



Independent Final Evaluation of the Lesotho Decent Work Country Programme 2018 – 2023

Evaluation Report

Submitted to:

International Labour Organization
Decent Work Team/Country Office - Pretoria

By

Dr. Sebastian Njagi Runguma
International Development Consultant
P.O BOX 7861-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 720 953288
Email: srnjagi@gmail.com

25 November 2023



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1.1 Background and Programme Description.....	13
1.2 Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation	15
1.3 Methodology and Limitations.....	17
CHAPTER 2: KEY FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	20
2.2Relevance and Coherence.....	20
2.3 Validity of Design and Evaluability	22
2.4 Programme Effectiveness	24
2.5 Efficiency of Resource Use	27
2.6 Effectiveness of Management Arrangements.....	28
2.7 Impact Orientation.....	30
2.8 Sustainability	32
2.9 Cross-cutting Themes	33
2.10 Overall Assessment	34
2.11 Stakeholders' Views regarding a Successor Programme	36
2.12 Lessons Learned	37
2.13 Emerging Good Practices	37
CHAPTER 3: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	38
3.1 Conclusions	38
3.2 Recommendations	38
Annex 1: Terms of Reference Lesotho Decent Work Country Programme (2018-2023) Review	40
Annex 2: Evaluation Questions Matrix	48
Annex 3a: DWCP Activity Implementation Tracker	51
Annex 3b: DWCP Results Monitoring Tracker.....	62
Annex 4: Evaluation Schedule	69
Annex 5: List of Evaluation Participants.....	70
Annex 6: Documents Reviewed	72
Annex 7: Lesotho DWCP 2018 – 2023 Evaluation Inception Report.....	75
Annex 8: Data Collection Instruments	86

ABBREVIATIONS

AU	: African Union
CPR	: Country Programme Review
CSOs	: Civil Society Organizations
DWCP	: Decent Work Country Programme
DWT/CO	: Decent Work Team/Country Office - Pretoria
EP	: Employment Promotion
FAO	: Food and Agriculture Organisation
FGD	: Focus Group Discussion
ILO	: International Labour Organisation
ILO P&B	: International Labour Organisation Plan and Budget
IRC	: Industrial Relations Council
IOM	: International Organisation for Migration
GOL	: Government of Lesotho
HQs	: Headquarters
LMI	: Labour Market Information
M&E	: Monitoring and Evaluation
MEAL	: Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning
MOHA	: Ministry of Home Affairs
MOGYSACSD	: Ministry of Gender, Youth, Sports, Arts, Culture and Social Development
MOLE	: Ministry of Labour and Employment
MOPSLE	: Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Employment
MOTI	: Ministry of Trade and Industry
MOU	: Memorandum of Understanding
NACOSH	: National Advisory Council on Occupational Safety and Health
NACOLA	: National Advisory Committee on Labour
NES	: National Employment Service
NSDP	: National Strategic Development Plan
OECD/DAC	: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development / Development Assistance Committee
OSH	: Occupational, Safety and Health
RBM	: Results Based Management
SADC	: Southern Africa Development Cooperation
SDGs	: Sustainable Development Goals
TOR	: Terms of Reference
UN	: United Nations
UNDAF	: United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNSDCF	: United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
UNDP	: United National Development Programme
UNRCO	: United Nations Resident Coordination Office
WAB	: Wages Advisory Board
WB	: World Bank

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the main findings, conclusions, lessons learned, emerging issues, good practices, and recommendations of the independent final evaluation of the Lesotho Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) 2018 – 2023 hereafter referred to simply as the DWCP or the programme. The DWCP is the third programme in Lesotho and its implementation period spanned five years from January 2018 to December 2023.

The DWCP had three priorities determined by the tripartite partners, International Labour Organisation (ILO) and other stakeholders. These were to create employment, particularly for young women and men; broaden social protection coverage; and promote good governance in the labour market. The programme pursued nine country programme outcomes and 35 outputs and these were to be achieved through the implementation of 130 planned activities.

The implementation of the DWCP took place during a period characterised by great difficulty and uncertainty caused by various factors, including political instability, frequent transfers of government officials, labour migration, COVID-19 pandemic, and unprecedented impact of climate change on the economy and livelihoods in Lesotho.

The purpose of the evaluation was to examine the achievements made in the programme towards the expected outcomes and take stock of recommendations, lessons learned, good practices, and challenges to inform the programme and understanding of reasons for pitfalls and how to address them.

The evaluation pursued seven specific objectives and sought to answer 37 evaluation questions across eight themes aligned to OECD/Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria, namely: relevance, coherence, the validity of design and evaluability, effectiveness, efficiency, management arrangements, impact, sustainability, and cross-cutting issues. In addition, lessons learned, emerging good practices, and stakeholders' views regarding the next phase of the DWCP were explored.

The clients of the evaluation were the tripartite plus constituents, ILO, and other key stakeholders of the DWCP. The evaluation covered the entire implementation period and its geographical scope was the entire country because the DWCP was a nation-wide programme.

The evaluation was organized under three inter-linked phases: planning, data collection, and data analysis, reporting, and feedback phases. Each of these phases involved specific activities that were conducted by the Country Programme Review (CPR) task force, the evaluator and other stakeholders of the DWCP as per the evaluation terms of reference (ToR). The data collection phase took place between mid-September and mid-October 2023.

Meaningful stakeholder participation occurred in the evaluation process, with a view to enhancing ownership and quality of the evaluation process and outputs. Stakeholder consultations covered both men and women and vulnerable groups¹ and their opinions and voices have been captured in the evaluation report.

¹ These included persons with disabilities, people living with HIV, migrants, youth, and informal sector workers, among others.

