Standards .

The three projects to be evaluated are under the 2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme which is funded by the Ministry of Employment and Labor of the Republic of Korea (MoEL/ROK). This final evaluation will allow for a holistic and integrated approach in assessing the coherence of the design of the programme and the three Asia-Pacific Regional projects, the efficiency and effectiveness of progress being made in terms of the overall programme's and projects' objectives. The evaluation will assess implementation performance and enhance learning within the ILO and among key stakeholders. The evaluation will apply mixed methods – both qualitative and quantitative. The evaluation team will conduct a thorough review of relevant documents and propose possible methods to gather evidence of implementation, progress, and challenges during the site visits. The evaluation will thus address OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and other relevant cross-cutting issues.

Gender equality and non-discrimination, promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes and constituent capacity development and environmental issues will also be considered throughout this evaluation.

This evaluation is planned for May– August 2020 with the field work in Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Myanmar will take place between 16 June and 29 June 2020 (The plan may be subject to change considering the evolving Covid-19 situation). The final report is expected to be completed by mid August 2020. The M&E Officer, in consultation with the ILO/Korea Programme Manager and the Operations and Program Support Specialist for the programme, will provide all necessary documents and information required by the evaluation team and will facilitate and support the evaluation team on the logistics needed in the evaluation process.

I. Background and description of program and project to be evaluated

ILO/Korea Partnership Programme

1. In 2003, the Ministry of Employment and Labor of the Republic of Korea (MoEL/ROK) signed a memorandum of understanding with the ILO to formalize their partnership for development. From 2004 onwards, the Government of Korea provided funding to institutionalize the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme, which focuses on realizing the objectives set out in the Asian Decent Work Decade. The Programme's support was directed into three thematic areas: competitiveness, productivity and job; labour market governance and social protection; and labour migration management.

2. The current ILO-Korea focuses had been shifted as a result from the findings of the 2013 independent final evaluation, which found that the Programme could enhance effectiveness, sustainability and impact by becoming more selective and focused in its approach and deepening the assistance provided to specific processes. As a result, the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme framework for 2015 – 2017 was therefore revised with a view to enhance efficiency and achieve more profound impacts for the Programme. The Programme framework for 2015 – 2017 focused on three major areas: employment and labour policy, social protection, and occupational safety and health in the following selected countries: Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam (CLMV). Since 2015 the Programme also changed the projects' funding period from one-year to three-year cycle.

3. In March 2018, the MoEL/ROK and the ILO signed a Letter of Agreement to implement the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for 2018-2020. With the total budget of US\$ 3,000,000, the MOEL/ROK and the ILO agreed that the budget allocation was made to the following priority areas/projects:

Priority Areas/Projects	Implementation area	Budget (USD)
Global projects (Geneva HQ)		
Strengthening Public Employment Services in English Speaking Africa (RAF/17/52/KOR)	N/A	600,000
Upholding sustainable delivery mechanisms to promote Occupational Safety and health (OSH) in small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) (GLO/1/52/KOR)	N/A	400,000
Asia-Pacific Regional Projects (ROAP-Bangkok)		
Promoting ASEAN Initiatives in TVET and Skills for Inclusive Future of Work (RAS 17/50/KOR)	Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and ASEAN	800,000
Supporting the Implementation of Sustainable Social Protection Floors for the Workers and their Families in ASEAN - Phase II (RAS 17/51/KOR)	Cambodia, Vietnam and Myanmar	900,000
Establishing and enhancing an overall Occupational Safety and Health frame work in Myanmar and Lao PDR (RAS 17/53/KOR)	Lao PDR, Myanmar and ASEAN	300,000

Background of the three Asia-Pacific Regional Projects

4. Promoting ASEAN Initiatives in TVET and Skills for Inclusive Future of Work (RAS 17/50/KOR). This project marks Phase III of the support of the Government of the Republic of Korea with Phase I taking place between July 2014 and Feb 2015 and Phase II between April 2015 and March 2018. The development objective of the project is to support ASEAN Members States' initiatives to promote mutual recognition of skills and AQRV-TVET in the region and assist their efforts in achieving inclusive future of work through regional networking and dialogue on national skills strategies in meeting future skills challenges. Within three years, the project aims to achieve the following three immediate objectives: 1) the strengthening of ASEAN's regional dialogue and network has facilitated the region's capacities to move forward with the MRS implementation and other key AQRV-TVET agenda; 2) Through the coherent strengthening of assessment, certification and accreditation frameworks, national TVET systems of CLM countries facilitate decent work for national and migrant workers in ASEAN sub-region ; 3) The region has increased its knowledge and experience in enhancing the employability of low-skilled workers in the face of increased automation and computerization.
5. Supporting the Implementation of Sustainable Social Protection Floors for the Workers and their Families in ASEAN - Phase II (RAS 17/51/KOR). The project aims to contributing to a better social protection system by securing income, increasing access to social services, and enhancing employability of female and male workers in ASEAN, with a specific focus on three countries: Cambodia and Myanmar and Vietnam. The project had three immediate objectives: 1) Social security schemes created and strengthened with the view to facilitate access to social protection for uncovered groups; 2) Access to social protection services enhanced through the progressive expansion of effective delivery mechanisms, and; 3) ASEAN countries are knowledgeable about relevant practices to extend social protection to all, including vulnerable and unprotected groups.
6. Establishing and enhancing an overall Occupational Safety and Health framework in Myanmar and Lao PDR (RAS 17/53/KOR). This is Phase II of the support by the ILO/Korea Project. The overall goal is Establish and enhance an overall occupational safety and health framework in Myanmar and Lao PDR. The specific goal is that by 2020, the Government in Myanmar (MOLIP/FGLLID) and in Lao PDR (MOLSW/DOLM) in consultation with the social partners has increased capacity to formulate, implement, monitor, review, enhance and/or enforce a modern OSH policy and legal framework. The project also extends to cover ASEAN with the aims to have Tripartite constituents in the region benefitting from increased OSH knowledge and capacities through training programs, workshops and fellowships supported by the project. The immediate objectives of the project include: 1) improvement of occupational injuries and diseases reporting system and raised awareness on OSH issues in Myanmar; 2) Improvement of the Legal and Institutional Framework on OSH in Lao PDR AND 3) Strengthened capacity of the OSH authority and OSH Inspection in Lao PDR; and 4) Increased OSH knowledge, capacity and collaboration in the ASEAN sub-region.

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

8. The Programme is executed by the ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) under the guidance of the Deputy Regional Director. The Programme Manager of the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme coordinates and monitors the Programme implementation and reporting requirements, provides administrative and programme support, and liaises with the donor and the ILO relevant departments on related matters. A Programme Officer and an Administrative Secretary support the work of the Programme Manager.

9. For implementation of the Programme’s priority areas/projects, the ILO designates a lead specialist per priority area of the Programme to ensure that activities planned and outputs delivered under different projects are inter-related and well-coordinated with other initiatives at the country and regional levels, and support the achievements of regional outcomes and Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs). The lead specialists coordinate and mobilize support of other specialists in related disciplines (development economist, employment, OSH, working conditions, social security, industrial relations, gender, migration, labour market information, skills etc.) for smooth delivery. Partner Institutions are advised on their counterparts for specific Programme areas and fully participate in planning and design of project activities. The lead specialists also coordinate with Decent Work Technical Support teams (DWTs), country offices and headquarters technical units for effective delivery of the Programmes.

Direct stakeholders

10. Direct stakeholders of the projects include
- National Government of Cambodia
 - o Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training (MOLVT)
 - o National Social Security Fund
 - o National Social Security Council
 - National Government of Lao PDR
 - o Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (MOLSW)
 - National Government of Myanmar
 - o Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population (MOLIP)
 - o Social Security Board
 - Employers’ Organization in CLMV

- Workers' Organization in CLMV

II. Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation

11. The main purpose of the independent final evaluation is for accountability (measure the process, progress, outcome, learning and the achievement of the project in terms of the expected and stated results) and learning for improvement. The evaluation will review the approach and design implemented in achieving and/or progress towards outcomes, as well as assess factors (in design and implementation) that have contributed to or impeded achievement of outcomes. The evaluation will also examine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the project. The evaluation will also identify the extent to which project activities have so far contributed towards the achievement of desired outcomes (in comparison with the expected KPI as per the project's log frame), and to draw out and document key lessons learnt as well as to provide a set of recommendations to inform future directions of the ILO/Korea programme and to inform better allocation of resources.

12. Specific objectives of the independent final evaluation are to:

- (i) Assess satisfaction of tripartite constituents and the project counterparts on the processes and procedures and the services delivered by the three projects under the 2018 – 2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme, using a standardized satisfaction assessment questionnaires;
- (ii) Assess effectiveness and efficiency of the three ILO/Korea-funded Asia-Pacific Regional projects, including the progress in achieving results vis-à-vis their original plans (including intended and unintended, positive and negative results), the challenges affecting the achievement of the results, factors that hindered or facilitated achievement so far, and effectiveness of management arrangements;
- (iii) Assess effectiveness and efficiency of overall performance of the 2018 – 2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme;
- (iv) Identify factors that influenced (positively or negatively) the sustainability of the interventions of the three ILO/Korea-funded Asia-Pacific Regional projects;
- (v) Identify good practices at the Programme and project levels that can and should be replicated; and
- (vi) Identify lessons learned that should be reflected in the design and implementation of similar projects and programmes in the future.

III. Evaluation Scope

13. The evaluation will cover the three priority areas administered by ROAP and implementation of all three-funded Asia-Pacific Regional projects. The evaluation will cover all the geographic coverage of the three projects, including Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar (CLM) and Vietnam Thailand, and ASEAN. However the main target countries are CLMV. As the countries selected for field visit include CLM and Thailand, the international evaluator will interview with interviewees in Vietnam and ASEAN through communication channels.

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

15. Gender dimension will be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report. In terms of this evaluation, this implies involving both men and women in the consultation, evaluation analysis and evaluation team. Moreover the evaluators should review data and information that is disaggregated by sex and gender and assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve the lives of women and men. All this information should be accurately included in the inception report and evaluation report.

IV. Evaluation Criteria and Questions

16. The evaluation should address the following ILO evaluation criteria: relevance and strategic fit of the intervention; coherence; efficiency of resource use; and effectiveness of management arrangements and impact and Sustainability; as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 3rd ed. (Aug. 2017) (Annex 1).

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

18. It is expected that the evaluation address all of the questions detailed below to the extent possible. The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions, but any fundamental changes should be agreed upon between the ILO team and the evaluator. The evaluation instruments (to be summarized in the inception report) should identify the general areas of focus listed here as well as other priority aspects to be addressed in the evaluation.

19. Suggested evaluation criteria and evaluation questions are summarized below:

Relevance

a) Do the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change?

b) To what extent have the three projects under the 2018 - 2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme have addressed the needs of the tripartite constituents in the target countries?

Coherence and strategic fit of the intervention

- a) How well does the project complement and fit with programmes and priorities of the constituents?
- b) To what extent are synergies and interlinkages between the project interventions and other interventions carried out by ILO, Government and social partners in place?
- c) Are the indicators and milestones useful in assessing the project's progress and achievements?

Effectiveness

- a) To what extent have the three projects and the 2018 – 2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for been making sufficient progress towards its planned results (including intended and unintended, positive and negative)?
- b) To what extent has gender mainstreaming been addressed by the design and implementation of the three projects and the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for 2018 – 2020?
- c) What evidences exist to demonstrate the three projects and the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme for 2018 – 2020 contributed to policy formulation and capacity building in the target countries?
- d) How well has each project comparatively performed as assessed through the satisfaction of the tripartite constituent project partners and beneficiaries? To what extent are the tripartite constituents and the project counterparts satisfied with the services and deliverables and outputs delivered by each of the regional projects?

Effectiveness of management arrangement

- a) To what extent are the tripartite constituents and the project counterparts satisfied with processes and procedures and the services delivered by each of the three regional projects?
- b) To what extent have stakeholders, particularly workers' and employers' organizations been involved in projects implementation?
- c) How effectively has the projects delivered core services to project counterparts and relevant stakeholders?
- d) To what extent are the ILO/Korea funded projects working effectively with other ILO development cooperation projects in order to maximize impact and minimize duplication of efforts?

Efficiency of resource use

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

Impact

a) To what extent has the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme through its funded projects had social, economical, and environmental effects in each of the targeted countries and ASEAN?