The evaluation utilized primary and secondary data collected from various sources. Secondary data were obtained from the review of over 70 relevant documents from ILO, the Government of Lesotho (GOL), United Nations (UN) agencies, and other sources. Primary data were obtained through semi-structured interviews among 49 key stakeholders of the DWCP, who included ILO, tripartite parties, and the UN agencies.

The obtained data were mainly qualitative and these were analysed using the thematic content analysis technique. Here, data from the stakeholder consultations and desk review were synthesized to identify commonly occurring themes on the programme.

Necessary steps and actions were performed to enhance the quality of the evaluation process and outputs. These measures included the setup of the CPR to manage the evaluation process, compliance with the agreed work plan, validation of the findings by the key stakeholders of the DWCP and strict adherence to ethical norms and standards for research and evaluations.

The specific findings below focus on the key evaluation questions across the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and strive to meet the purpose and specific objectives of the evaluation:

Programme Status

- The exact level of implementation of planned activities and achievement of expected results remained unclear from stakeholder interviews and available literature on the programme.
- Although the DWCP was a well-designed intervention, the programme was neither fully implemented nor achieved many of the expected results. Best estimates indicated that about 40% of the planned activities and expected results were achieved.
- Major factors that affected the successful implementation and achievements of expected results related to both the internal and external context of the programme. These included challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, inadequate resources (financial and human resources), and lack of awareness of the DWCP by some of the the key stakeholders of the programme. Some of these factors could have been factored into the design and implementation of the intervention.

Relevance and Coherence

- The programme was a highly relevant and coherent intervention that focused on the right things, namely the needs, rights and priorities of the target groups and final beneficiaries across the three priorities.
- The intervention logic of the DWCP was significantly aligned to the outcomes in the NSDP II, the Abidjan Declaration UNDAF/UNSDCF, priorities of social partners, ILO's biennial programme and budget outcomes, as well as national, regional, and international plans, frameworks, conventions, and standards. Like the DWCP, these national, regional and global frameworks address specific socio-economic challenges and needs, including poverty reduction, employment creation, and sustainable development generally.
- The activities and outputs of the programme were consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives. In particular, there was a clear linkage between the activities, outputs, and outcomes, as well as strategies adopted to create employment, particularly for young women and men; broaden social protection coverage; and promote good governance in the labour market in Lesotho.
- The DWCP was relevant to gender equality, disability inclusion, and other non-discrimination issues and this was explicit in several outcomes, outputs and indicators statements, as well as strategies adopted particularly in priority 1.

Validity of Design and Evaluability

- The DWCP appeared to be an ambitious intervention in terms of the number and scope of planned activities (130). This number was high given the various challenges posed by both the internal and external context of the programme. It is possible that the design of the DWCP could have been improved by setting not too ambitious but realistic targets taking into account contextual factors and capacity of the local partners leading to largely unrealistic expectations in the programme.
- Whilst the key stakeholders of the DWCP participated in its implementation not all were involved in a significant way or directly. While GOL, ILO, and a few UN agencies (UNDP and IOM) implemented or supported specific projects that were relevant to the DWCP, the social partners did not, reportedly due to inadequate resources.
- The DWCP was not entirely evaluable. Although the programme was designed using a results-based management approach, core RBM principles were not fully adhered. Notably, it lacked output indicators and adequate monitoring and evaluation system that delivered robust and useful information needed to enhance accountability, learning, knowledge base, and programme management.

Programme Effectiveness

- The programme had several outstanding achievements relating mostly to policy development. These included the ratification of ILO conventions 151, 187, and 190, as well as the development of at least eleven labour policies, bill, guidelines, regulations and agreements: the OSH policy 2021, labour migration policy 2021, social protection policy 2020, gender and development policy 2018, OSH guidelines/regulations 2021, National Occupational Safety and Health Profile 2018, OSH bill 2022, social security bill, the occupation in demand list, bilateral labour agreements guidelines 2019, and bilateral labour agreements with Seychelles, Mauritius, and Qatar.
- Assessed along the three priorities of the DWCP, good progress toward the planned outputs and outcomes was made in Priority 2 but not much was achieved under DWCP Priorities 1 and 3.
- Many of the expected results (outputs and outcomes) were not produced as planned due to various challenges, including the COVID-19 pandemic, financial constraints, political instability and ineffective governance, and a lack of adequate coordination, monitoring and reporting in the programme.

Efficiency of Resource Use

- The resources allocated by the ILO and constituents were used strategically and no wastage of resources was noted. Stakeholder groups hailed ILO as one of the critical partners in the delivery of the DWCP, through its technical assistance comprising capacity building, training, and limited financial support.
- The ILO Decent Work Team based in Pretoria worked harmoniously to provide technical assistance support for the delivery of the DWCP. The backstopping support provided by the ILO including Geneva HQ Units to the DWCP was also effective in delivering various trainings including on gender equality and OSH.
- To a fair extent, the DWCP created complementarity and synergies with other actors and benefited from it. Notably, there were several projects funded or implemented by diverse actors such as the World Bank, IOM, UNDP and GOL ministries whose activities results were relevant to the planned outputs and outcomes of the DWCP.

Effectiveness of Management Arrangements

- The DWCP had elaborate implementation arrangements but these were not fully implemented. Notably, NACOLA was vested with the overall oversight and governance of the programme but the institution did not play its role in the DWCP as expected.
- To some extent, the tripartite plus constituents effectively used existing linkages to promote the DWCP and contribute towards resource mobilization efforts. There were various examples showing how the programme, with the support of ILO, created synergies or leveraged other interventions to achieve some of the planned results.
- Although the DWCP obtained political, technical, and administrative support from the GOL and the national partners, this was not sufficient for the full delivery of the programme. This is demonstrated by the high number and type of constraints faced in the implementation of the DWCP.
- Financing of the DWCP was one of the major challenges identified in this evaluation. Coordinated efforts at resource mobilisation by GOL, social partners, and the ILO were not evident.