Sustainability

a) What strategies have the three projects put in place to ensure continuation of mechanisms/tools/practices provided, if the support from the ILO/Korea Programme ends? To what extent are there strategies likely to be effective?

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

Cross cutting issues

a) To what extent have gender equality and non-discrimination, international labour standards (ILS), social dialogue, tripartite processes, and constituent capacity development and environmental sustainability been addressed in the design and in the implementation of the ILO/Korea projects? And what interventions have been applied to address these issues?

V. Methodology

20. The evaluation will comply with evaluation norms, standards and follow ethical safeguards, as specified in the ILO's evaluation procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations system of evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

20. A mix-method (both qualitative and quantitative evaluation approaches) should be used for this evaluation. Qualitative information will be obtained from key informant interviews and focus group discussions as appropriate.

21. Quantitative data of Constituents' satisfaction with the services, will be drawn both from the existing Project data of Constituents' satisfaction with the services they received, and a final assessment (rating) to be carried out by the evaluation team.

22. Quantitative comparative and crossover analysis that is to be executed would yield numeric ratings that allow comparisons of levels of satisfactions of the constituents on the three projects. The criteria for assessment would follow some of the evaluation criteria, i.e. Relevance, Coherence and strategic fit of the intervention, Effectiveness, Effectiveness of management arrangement, Efficiency of resource use, Impact, Sustainability, and Gender equality and non-discrimination. In addition, questionnaire should capture the levels of informant satisfaction towards the projects during the two different phases that allows crossover analysis. A survey questionnaire questions should not exceed 15 questions. This satisfaction survey will be undertaken with all targeted respondents in all targeted countries to be identified together with the ILO/Korea Project Management. In the non-visited country, survey would be delivered through an online survey

platform with the support from the project teams, whereas in the visited countries, the National Consultant will ensure that satisfaction assessment questionnaire forms are completed by the targeted interviewees. The comparative and crossover analysis should be articulated clearly in the evaluation report using appropriate data presentation techniques. Below are examples of data presentation techniques for the comparative crossover analysis of satisfaction of projects. Consultants may come up with more appropriate data analysis methods and data presentation techniques.

23. Attempts should be made to collect data from different sources by different methods for each evaluation question and findings be triangulated to draw valid and reliable conclusions. Data shall be disaggregated by sex where possible and appropriate. The evaluation fieldwork will be participatory in nature. The participatory nature of the evaluation will contribute to the sense of ownership among stakeholders.

24. A detailed methodology will be elaborated by the independent evaluator in the inception report, on the basis of this ToR. The detailed methodology should include key and sub-question(s), detailed methods, data collection instruments, data analysis plans, and data presentation techniques to be presented as the key elements in the inception report.

25. The methodology for collection of evidences should be implemented in three phases The methodology for collection of evidences should be implemented in three phases:

An inception phase based on a review of existing documents to produce inception report. The independent evaluator will review the project documents, progress reports, previous evaluations completed by the ILO, meeting minutes, training manuals, tools, technical guidelines, other publications used or developed by the three projects, and national policies on skills development social protection, and occupational safety and health in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam.

A fieldwork phase to collect and analyze primary data. Once the inception report is approved, the independent evaluator will travel to Bangkok to interview the programme management team in ROAP, the lead specialists and other relevant specialists and ILO officials. The independent evaluator will travel to Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar to conduct a field mission to interview (with support from a national consultant in each respective country) the following key stakeholders but not limited to: the ILO Country Director, program officer, government counterparts, Employers' and Workers' Organizations, and project counterparts. For Vietnam and ASEAN, the independent evaluator will conduct interviews (via Skype calls) with the ILO Country Director, program officer, government counterparts, Employers' and Workers' organizations, and project counterparts. At the conclusion of the field mission, the independent evaluator will conduct a stakeholder workshop in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar to validate information and data collected through various

methods and to share the preliminary findings with key stakeholders in each respective country. The evaluator will debrief the management team in ROAP on preliminary findings from the field missions before departing the region.

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

Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO

As the COVID 19 pandemic continues to persist, this evaluation is guided by ILO's Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO: An internal guide on adapting to the situation.

The evaluation methodology (especially the field mission) may be adjusted taking into the account the evolving situation and the risks associated with it. The following are three possible scenarios if the COVID-19 situation continues to persist, or gets worse. Situation will be assessed together with the ILO/Korea management team and project team in each country. Decision on final evaluation methodology will be decided around mid-May 2020, before the contract is finalized and signed

Scenario	Adaptation	Role	Tools
During the contract development phase, if travel restrictions are applied in all countries, Lock down applied and stakeholders are unwilling to meet in person	Totally remote	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International consultant and National consultant to conduct remote interviews • Web based survey • Project management to provide stakeholder contact information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skype, S4Biz or ZOOM • Survey Monkey or similar tool
During the contract development phase, if travel restrictions still apply that restrict travel into some or all countries. But mobility within the country are allowed and some stakeholders are unwilling to meet interviewers in person	Hybrid—remote/face-to-face data collection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International consultant to conduct remote interviews • Project management to provide stakeholder contact information • National consultant to conduct limited face-to-face interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skype, S4Biz or ZOOM • Survey Monkey or similar tool • IOCE website to help identify national consultants
During the contract development phase, if travel restrictions no longer apply in	Business as usually	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International consultant and National consultant 	

<p>all the countries targeted for visit. Mobility within the country are allowed and stakeholders are willing to meet with interviewers in person</p>		<p>may conduct face-to-face interviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International consultant must get their own health and travel insurance coverage • ILO cannot take any responsibility for travel cancelations, repatriation and the like. 	
---	--	---	--

VI. Main Deliverables

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

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

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

Deliverable 3: First draft evaluation report. Evaluation report should include action-oriented, practical and specific recommendations assigning or designating audiences/implementers/users. The draft evaluation report should be prepared as per the ILO Checklist 5: Preparing the Evaluation Report which will be provided to the evaluators. It should address all the evaluation questions and present explicit comparative and crossover analysis, in table format, of level of satisfaction towards the projects using appropriate data presentation techniques. Annexes should include lessons learned and best practices using ILO template, full Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey report, and list of informants. The first draft evaluation report will be improved by incorporating evaluation manager’s comments and inputs.