Impact Orientation

- Despite a low level of implementation, the programme achieved several concrete changes across the three priority areas. These changes were positive and related mostly to the development of policies and regulations, and increased capacity (knowledge and skills) in labour matters among the employers and workers following targeted capacity building initiatives conducted by ILO.
- The development of the social security bill and the ratification of three ILO Conventions (151, 187, and 190) by Lesotho were widely perceived to be the most outstanding achievements of the DWCP and represented a positive step in promoting the decent work agenda in the country.
- The DWCP produced one unexpected positive result relating to improved capacities (knowledge, skills and attitude) of the social partners to engage with other development actors positively in labour matters in Lesotho with a view to finding sustainable solutions to prevailing challenges. This was demonstrated by a reported meaningful participation of the social partners in the development of the UNSDCF 2024 – 2028. There was no evidence showing that the DWCP produced negative un-intended results.

Sustainability

- The level of ownership of both the expected and achieved results of the DWCP by partners and target groups was high and this contributed to the sustainability potential of the programme. Commendably, there was no indication that the tripartite partners perceived the DWCP as ILO's programme but one in which they were the principal stakeholders.
- Five main factors tended to enhance the viability of the DWCP results achieved, which included a sense of ownership of the results among the key stakeholder groups, and the plans by the ILO tripartite plus partners to develop and implement a new DWCP for Lesotho. On the other hand, two issues tend to undermine the sustainability potential of the programme. Firstly, the DWCP lacked a documented sustainability plan or exit strategy that would have spelt out appropriate sustainability efforts and measures. Secondly, there was no evidence indicating that strategies have been considered to ensure that institutions

at various levels (local, and national) will sustainably take ownership of the results of the DWCP.

Cross-cutting Themes

- The design and implementation of the DWCP promoted various cross cutting issues, including gender equality, disability inclusion, non-discrimination, among others. However, there was no evidence showing that the DWCP considered a fair transition to environmental sustainability in both its design and implementation.
- To a large extent, the DWCP took into account tripartism, social dialogue, international labour standards in its design and implementation. These issues are reflected in particularly the activities and outputs of the programme.
- At least three factors facilitated the contribution of the DWCP to issues relating to gender equality, disability, non-discrimination, tripartite, and international labour standards. These were a largely appropriate programme design, relevant capacity building initiatives, and the existence of relevant policies and guidelines by ILO and GOL.

Overall Assessment

Although there were considerable data gaps on the programme, it was possible to develop, based on insights from desk review and stakeholder consultations, best estimates on the performance of the DWCP across the different evaluation criteria and specific issues of interest to ILO and the tripartite partners.

Evaluation criteria/issues	Estimated performance score (maximum 10)*
Relevance and Coherence	8
• Alignment with NSDP II, SDGs and other national, regional and international frameworks	9
Validity of Design and Evaluability	6
• Adherence to RBM principles	6
Programme Effectiveness	4
• Achievement of results for priority 1 – Employment creation	2
• Achievement of results for priority 2 – Social protection	5
• Achievement of results for priority 3 – Labour market governance	4
• Tripartism	7
• Social dialogue	6
• Labour inspections	3
Efficiency of Resource Use	7
Effectiveness of Management Arrangements	3
Impact Orientation	3
Sustainability	6
Cross-cutting Themes	6
• International labour standards	8
• Fair transition to environmental sustainability	0
• Gender equality	6
• Disability inclusion	6
• Non-discrimination	9

**Performance is assessed in terms of achievement of planned activities and results against the set targets and/or adherence to the expected quality.*

The DWCP performed highly in relation to the following issues: relevance; coherence; alignment with national, regional and international frameworks; tripartism; use of available resources; promotion of international labour standards; and adherence to the principles of disability inclusion and non-discrimination. The programme performed poorly in terms of completion of planned activities; achievement of expected results, especially under priority1;

having effective management arrangements; achievement of effective labour inspections; making a significant difference (impact orientation); and promoting environmental sustainability.

Lessons Learned

1. Greater alignment of the DWCP with the strategic objectives of MOPSLE/GOL, NSDP, UNSDCF, and SDGs is important for securing adequate political, financial, and administrative support and to tap into available opportunities and resources in support of the decent work agenda in Lesotho.
2. Effective internal monitoring, reporting, and learning from implementation are critical elements for supporting the successful implementation of DWCP and these need to be explicitly reflected in the DWCP document, implementation plan, and budget.
3. Effective communication, sensitisation, and coordination are critical for the successful implementation of the DWCP. These aspects need to be explicitly reflected in the DWCP document, implementation plan, and budget and operationalised throughout the programme cycle.
4. Compliance with roles and responsibilities highlighted in the DWCP financing plan by the tripartite plus partners and ILO is critical for ensuring the programme has the necessary resources to implement planned activities smoothly.
5. Increased technical capacity of workers' organisations was critical for their meaningful participation in decent work processes in Lesotho, including the delivery of the DWCP, social dialogue, and their representation role generally.
6. Social dialogue was a critical element in the work and success of DWCPs hence the need to ensure social dialogue institutions functioned properly in Lesotho, including the conduct of regular tripartite meetings.

Emerging Good Practices

The evaluation identified one good practice in the DWCP relating to the development process of the programme. The DWCP was developed through a participatory and inclusive process and encompassed all key stakeholders of the programme. A national working group comprising academia, key government ministries, civil society, and social partners led the DWCP development process, from which a tripartite plus drafting team with 16 members with specialisation in the four decent work pillars was established.