Deliverable 4: Final evaluation report with evaluation summary. The evaluators will incorporate comments received from ILO and other key stakeholders into the final report. The report should be finalized as per the ILO Checklist 5: Preparing the Evaluation Report which will be provided to the

evaluators. The quality of the report and evaluation summary will be assessed against the ILO Checklists 5, 6, 7, and 8 (Annex 1).

The draft and final versions of the evaluation report in English (maximum 40 pages plus annexes) will be developed under the following structure:

1. Cover page with key project data (project title, project number, donor, project start and completion dates, budget, technical area, managing ILO unit, geographical coverage); and evaluation data (type of evaluation, managing ILO unit, start and completion dates of the evaluation mission, name(s) of evaluator(s), date of submission of evaluation report).
 2. Table of contents
 3. Acronyms
 4. Executive Summary
 5. Background of the project and its intervention logic
 6. Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation
 7. Methodology and limitations
 8. Review of project results
 9. Presentation of findings (by evaluation criteria and succinct survey results)
 10. Conclusions and Recommendations (including to whom they are addressed, resources required, priority and timing)
 11. Lessons learnt and potential good practices
 12. Annexes (TOR, table with the status achieved of project indicators targets and a brief comment per indicator, list of people interviewed, Schedule of the field work overview of meetings, list of Documents reviewed, Lessons and Good practices in ILO template, Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey report, other relevant information).
27. The reports and all other outputs of the evaluation must be produced in English. All draft and final reports including other supporting documents, analytical reports, and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with WORD for windows. Ownership of the data from the evaluation rests jointly between ILO and ILO consultants. The copy rights of the evaluation report rests exclusively with the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

VII. Management Arrangements and Workplan

28. A designated ILO staff who has no prior involvement in the project will manage this independent evaluation with oversight provided by the ILO Evaluation Office. An international consultant will be commissioned to conduct this evaluation. The evaluation will be funded from the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme budget. A list of tasks of the evaluation manager is following:

- Draft and finalize the evaluation TOR upon receiving inputs from key stakeholders;
- Reviewing CV and proposals of the proposed evaluators;

- Providing project background documents to the evaluator;
- Coordinate with the project team on the field visit agenda of the evaluators;
- Briefing the evaluation consultant on ILO evaluation procedures;
- Circulating the report to all concerned for their comments;
- Reviewing and providing comments of the draft evaluation report; and
- Consolidate comments and send them back to the evaluators.

29. The ILO/Korea programme management team and relevant ILO officials will handle administrative contractual arrangements with the evaluator and provide any logistical and other assistance as required. The ILO/Korea programme management team and relevant ILO officials will be responsible for the following tasks:

- Provide project background materials to the evaluator;
- Prepare a list of recommended interviewees;
- Schedule meetings for field visits and coordinating in-country logistical arrangements;
- Be interviewed and provided inputs as requested by the evaluator during the evaluation process;
- Review and provide comments on the draft evaluation reports;
- Organize and participate in the stakeholder workshops; and
- Provide logistical and administrative support to the evaluator, including travel arrangements (e.g. plane and hotel reservations, purchasing plane tickets, providing per diem) and all materials needed to provide all deliverables.

30. The evaluation team reports to the evaluation manager. The evaluation team will compose of four persons, including an international consultant and 3 national consultants (Lao PDR, Cambodia and Myanmar), selected through a competitive process from qualified consultants. The international consultant will lead the evaluation and will be responsible for delivering the above evaluation deliverables using a combination of methods as mentioned above.

31. The international consultant will have final responsibility for above described deliverables. The national consultants (nationals of Lao PDR, Cambodia and Myanmar) will assist the team leader in conducting an assessment of constituent satisfaction and analyse the data. They will also support the team leader in a participatory and inclusive evaluation in their respective country. ToR of national consultant can be seen in Annex 2.

32. Indicative time frame and responsibilities

	Task	Responsible person	Indicative Time frame
1	Preparation, sharing and finalization of the TOR	Evaluation Manager	4 March 2020

	Task	Responsible person	Indicative Time frame
2	Approval of the TOR		11 March 2020
3	Issuance of EOI, advertisement of consultant, and selection of consultant	Evaluation Manager/ Regional M&E Officer	16 March - 29 March 2020 (EOI issuance); 10 May 2020 (consultant selection)
4	Issuance of contracts	ILO/Korea Programme Management Team	25 May 2020
5	Brief evaluators on ILO evaluation policy and the project	Evaluation Manager	28 or 29 May
6	Draft mission itinerary for the evaluator and the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed	ILO/Korea Programme Manager	
7	Document review and development of the inception report submitted to Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	8-12 June
8	Inception report approved	Evaluation Manager	
9	Skype interviews with constituents in Vietnam and ASEAN Secretariat.	Evaluators	15-18 June
9.1	Evaluation Missions (Bangkok, Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar), including conducting three stakeholders workshops and debriefing with management team in Bangkok <i>(If the covid 19 situation continue to persist in Southeast Asian regions and travel restriction is restricted to the target visit countries, the field visit plan of international consultant may be subject to change to online interviews)</i>		19 June (Bangkok) 29 June-10 July (Cambodia, Myanmar, Lao PDR) – Field or on-line
10	Draft report submitted to Evaluation Manager	Evaluators	22 July
11	Sharing the draft report with all concerned stakeholders for comments	Evaluation Manager	23 July-5 August
12	Consolidated comments on the draft report and send to the evaluator	Evaluation Manager	7 August

	Task	Responsible person	Indicative Time frame
13	Finalization of the report and submission to Evaluation Manager	Evaluators	10-11 August
14	Review and approval of the final report	Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Office	17 August

VIII. Required Qualifications and Duration

34. An international consultant /Team leader.

Desired skills and competencies:

- No previous involvement in the delivery of the 2018-2020 ILO/Korea programme funded activities;
- University Degree with minimum 10 years of strong and substantial experience in project /programme evaluation;
- An evaluation expert in development field with demonstrated technical expertise in evaluation methodologies and previous proven skills and experience in undertaking evaluations of similar projects;
- Strong background in organizational and institutional capacity building, Human Rights-Based Approach programming, and Results-Based Management and Monitoring;
- Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative research methodologies;
- Excellent analytical skills and communication skills;
- Demonstrated excellent report writing skills in English;

- Knowledge of ILO's roles and mandate and its tripartite structure as well as UN evaluation norms and its programming is desirable;
- Experience in at least one programme areas in which the ILO/Korea programme is currently supporting will be an advantage; and
- Working experience in Southeast Asia will be an advantage.

35. National Evaluator/Team Members' desired skills and competencies see Annex 2

36. It is foreseen that the duration of this evaluation will fall within April – June 2020. The field missions in Bangkok, Cambodia and Myanmar are 18 May – 1 June 2020.

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

Tasks	Inputs	Proposed timeline (by end)
Desk review of project related documents; Skype briefing with evaluation manager and the ILO/Korea Programme Manager; Prepare inception report	5 days	8-12 June 2020
Skype interviews with project stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries in Vietnam including the ILO Country Director, program officer, government counterparts, employers' and workers' organizations, and project counterparts, and the ASEAN Secretariat.	4 days	15-18 June
Conduct Field visits (Bangkok, Cambodia and Myanmar) and interviews the ILO/Korea Programme Management Team, the lead specialists and relevant ILO official, constituents and project partners; conduct two stakeholder workshops, one in Cambodia and the other in Myanmar.	11 days	19 June (Bangkok) 29 June-10 July (Cambodia, Myanmar, Lao PDR) – Field or on-line
Analysis of data based on desk review, field visit, interviews/questionnaires with stakeholders; draft report	7 days	11 June -21 July 2020
Finalize the report including explanations on why comments were not included.	2 days	17 August 2020
	29 days	

IX. Legal and Ethical Matters

34. The evaluation will comply with UN Norms and Standards. The ToR is accompanied by the code of conduct for carrying out the evaluations. UNEG ethical guidelines will be followed. It is important that the evaluator has no links to project management or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of evaluation.

Annex 1: All relevant ILO policies and guidelines

ILO Policy Guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 3rd ed.

http://www.ilo.ch/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm

Code of conduct form (To be signed by the evaluators)

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206205/lang--en/index.htm

Checklist No. 3: Writing the inception report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165972/lang--en/index.htm

Checklist 5: preparing the evaluation report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang--en/index.htm

Checklist 6: rating the quality of evaluation report

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

Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices

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

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

Guidance note 7: Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation

https://www.ilo.org/global/docs/WCMS_165982/lang--en/index.htm

Guidance note 4: Integrating gender equality in the monitoring and evaluation of projects

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm

Template for evaluation title page

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

Template for evaluation summary

<http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/edmas/eval/template-summary-en.doc>

UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation

<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/548>

Annex 2: National consultant TOR (for Cambodia, Laos, and Myanmar)

The reference must be made to the main evaluation TOR for the independent final evaluation of ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2018 – 2020 funded projects in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Vietnam and ASEAN.

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

Specifically, the national consultants will be responsible:

- To pro-actively provide relevant local knowledge and insights to the international consultant during the field mission.

- To take part in the interviews with key stakeholders, to make notes during interviews, and to write brief reports during the interview on main observations and conclusions.
- To contribute to the presentations at the stakeholder workshops to be responsible by the international consultant (team leader). The national consultant may be requested to contribute to the presentations as requested by the Team Leader (International Consultant).
- To conduct an assessment of constituent satisfaction and analyse the data
- To participate and jointly facilitate the stakeholders workshop.
- Provide interpretation, where needed.

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

- Cambodia nationality (for Cambodia), Lao Nationality (for Lao PDR), and Myanmar nationality (for Myanmar) with relevant qualifications in Law, Business Administration, International Development, Social Sciences or other relevant fields;
- No previous involvement in the delivery of the 2018-2020 ILO/Korea programme funded activities;
- Master's Degree with minimum 3 years of experience in conducting research using both quantitative and qualitative methodologies
- Knowledge of local context and of target areas where the project operates;
- Knowledge of other related local programmes/projects, and of associated local institutions and government structures will be a great asset;
- Have 3 years of experience conducting evaluation and/or expertise in related areas;
- Experience in working with the UN agencies will be an advantage.
- Experience working on the following issues will be an advantage:
 - in Cambodia: social protection and/or skills development;
 - in Lao PDR: Occupational Safety and Health
 - in Myanmar: Social protection and/or skills development

Management

The national consultant will report to the international evaluator.

Deliverable

The stakeholder workshops in Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Myanmar completed.

Contract dates and period

To join the team leader's evaluation mission in Cambodia during 29 June-1 July 2020 and Myanmar during 6 -8 July 2020, Lao PDR during 2-3 July 2020. Either issued by ILO or by the team leader, the contract is for a total of 4 work days for a national consultant in Cambodia during the period of 28 June-1 July 2020. And a total of 4 working days for a national consultant in Myanmar during the period of 5 -8 July 2020. And a total of 3 working days for a national consultant in Lao PDR during the period of 1-3 July 2020.

Appendix 2: List of persons and organisations interviewed

Name	Designation
ILO (ROAP & Geneva) & Programme Team	
Ms. Panudda Boonpala	Deputy Regional Director (ROAP)
Mr. Graeme Buckley	Director, ILO Country Office for Thailand, Cambodia & Lao PDR
Mr. Jungwoo Hong	Programme Manager
Ms. Aatcharaporn Chaowahem	Programme Officer
Ms. Akiko Sakamoto	Specialist on Skills and Employability
Mr. Julien Magnat	Specialist on Skills and Employability
Ms. Sutida Srinopnikom	Senior Programme Assistant
Ms. Suttida Chaikitsakol	Programme Officer
Mr. Markus Ruck	Senior Specialist on Social Protection
Mr. Nuno Meira Simoes de Cunha	Senior Specialist on Social Protection
Ms. Youji Hwang	Social Security Officer
Mr. Junggho Choi	Former ILO OSH Expert
Mr. Francisco Santos-O'connor	ILO Geneva - Former Senior Specialist on OSH
Cambodia	
Mr. Khoeun Chhoum	Ministry of Labour & Vocational Training – Deputy Director, Department of Standard and Curriculum
Mr. Hkim Yorm	Ministry of Labour & Vocational Training – Deputy Director, Department of Standard and Curriculum
Mr. Sambo Pheakdey	General Secretariat of the National Social Protection Council – Deputy Secretary General
Ms. Than Kennariot	General Secretariat of the National Social Protection Council – Deputy Director Social Security Department
Mr. Tep Sophaon	Cambodian Federation of Employers and Business Associations – General Manager
Mr. Ath Thorn	Cambodian Labour Confederation – President
Mr. Sok Kin	Building & Wood Workers Trade Union Federation – President
Mr. Heng Sophannarith	National Social Security Fund – Director of Policy Division
Ms. Malika Ok	Former National Programme Officer
Mr. Finn Koh	ILO Phnom Penh, Programme Manager
Mr. Tun Sophorn	ILO Phnom Penh, National Coordinator
Lao PDR	
Ms. Keomanivone Sayavongsa	Lao National Chamber of Commerce & Industry – Director, Business Enabling Environment Division
Mr. Inthavone Singdala	Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, Department of Skills Development and Employment – Deputy Director
Mr. Oudone Maniboun	Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, Department of Labour Management – Deputy General Director
Ms. Viengxaylack Souksavath	Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, Department of Labour Management – Director OSH Division
Ms. Sourivonexay Phrommala	Former National Project Coordinator Lao PDR
Ms. Kristina Khurts	Project Manager, Vision Zero Fund, Lao PDR
Ms. Khemphone Phaokhamkeo	ILO – National Coordinator
Myanmar	