Conclusions

1. *Relevance and Coherence.* The programme was a highly relevant and coherent intervention that focused on the right things. However, it was a fairly ambitious programme that had a high number of planned activities to be implemented within the context of significant resource constraints and political instability in the country.
2. *Programme Efficiency.* The level of implementation of planned activities and the achievement of the expected results were below expectation. This occurred in previous DWCPs in Lesotho, indicating a worrying trend of non-completion of DWCPs in the country. Contrary to the requirements of results-based management approach, the DWCP lacked adequate coordination, adaptive management, monitoring and evaluation, reporting, learning, and financing of the planned work. Gaps in these aspects undermined its implementation and overall performance.
3. *Effectiveness of Management Arrangements.* Although tripartism and social dialogue were widely recognised to be critical factors for the decent work agenda in Lesotho, these

issues were negatively affected by a lack of proper functioning of statutory social dialogue institutions (especially NACOLA), various unresolved issues, and technical capacity gaps among the social partners (especially workers' organisations).

The DWCP was implemented during a period of significant difficulty and uncertainty associated with the COVID-19 pandemic, political instability in Lesotho, and frequent transfers of key officials in MOPSLE with critical roles in the implementation of the DWCP. As such, the context of the programme must be taken into consideration in interpreting the findings presented in this report.

Recommendations

1. The tripartite partners, ILO, and other key stakeholders of decent work agenda in Lesotho should halt the emerging trend of incomplete implementation of Decent Work Country Programmes in the country by adopting appropriate measures, including well-coordinated activity planning for example the development of DWCP work plans or Joint Annual Work plans with clear financial arrangements. This is a high priority recommendation that should apply to the next phase of the Decent Work Country Programme. No additional resources are anticipated outside of the agreed Decent Work Country Programme budget.
2. Going forward, tripartite partners, ILO, and other key stakeholders of the Programme in Lesotho should ensure future DWCPs comply fully with results - based management principles., including capacity building training RBM principles for the tripartite partners including representatives of both the workers' and employers' organisations. This is a high priority recommendation that should apply to the next phase of the Decent Work Country Programme. No additional resources are anticipated outside of the agreed Decent Work Country Programme budget.
3. The tripartite plus partners, ILO, and other stakeholders should improve the coordination, communication and visibility of future DWCPs by undertaking appropriate actions, including launch of the programme, sensitisation meetings, developing a simplified version of the DWCP, and regular sharing of information on the programme with key stakeholders. This is a high priority recommendation that should apply to the next phase of the Decent Work Country Programme. No additional resources are anticipated outside of the agreed Decent Work Country Programme budget.
4. The tripartite plus partners, ILO, and other stakeholders of decent work agenda in Lesotho should provide adequate financing for the DWCP to achieve smooth implementation. This is a high priority recommendation that should apply to the next phase of the Decent Work Country Programme. No additional resources are anticipated outside of the agreed Decent Work Country Programme budget.
5. The tripartite plus partners, ILO, and other stakeholders should strengthen tripartism and social dialogue in Lesotho by implementing appropriate measures. These include supporting the proper functioning of social dialogue institutions, regular tripartite meetings, and addressing various unresolved issues and technical capacity gaps among the tripartite partners, especially workers' organisations. This is a high priority recommendation that should apply to the next phase of the Decent Work Country Programmes. No additional resources are anticipated outside of the agreed Decent Work Country Programme budget.

6. Ideas for the next phase of DWCP for Lesotho.

One of the specific objectives of this evaluation was to develop recommendations towards the implementation of the remaining period of the DWCP and for the successor programme. Stakeholders' views indicated two potential options going forward and provided plausible justification for each of the options. Option 1 was to extend the implementation period of the DWCP for a period aligned with that of NSDP II, which was reportedly being extended. Option 2 was to develop a new DWCP for another 5 years, focused on implementing the pending activities and other priorities that the tripartite plus partners and ILO may determine through a thorough consultative process. Stakeholder views appeared to gravitate towards the second option and provided useful suggestions on the potential focus and scope of a successor programme.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Programme Description

Introduced by the International Labour Organisation (ILO) in 2004, the Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) is ILO's vehicle to promote the decent work agenda and deliver its mandate in the Member States.

DWCPs seek to promote the decent work agenda in ILO Member countries through the cooperation of various key actors, notably the Government, employers, workers, ILO, development partners, and other stakeholders. The formulation of DWCPs is based on an integrated and participatory programmatic approach.

Depending on member states' priorities alignment, DWCPs cover between 4 and 6 years and defines how in each country, the ILO constituents² and other key partners work together towards the attainment of promoting full employment and ensuring access for every man and woman to decent and productive work in conditions of freedom, equity, security and human dignity. In each country, a memorandum of Understanding (MoU) is signed between ILO and the Government, employers, and workers for the implementation of the DWCP. ILO provides technical support to countries within the DWCP framework.

DWCPs are generally designed, implemented, monitored, and evaluated based on results-based management principles (RBM). Also, the development process of DWCPs ensures that the programme draws from, contributes, and aligns with relevant national, regional, and international plans, frameworks, conventions, and standards.

In each country, the goal of DWCP is articulated around the following four strategic objectives:

- The application of international standards and respect for fundamental rights at work;
- The creation of employment and income opportunities for men and women;
- Improving coverage and extending social protection to all; and
- Strengthening tripartism and social dialogue.

In line with the provisions of the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, the programmatic approach towards implementing the DWCP takes due account of the inseparable, interrelated, and mutually supportive nature of the four strategic pillars of decent work. These pillars necessitates collaborative work across all technical sectors of the ILO reflecting the integrated approach required by the Social Justice Declaration.