Mr. Maung Maung Aye	Social Security Board – Director General
Mr. Ei Ei Soe Tun	Social Security Board – Director IT Department
Ms. Phyo Sandar Soe	Confederation of Trade Unions Myanmar (CTUM) – Assistant General Secretary
Mr. U Zarni Thwe	Agriculture & Farmer Federation of Myanmar (AFFM) – General Secretary
Ms. Daw Nang Cherry Than	Agriculture & Farmer Federation of Myanmar (AFFM)
Ms. Kay Khine Aye	Ministry of Health – Deputy Director
Mr. U Win Naing	Myanmar Industrial Zone Business Association (MIBA)
Mr. Kyaw Soe Than	Myanmar Industries, Craft and Services (MICS-TUsF)
Mr. Kyaw Kyaw Lwin	Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population – Director Skills Department
Ms. Khin Mar Aye	Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population – Deputy Director Skills Department
Ms. Alba Mariana Infante Villarroel	Vision Zero Fund Project – Senior Technical Officer
Mr. Thein Than Htay	ILO – National Project Coordinator
Thailand	
Ms. Prommongkol Wongboonfoo	Ministry of Labour, Director of Foreign Relations Division, Department of Skill Development
Mr. Chinapop Kooramasuvan	Ministry of Labour, Foreign Relations Officer, International Cooperation Division, Department of Skill Development
Others	
Ms. Irene Isaac	Consultant / ex- DG of TESDA, Philippines
Ms. Rosanna Urdaneta	Deputy DG for Policies & Planning, TESDA, Philippines
Ms. Imelda Taganas	Executive Director, Qualifications and Standards Office, TESDA
Ms. Charlyn B. Justimbaste	Director, Project Development Division, TESDA
Mr. Dat Nguyen	National Programme Officer, ILO Hanoi

Appendix 3: List of documents and publications consulted

- Terms of Reference for the Evaluation

- Arrangement between the Ministry of Employment and Labour of the Republic of Korea and the ILO on Korea/ILO Partnership Programme (signed 14 March 2018)
- PARDEV Minute Sheet (12 April 2018)
- PARDEV Minute Sheet (29 April 2019)

- Final evaluation report ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2015-2017 funded projects in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam (August 2018)

- ILO/Korea Partnership Programme Overview (J. Hong)

- Project document RAS/17/50/KOR
- Progress report (April-December 2018)
- Progress report (January-December 2019)
- Updated workplan
- Adjusted work programme for skills
- Summary of the 4th RTSWG meeting (July 2018, Manila)
- Summary of the 5th RTSWG meeting (September 2019, Hanoi)
- Roadmap for implementing the MRS in ASEAN (PPT)
- Draft Concept note for piloting the MRS (February 2019)
- Key points of discussion ILO/Korea TVET Forum (November 2018)
- Evaluation Results ILO/Korea TVET Forum

- Project document RAS/17/51/KOR
- Progress report (April 2018-March 2019)
- Progress report (January-December 2019)
- Guidebook on the governance and management of Employment Injury Social Security Systems (draft)
- COVID-19 Contingency Plan
- Social Protection responses to the Covid-19 crisis (March 2020)

- Project document RAS/17/53/KOR
- Progress report (April-December 2018)
- Progress report (January-December 2019)
- Draft National Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) profile of Lao PDR

- Statements of Income and Expenditure as at 31 December 2019

- Information available on ILO web site:
<https://www.ilo.org/asia/projects/korea/lang--en/index.htm>

- ILO Decent Work Country Programmes
 - Cambodia 2019-2023
 - Lao PDR 2017-2021
 - Myanmar 2018-2021

ILO Policy Guidelines for Evaluations and Support Guidance Documentation (3rd edition – August 2017) including checklists and templates.

UNEG Ethical guidelines for evaluations

Appendix 4: Satisfaction survey report

Satisfaction questionnaire

Instructions

This survey serves to measure your knowledge, awareness, and **satisfaction** of the implementation and the results of the projects funded under the ILO/Korea Partnership Programme 2018-2020.

Please select the rating for each section based on the following criteria:

5=excellent 4=good 3=average 2=fair 1=poor

Your answers will remain confidential and will not be shared individually with the ILO which will only receive consolidated results of the survey.

1: General Context

Awareness of the Programme and of the projects' objectives

5 4 3 2 1

2: Communication & information

2.a. Information provided by the projects

5 4 3 2 1

2.b. Communication of the programme

5 4 3 2 1

3: Needs and priorities

3.a. Pertinence of activities with your needs and priorities

5 4 3 2 1

3.b. Ability of projects to address these needs and priorities

5 4 3 2 1

4: National policies

4.a. Compliance of projects with national policies

5 4 3 2 1

4.b. Contribution of projects to policy making

5 4 3 2 1

5: Cooperation and partnership

5.a. Ability of projects to involve key stakeholders with other partners and governmental bodies

5 4 3 2 1

5.b. Responsiveness of projects to your expectations

5 4 3 2 1

5.c. Capacity of projects to respond to challenges

5 4 3 2 1

6: Cross-cutting issues

6.a. Contribution of projects to environmental issues

5 4 3 2 1

6.b. Contribution of projects to gender equality

5 4 3 2 1

7: Capacity development

7.a. Contribution of project to capacity development 5 4 3 2 1

7.b. Contribution of project to institutional development 5 4 3 2 1

8: Beyond 2020

Ability of project team to encourage beneficiaries to build on achievements without additional external support 5 4 3 2 1