The Lesotho DWCP 2018 – 2023 covered the period January 2018 – December 2023 and was the third phase of DWCPs in the country. The first DWCP covered the period 2006 – 2009. The second DWCP covered the period 2012 – 2017, which was extended to December 2018 to allow for alignment of the DWCP with the second National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP II) that covered the same period.

The priorities of the Lesotho Decent Work Country Programme 2018 – 2023 were determined by the tripartite partners and other stakeholders as follows:

² These refer to government, employers, and workers' organizations. They are also commonly referred to as ILO tripartite partners.

- (a) To create employment, particularly for young women and men;
- (b) To broaden social protection coverage; and
- (c) To promote good governance of the labour market.

The successful implementation of the DWCP aimed to contribute to the attainment of decent work in Lesotho, as well as poverty reduction and attainment of the development plan outcomes in Lesotho including the National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP) II, African Union Agenda 2063, and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

The implementers of the DWCP were the Government of Lesotho (GOL) led by the Ministry of Public Service, Labour, and Employment (MOPSLE)³, social partners (workers' organisations and employers' organisations), ILO, and development partners in Lesotho. The latter included United Nations (UN) agencies, civil society organisations, private sector organisations, among others. It was expected that the ILO would work closely with UN agencies, GOL, the private sector, and social partners to explore potential synergies through the context of United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) pillars.

The results framework of the DWCP has nine country programme outcomes and 35 outputs, which were to be achieved through the implementation of 130 planned activities. While it has 18 outcome indicators for tracking progress on the expected outcomes, the DWCP lacks output indicators in the results matrix.

The programme budget of USD 6,479,890 was to be contributed by the ILO tripartite plus partners. Government ministries and agencies were expected to commit and allocate annual ministerial budgetary allocations towards this budget and the implementation of specific outcomes and outputs. The 2016 ILO resource mobilisation strategy for Southern Africa was adopted as the main framework for resource mobilisation for the DWCP.

The political, socio-economic, and development context of Lesotho in 2018, as well as the need to align the programme with the national, sub-regional, continental, and global frameworks⁴ significantly influenced the design of the DWCP. At the time of the development of the programme, Lesotho faced high unemployment rates (32.8%), especially among the youth due to persistent skills and labour industry mismatch, child labour and human trafficking, high labour migration, and a lack of a comprehensive social security scheme due to the absence of social security policy and legislation. There were also limited reliable and up-to-date labour market information and statistics, as well as challenges relating to occupation safety and health in the workplace. In addition, several ILO conventions had not been ratified. Furthermore, the tripartite relations and social dialogue were not effective as expected in Labour Code Order Number 24 of 1992 and its amendments. Although Lesotho had created four statutory bodies through which social partners consulted (NACOLA, NACOSH, WAB and IRC), these institutions did not function optimally due to various challenges. These included restrictions on

³ This ministry was previously known as the Ministry of Labour and Employment (MOLE).

⁴ These included the Second National Strategic Development Plan 2028/9 – 2022/3 (NSDP II), Lesotho Vision 2020, Southern Africa Development Cooperation (SADC) Decent Work Programme 2013-2019, and SADC Industrialisation Strategy and Roadmap 2015 – 2063 and other SADC decisions. Others were the African Union (AU) Agenda 2063, AU Declaration on Employment, Poverty Eradication and Inclusive Development in Africa; the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); the Lesotho United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2019/2023.

meetings and movement associated with COVID-19 pandemic and inadequate financial resources.

1.2 Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation was to examine the achievements made so far in attaining the expected outcomes and take stock of recommendations, lessons learned, good practices, challenges encountered and an understanding how to address them.

The specific objectives of the evaluation were to:

1. Examine the coherence and relevance of the 2018-2023 DWCP in relation to Lesotho's National Strategic Development Plan, the Abidjan Declaration, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the UNDAF 2013-2017 and the UNSDCF 2024-2028, and other international commitments and national frameworks.
2. Examine the degree of coherence between outcomes, outputs, and implementation strategies of the DWCP with the ILO Programme and Budget 2018-19, 2020-21 and 2022-2023.
3. Take stock of what has been accomplished in terms of changes compared to the expected results of its implementation and the unexpected, positive, and negative results.
4. Examine the level of sustainability of results obtained.
5. Analyse the participation and contributions of different stakeholders, in terms of program implementation, monitoring, and coordination (i.e. effective participation and ownership of the DWCP and its articulation with the SDGs).
6. Draw lessons and good practices from the development, implementation, and monitoring of the DWCP 2018 - 2023.
7. Develop the recommendations towards the implementation during the next DWCP and the potential of the next DWCP for the tripartite plus constituents, ILO for its work in Lesotho and similar contexts, and other relevant stakeholders.

The clients of the evaluation were mainly the tripartite plus constituents and other key stakeholders who participated and/or benefited from the implementation of the programme, and the ILO at country, regional, and global levels. The tripartite partners in Lesotho comprise the Government of Lesotho (GOL), employers' organisations, and workers' organisations⁵.

The evaluation pursued seven specific objectives and 37 evaluation questions⁶ across the following themes aligned to the OECD/DAC criteria: relevance, coherence, the validity of design and evaluability, effectiveness, efficiency, management arrangements, impact, sustainability, and cross-cutting issues. In addition, lessons learned, good practices and DWCP stakeholders' aspirations for the next phase of the Lesotho DWCP were explored.

⁵ In the ILO terminology, the latter two stakeholders are referred to as social partners.

⁶ The stated evaluation objectives and key questions contained in the evaluation terms of reference guided the information gathering, data analysis and reporting in this evaluation.