Ability of the project to have a significant Impact 5 4 3 2 1

9: 2018-2020 vs 2015-2017

Compare projects of current phase vs previous phase

5 4 3 2 1

(5= significant improvement in respect of all criteria; 4= partly improved; 3=no difference between the 2 programmes; 2=no major improvement; 1= overall less adequate)

Please add any comment you would like to make, in particular with regard to question 9:

Name:

Organization:

Survey report

Satisfaction rates for ILO/Korea Projects (composite score)

	Cambodia	Laos	Myanmar	Thailand
Social protection Project	3.2	n/a	3.2	n/a
Skills Project	3.4	4.4	4.3	4.1
OSH Project	n/a	4.3	3.6	n/a
Overall satisfaction	3.3	4.4	3.9	4.1

5=excellent 4=good 3=average 2=fair 1=poor

Comparison 2018-2018 vs. 2015-2017

	Cambodia	Laos	Myanmar	Thailand
Social protection Project	3.7	n/a	3.6	n/a
Skills Project	3.7	2	4	4
OSH Project	n/a	4.5	4	n/a
Country average	3.7	3.7	3.7	4

(5= significant improvement in respect of all criteria; 4= partly improved; 3=no difference between the 2 programmes; 2=no major improvement; 1= overall less adequate)

Country/project-based satisfaction rates

Cambodia/Skills (3 responses)

	5	4	3	2	1
General context (Awareness)	2			1	
Communication		2		1	
Information		1	1	1	
Match with needs and priorities	1	2			
Ability to address needs		2	1		
Compliance with national policies	1	2			
Contribution to policy making		2	1		
Involvement of key partners	1		1	1	
Responsiveness to expectations		1	1	1	
Capacity to address challenges		1		2	
Contribution to environmental issues	1		1	1	
Contribution to gender equality		1	1	1	
Contribution to capacity development	1	2			
Contribution to institutional development		2	1		
Ability to encourage ownership towards sustainability			1	2	
Ability to generate impact		1	1	1	
Total ratings	7	19	10	12	
Total ratings in %	14.6%	39.6%	20.8%	25.0%	
Comparison 2018-2020 vs. 2015-2017		2	1		

Cambodia/Social Protection (7 responses)

	5	4	3	2	1
General context (Awareness)	2		3	2	
Communication	2		1	4	
Information	2		1	4	
Match with needs and priorities		6	1		
Ability to address needs	2	3	1	1	
Compliance with national policies		5	1	1	
Contribution to policy making	2	2	2	1	
Involvement of key partners		2	2	3	
Responsiveness to expectations		2	4	1	
Capacity to address challenges		2	3	2	
Contribution to environmental issues		2	2	1	2
Contribution to gender equality		2	2	2	1
Contribution to capacity development	3	2	2		
Contribution to institutional development	3	1	1	1	1
Ability to encourage ownership towards sustainability		2		3	2
Ability to generate impact		3		3	1
Total ratings	16	34	26	29	7
Total ratings in %	14.3%	30.4%	23.2%	25.9%	6.2%
Comparison 2018-2020 vs. 2015-2017		5	2		

Lao PDR/Skills (1 response)

	5	4	3	2	1
General context (Awareness)	1				
Communication	1				
Information	1				
Match with needs and priorities		1			
Ability to address needs		1			
Compliance with national policies	1				
Contribution to policy making	1				
Involvement of key partners	1				
Responsiveness to expectations		1			
Capacity to address challenges		1			
Contribution to environmental issues			1		
Contribution to gender equality			1		
Contribution to capacity development	1				
Contribution to institutional development	1				
Ability to encourage ownership towards sustainability		1			
Ability to generate impact	1				
Total ratings	9	5	2		
Total ratings in %	56.2%	31.3%	12.5%		
Comparison 2018-2020 vs. 2015-2017				1	

Lao PDR/OSH (2 responses)

	5	4	3	2	1
General context (Awareness)	2				
Communication	1	1			
Information	1	1			
Match with needs and priorities	1	1			
Ability to address needs	1	1			
Compliance with national policies	2				
Contribution to policy making	2				
Involvement of key partners	1	1			
Responsiveness to expectations		2			
Capacity to address challenges		2			
Contribution to environmental issues		2			
Contribution to gender equality		2			
Contribution to capacity development		2			
Contribution to institutional development		2			
Ability to encourage ownership towards sustainability		1	1		
Ability to generate impact	1	1			
Total ratings	12	19	1		
Total ratings in %	37.5%	59.4%	3.1%		
Comparison 2018-2020 vs. 2015-2017	1	1			

Myanmar/Skills (1 response)

	5	4	3	2	1
General context (Awareness)	1				
Communication	1				
Information	1				
Match with needs and priorities			1		
Ability to address needs	1				
Compliance with national policies	1				
Contribution to policy making			1		
Involvement of key partners	1				
Responsiveness to expectations		1			
Capacity to address challenges	1				
Contribution to environmental issues	1				
Contribution to gender equality	1				
Contribution to capacity development	1				
Contribution to institutional development	1				
Ability to encourage ownership towards sustainability					1
Ability to generate impact				1	
Total ratings	11	1	2	1	1
Total ratings in %	68.8%	6.2%	12.5%	6.2%	6.2%
Comparison 2018-2020 vs. 2015-2017		1			

Myanmar/Social Protection (5 responses)

	5	4	3	2	1
General context (Awareness)		3	1	1	
Communication	1	2		2	
Information	1	2		2	
Match with needs and priorities	1	2		2	
Ability to address needs		3		2	
Compliance with national policies	1	2	1		1
Contribution to policy making	1	1	2		1
Involvement of key partners		2	2	1	
Responsiveness to expectations		2	3		
Capacity to address challenges	1	1	2	1	
Contribution to environmental issues		3			2
Contribution to gender equality	1	2	1		1
Contribution to capacity development		4		1	
Contribution to institutional development		2	1	2	
Ability to encourage ownership towards sustainability			1	2	2
Ability to generate impact	1	2		1	1
Total ratings	8	33	14	17	8
Total ratings in %	10.0%	41.2%	17.5%	21.3%	10.0%
Comparison 2018-2020 vs. 2015-2017	1	2	1	1	