Table 1. Key Evaluation Questions

1. Relevance and Coherence of the DWCP

- Is the Programme relevant and coherent to the outcomes in the NSDP, the Abidjan Declaration UNDAF/UNSDCF and the priorities of social partners?
- Are the activities and outputs of the Programme consistent with the overall goal(s) and the attainment of its objectives?
- To what extent did the DWCP relevant to gender equality, disability inclusion and other non-discrimination issues?

2. Validity of Design and Evaluability

- Has the DWCP carried out a proper consultation and involvement of tripartite plus constituents during planning, implementation and monitoring?
- Is the DWCP evaluable?
- Was the DWCP developed in a results-based approach?
- Does the DWCP expressed in an implicit or explicit Theory of change?
- Were DWCP indicators and targets sufficiently defined in the DWCP?
- Does the DWCP have a monitoring and evaluation system that could have been effective towards understanding how and why the DWCP achieved specific results?
- Have International Labour Standards, the promotion of gender equality and non-discrimination (i.e., people with disabilities, youth, and informal economy men and women), social dialogue, and fair transition to environment issues been addressed in the Programme document, implementation and monitoring and evaluation system?

3. Programme Effectiveness

- To what extent have the expected outputs and outcomes have been achieved?
- Which are the main reasons for the achievement or not of them?
- Have outputs been produced as planned? Which ones not and why?
- In which area (geographic, component, issue) does the DWCP have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors?
- Do the benefits accrue equally and strategically to men and women, people with disabilities, youth, and informal economy men and women?

4. Efficiency of Resource Use

- Were resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds, etc.) allocated by the ILO and constituents used strategically, considering existing opportunities, to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader programme outcomes?
- Have the results been achieved in a timely manner?
- How effective were the backstopping support provided so far by the ILO including Geneva HQ Units?
- To what extent did the DWCP implementation budget factor in cost of specific activities, outputs or outcomes to gender equality, disability and other non-discrimination issues?

5. Effectiveness of Management Arrangements

- Was the management and governance arrangement of the DWCP adequate to the implementation and monitoring needs?
- Has there been a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?
- Has there been a monitoring and evaluation system in place and used for management, reporting and learning? Has it included and analysed data disaggregated by sex (and by other relevant characteristics if relevant)?
- Has the DWCP being receiving adequate political, technical, and administrative support from its national partners/implementing partners and ILO?

- Did the tripartite plus constituents effectively use existing linkages to promote the DWCP and contribute towards resource mobilization efforts?
 - To what extent did the constituents have the capacity to integrate the DWCP activities into the different SDGs in the country at the level of implementation, monitoring and evaluation?
 - What are the needs and gaps to be addressed to strengthen this capacity for each of them?
6. *Impact Orientation*
- What concrete changes has the DWCP results brought to ILO tripartite plus constituents and ultimate beneficiaries of it?
 - To what extent has the DWCP contributed to strengthen the capacities of tripartite plus constituents and relevant institutions and the national environment at dimensions such as policies, laws, skills, and attitudes towards decent work?
7. *Sustainability*
- To what extent are the results of the DWCP sustainable?
 - What are the main factors that affect the viability or non-sustainability of the DWCP results?
 - Have strategies being considered to ensure that institutions at various levels (local, national) will sustainably take ownership of the results?
 - What is the level of ownership of the results by partners and target groups?
8. *Cross-cutting Themes*
- Within the project's thematic area, what were the facilitating and limiting factors in project's contribution/potential contribution to gender equality and non-discrimination?
 - Has the project taken into account tripartism, social dialogue, international labour standards and a fair transition to environmental sustainability in its design and implementation?

The evaluation covered the entire duration of the DWCP (January 2018 - December 2023). Its geographical scope was the entire country because the DWCP was a nation-wide programme.

1.3 Methodology and Limitations

Evaluation design

The evaluation of DWCPs follow the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria – relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability - as the main organising, analytical, and reporting framework. In addition, the validity of design and evaluability criteria has been added. Because ILO concerns on Decent Work include the International Labor Standards, the promotion of gender equality and non-discrimination, social dialogue, tripartism, and fair transition to environment, these issues were considered in the evaluation.

The Evaluation Process

The evaluation⁷ was organized under three inter-linked phases, namely planning, data collection phase, and data analysis, reporting, and feedback phases. The inception phase involved planning meetings, desk review, development of an inception report and data collection tools, sampling, field logistics, and other preparatory tasks. The fieldwork phase involved data collection in both Lesotho and virtually with key stakeholders of the programme between 18th September and 15th October 2023. A list of DWCP stakeholders prepared by the Country Programme Review (CPR) Taskforce served as the sampling frame. The data analysis, reporting, and feedback phase

⁷ In this report the words evaluation and country programme review (CPR) are used interchangeably.

involved the analysis of both primary and secondary data and the use of the data analysis results to develop the evaluation report. The ILO and other key stakeholders of the DWCP reviewed the draft report and shared consolidated feedback culminating in the preparation of the final evaluation report.

Stakeholder Participation

Meaningful stakeholder participation occurred throughout the evaluation process. For example, the CPR taskforce worked closely with the evaluator to provide guidance and input. Stakeholder consultations covered both men and women and vulnerable groups (persons with disabilities, people living with HIV, migrants, youth, and informal sector workers, among others). Their opinions and voices have been captured in the evaluation report.

Types, Sources and Methods of Data Collection

The evaluation utilized primary and secondary data collected from various sources. Secondary data were obtained from the review of DWCP documents and external documents from ILO, the Government of Lesotho (GOL), United Nations (UN) agencies, development partners, civil society organisations (CSOs), media, and academia. Annex 6 provides a list of relevant documents reviewed. Primary data were obtained through semi-structured interviews among key stakeholders of the DWCP. These included ILO the tripartite parties, and the UN agencies. The stakeholders interviewed were persons with good knowledge of or who had participated in the development or implementation of the DWCP. The interviews were conducted through face-face encounters and virtually using Zoom and MS Teams digital channels. Overall, 49 key stakeholders of the DWCP participated in the evaluation (Annex 5). Focus group discussions (FGDs) with a representative sample of workers from the different trades had been planned but were not carried out due to the logistical challenges of organizing the FGDs. Instead, information on the experiences and views of workers were explored by workers' representatives (trade union officials). Also, a planned administration of a programme sustainability questionnaire to key officials from ILO and the tripartite partners was abandoned during the field work phase after it became clear from stakeholder interviews that many of the planned activities and results had not been achieved.

Data Analysis

The obtained data were mainly qualitative and these were analysed using the thematic content analysis technique. Here, data from the stakeholder consultations and desk review were synthesized to identify commonly occurring themes on the programme. The obtained insights have been captured in the evaluation report in the form of text and direct quotations where appropriate.

Achieving Efficiency and Quality in the Evaluation Process

Necessary steps and actions were performed to enhance the quality of the evaluation process and outputs. These measures included the setup of the CPR task force by ILO to manage the evaluation process, adherence to research ethics, compliance with the agreed work plan, and validation of the findings by the key stakeholders of the DWCP. The taskforce comprised one member of ILO Pretoria and two members of the Regional Program Unit at ROAF. To a large extent, the evaluation process complied with the agreed evaluation schedule (Annex 4).

Ethical Considerations

The evaluation was conducted in strict adherence to ethical norms and standards for research and evaluation studies. In particular, data were only solicited from consenting adults, namely the implementers and other key stakeholders of the DWCP. The identified participants had an opportunity to make an informed choice to voluntarily participate in the evaluation. Further, the evaluation design reduces traceability of participants, by minimizing the collection of personal details that may provide obvious identities of the participants. Also, the evaluation observed conflict sensitivity principle through objective sampling as well as the framing and application of the interview questions. The obtained data were securely stored and only accessible to the evaluator for analysis and report-writing purposes.

Challenges and Limitations in the Evaluation

This evaluation encountered two notable challenges, which to some extent influenced the depth of analysis and the breadth of the findings, conclusions and recommendations presented in this report.

Firstly, there were considerable data gaps on the programme, manifested in the lack of complete information among GOL entities, social partners, and ILO on the exact implementation status and achievement of the DWCP. These gaps were to a large extent due to weaknesses in results monitoring and reporting on the programme. As such, the evaluation has relied substantially on insights from qualitative interviews with key stakeholders reached and desk review of available documents.

Secondly, it was not possible to engage all the identified key stakeholders of the programme. In particular, some of the development partners (CSOs) and UN agencies such as the UNDP and IOM that were involved in the implementation of the DWCP did not participate in stakeholder consultations due to logistical difficulties in securing interviews on time. Instead, insights from the review of available documents covering their contribution in the programme has been utilised.

CHAPTER 2: KEY FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

2.1 Programme Status

The exact level of implementation of planned activities and achievement of results was not clear from available programme documents or stakeholder interviews. It was clear most of the stakeholders of the DWCP who engaged in this evaluation were not fully aware of the exact level of implementation or achievements of the programme. This was mainly due to a lack of well-coordinated implementation, monitoring, and reporting in the DWCP.

Insights from stakeholder interviews and available literature indicated that approximately 40% of the planned activities and results were achieved. This low achievement level was due to various factors such as disruptions caused by COVID-19 pandemic, limited financial and human resources, and lack of adequate coordination of work. There were notable delays or non-performance of planned activities across all three priority areas.

Drawing on their experience and knowledge of the DWCP, most of the evaluation participants indicated they were highly satisfied with its design with an average rating of 8 out of 10 scores. On the other hand, stakeholders' views showed a generally low rating (an average of 4 out of 10 scores) on the level of implementation and achievement of the expected results.

Stakeholder sentiments on achievement of planned activities and results were most favourable towards priority 2 (average rating of 7 scores out of 10), compared to 3 scores and 5 scores for priority 1 and 3 respectively.

The DWCP document correctly notes that the successful implementation and monitoring of the programme depended on several factors. These included effective partnerships and improved coordination amongst the stakeholders of the DWCP, significant resource mobilisation, effective roles of the tripartite parties, political stability and governance in Lesotho, and capacity for RBM including effective monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and learning practice. These conditions were not entirely achieved in the programme and this affected the implementation of planned activities and achievement of expected results.

Other factors that undermined successful implementation of the DWCP included COVID-19, and lack of awareness of the implementation plan and responsibilities in the DWCP by the key stakeholders. For example, interviews with many of GOL stakeholders showed they were not fully aware of their exact role and responsibilities in the implementation, funding, monitoring and reporting on the DWCP. As such, they did not pay much attention to it when developing and implementing their individual, department, and ministerial work plans and budgets.

2.2 Relevance and Coherence

The programme was relevant and coherent to the outcomes in the NSDP II, the Abidjan Declaration UNDAF/UNSDCF, and the priorities of social partners and focused on the right things. This is evident when one considers the socio-economic and political context within which the programme was designed and implemented. For instance, the focus on priority 1 took into consideration the high number of graduates entering the labor market with no jobs.

There was significant alignment of all three priorities and expected results to the aspirations and provisions in various national, regional, and international plans, frameworks, conventions, and

standards, notably the Second National Strategic Development Plan 2018/9 – 2022/3 (NSDP II). This alignment is articulated explicitly in chapter 2 of the DWCP (Context) and summarised in Table 1: Alignment of DWCP priorities to SDGs and the national planning frameworks in Lesotho. The alignment is further highlighted under each of the three priorities. Like the DWCP, these national, regional and global frameworks addresses specific socio-economic challenges and needs, including poverty reduction, employment creation, and sustainable development generally.