Myanmar/OSH (1 response)

	5	4	3	2	1
General context (Awareness)		1			
Communication		1			
Information	1				
Match with needs and priorities			1		
Ability to address needs			1		
Compliance with national policies			1		
Contribution to policy making			1		
Involvement of key partners		1			
Responsiveness to expectations		1			
Capacity to address challenges		1			
Contribution to environmental issues				1	
Contribution to gender equality		1			
Contribution to capacity development		1			
Contribution to institutional development		1			
Ability to encourage ownership towards sustainability			1		
Ability to generate impact		1			
Total ratings	1	9	5	1	
Total ratings in %	6.2%	56.3%	31.3%	6.2%	
Comparison 2018-2020 vs. 2015-2017			1		

Thailand/Skills (1 response)

	5	4	3	2	1
General context (Awareness)	1				
Communication	1				
Information		1			
Match with needs and priorities	1				
Ability to address needs		1			
Compliance with national policies	1				
Contribution to policy making			1		
Involvement of key partners		1			
Responsiveness to expectations		1			
Capacity to address challenges	-	-	-	-	-
Contribution to environmental issues			1		
Contribution to gender equality			1		
Contribution to capacity development	1				
Contribution to institutional development	1				
Ability to encourage ownership towards sustainability			1		
Ability to generate impact			1		
Total ratings	6	4	5		
Total ratings in %	40%	26.7%	33.3%		
Comparison 2018-2020 vs. 2015-2017		1			

Appendix 5: Lessons learned

ILO Lesson Learned 1

Project Title: “2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme funded projects in ASEAN, Thailand, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam”

Project TC/SYMBOL: RAS/17/50/KOR-RAS/17/51/KOR-RAS/17/53/KOR

Name of Evaluator: Pierre Mahy

Date: 08/2020

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<p>A long-term partnership offers the best perspective to achieve meaningful results</p> <p>Experience in many countries shows that many development partners typically engage in short-term support rather than in long-term partnerships, often leaving the results of projects uncompleted and hardly sustainable. Sustainability is often defined as “the next project” to take the work up where the previous project ended. This unfortunately is one of the realities of development cooperation. The long-term partnership between the Republic of Korea and the ILO addresses this reality and offers a much better perspective to achieve meaningful results.</p>
Context and any related preconditions	<p>The programme builds on previous interventions in the framework of a long-established partnership, in particular on the projects of the previous 2015-2017 cycle with a stronger geographical and thematic focus.</p> <p>Enhancing Social Protection, achieving Skills recognition and improving OSH requires time and resources, both due to the number of steps involved to clear the technical issues, and to the political commitment required to implement and/or enforce decisions and laws. While the projects make good progress, it is clear that two or three years are insufficient to entirely complete the different processes involved and reach the final objectives.</p>
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	ILO, Republic of Korea and development partners in general
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	n/a
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	The long-term partnership is well received by beneficiaries and has allowed creating a relationship of mutual confidence by the 2 partners
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	The long-established partnership should be further maintained.

ILO Lesson Learned 2

Project Title: “2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme funded projects in ASEAN, Thailand, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam”

Project TC/SYMBOL: RAS/17/50/KOR-RAS/17/51/KOR-RAS/17/53/KOR

Name of Evaluator: Pierre Mahy

Date: 08/2020

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	Independent evaluations are not sufficiently taken into consideration Besides assessing the progress of projects, an important part of an evaluation is to formulate recommendations which aim to correct and/or improve weaknesses observed by the evaluators. While recommendations can be accommodated when they are deemed to be somewhat unrealistic, they should not be ignored
Context and any related preconditions	The evaluation of the 2015-2017 evaluation made 12 recommendations, of which several already were repeat recommendations from previous evaluations; 4 have not been taken into consideration.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	Project management teams
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	Not taking into consideration recommendations made by external evaluators diminishes the value of an evaluation and does not allow making progress
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	n/a
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Resources are often not necessary to follow recommendations but require the willingness to learn from independent consultants.

Appendix 6: Good practices

ILO Emerging Good Practice 1	
<p>Project Title: “2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme funded projects in ASEAN, Thailand, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam”</p> <p>Project TC/SYMBOL: RAS/17/50/KOR-RAS/17/51/KOR-RAS/17/53/KOR</p> <p>Name of Evaluator: Pierre Mahy Date: 08/2020</p> <p>The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.</p>	
GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	<p>The formal coordination mechanisms set up for the OSH project in Myanmar and Lao PDR to promote synergies and interlinkages while avoiding overlaps with other projects</p> <p>In both countries where multiple projects are being implemented in the same field, both from the ILO and from other donors, the ILO has set up Project Advisory Committees to coordinate project interventions and develop synergies.</p>
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	No limitation – this can be replicated in every country
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	Synergies are being developed and overlaps between projects avoided
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	Final beneficiaries of good coordination and joint efforts are the target receivers of the support provided by the projects
Potential for replication and by whom	Fully replicable by ILO
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO’s Strategic Programme Framework)	Besides promoting coordination and synergies, such joint committees offer the possibility to align projects to DWCPs.
Other documents or relevant comments	n/a

ILO Emerging Good Practice 2

Project Title: “2018-2020 ILO/Korea Partnership Programme funded projects in ASEAN, Thailand, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam”

Project TC/SYMBOL: RAS/17/50/KOR-RAS/17/51/KOR-RAS/17/53/KOR

Name of Evaluator: Pierre Mahy

Date: 08/2020

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.)	The structured approach to progress on MRS by means of a Roadmap for implementing a pilot scheme endorsed and followed by all beneficiaries In order to progress on the recognition of skills, the project developed a Roadmap in 7 steps to implement a pilot scheme between Thailand and three neighboring countries. The Roadmap has been endorsed by all parties involved, clearly defining the way on how to proceed in a coordinated way to achieve the expected goal.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	Roadmaps facilitate difficult processes when they are endorsed by all parties involved. They have been used in many different instances both for political and technical issues which are difficult to address.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	A roadmap is not necessarily the solution to a problem, but it facilitates the process to reach a solution
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	Each single step of a roadmap represents a milestone which can be monitored
Potential for replication and by whom	Everywhere in all circumstances by all projects
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO’s Strategic Programme Framework)	n/a
Other documents or relevant comments	n/a