Significant work was put in the DWCP towards policy and law reforms and this was correctly in pursuit of the full operationalisation of the decent work agenda and ILO labour norms and standards in Lesotho. At least eleven relevant policies, guidelines, regulations and agreements⁸, as well as the development of the social security bill, OSH bill 2022, and ratification of three ILO conventions (151, 187, and 190) were achieved.

Most of the evaluation participants across all key stakeholder groups rated the appropriateness of the design and relevance of the DWCP highly, with an average of 8 out of 10 scores while some gave 9 scores. The implementation and achievements of the DWCP did not receive a similar high rating among the evaluation participants.

The activities and outputs of the programme were consistent with the overall goal(s) and the attainment of its objectives. As already noted in Chapter 1, the goal of the programme was around the four strategic objectives of the DWCP framework:

- The application of international standards and respect for fundamental rights at work;
- The creation of employment and income opportunities for men and women;
- Improving coverage and extending social protection to all; and
- Strengthening tripartism and social dialogue.

Towards this goal, the DWCP pursued nine country programme outcomes, 35 outputs, and 130 corresponding activities. There is a clear linkage between the activities, outputs, and outcomes, as well as strategies adopted to realise these objectives.

The choice of the planned activities and results was correct, as it was informed by the National Strategic Development Plan II, the UNDAF, SDGs and the ILO Biennial Programme and Budgets (P&B) for the period 2018 – 2019, 2020 – 2021, and 2022 – 2023. However, it appeared the DWCP was overambitious; it had a high number of planned activities (130) when viewed against the internal and external context within which it was implemented. It should be noted that the implementation period was characterised by various challenges, including the following;

- There had been three national elections in a short time, which affected the proper functioning of parliament and the rest of Government institutions;
- The change in governments led to frequent transfers of government officials and mergers of government ministries and departments;
- The COVID-19 pandemic led to massive job losses, and dwindling of government resources, and tripartite meetings could not occur as expected within structures such as NACOLA.

⁸These are the OSH policy 2021, labour migration policy 2021, social protection policy 2020, gender and development policy 2018, OSH guidelines/regulations 2021, National Occupational Safety and Health Profile 2018, social security bill, OSH bill 2022, the occupation in demand list, bilateral labour agreements guidelines 2019, and bilateral labour agreements with Seychelles, Mauritius, and Qatar.

- There has been an unprecedented impact of climate change on the economy and livelihoods in the country.
- The two-faced migration phenomenon of Lesotho – in-migration of South Africans into Lesotho and out-migration of the Basotho to South Africa in search of dwindling number of jobs - played out during the DWCP implementation period.

The target setting during the design stage did not adequately consider the contextual factors and capacity of the local partners leading to largely unrealistic expectations in the programme.

The DWCP was relevant to gender equality, disability inclusion, and other non-discrimination issues. This is explicit in several outcomes, outputs and indicators statements, as well as strategies adopted in particularly priority 1. This is evident, for example, in outcome 1.3 seeking improved enabling environment for the development of sustainable enterprises. The background information provided under each of the outcome statements explicitly indicate the DWCP's commitment to promote the principles of gender equality, disability inclusion, and non-discrimination.

ILO and the tripartite partners made commendable efforts to mainstream gender equality and equal opportunities and treatment for all in the world of work in Lesotho within the auspices of the DWCP. For example, ILO Decent Work Team conducted targeted trainings for the tripartite partners focused on gender equality, disability inclusions and non-discrimination. Also, the Lesotho HIV Strategic Plan: 2023 – 2028⁹ was developed and adopted with ILO support in collaboration with the National AIDS Commission. Furthermore, support was provided for strengthening the capacity of labour inspectors on HIV/AIDS and Disability to support equal opportunities and treatment in the world of work in agriculture; support the new NSDP (ensuring its responsiveness to disability/ HIV/AIDS; revision of the 2006 Labour Code Amendment Act on to ensure equal opportunities and treatment in the world of work for all, including persons with disabilities and People Living with HIV. Commendably, the GOL through the Ministry of Gender, Youth, Sports, Arts, Culture and Social Development developed in 2018 a Gender and Development Policy 2018 – 2028 that directly supported the objectives of the DWCP.

2.3 Validity of Design and Evaluability

There was adequate consultation and involvement of tripartite plus constituents during planning, but not during the implementation and monitoring and this contributed to less than expected performance of the programme.

The drafting process of the DWCP was participatory and inclusive and this enhanced a sense of ownership of the programme among its stakeholder groups. Stakeholder interviews hailed the process of developing the DWCP as a good practice in this programme. At the same time, there were suggestions that the ministry responsible for youth and gender should have formed part of the drafting as their work was highly relevant particularly to priority 1. Also, the involvement of the informal sector, through its association was limited given that one of the outcomes following the Kingdom's adoption of Recommendation 204 was to transition from the informal to the formal economy.

⁹ This plan is expected to be launched in December 2023.

All key stakeholders of the DWCP were involved in the implementation process although not at the same level. For example, while some of the stakeholders (GOL, ILO, and UN agencies) were substantially involved, the social partners did not undertake any specific projects or activities that were directly linked to the DWCP. This was mainly due to a lack of clear structure for implementation and a lack of resources.

The DWCP was not entirely evaluable due to inadequacies in several aspects. Firstly, the programme's logical framework is incomplete; the horizontal intervention logic starts with outcomes and proceeds to outputs and activities without showing the overall objectives or goals of the programme. Secondly, whilst the programme was developed in a results-based approach, its implementation did not comply with the principles of the RBM approach entirely. For example, the DWCP lacked an adequate monitoring and evaluation system capable of delivering robust and useful information needed to enhance accountability, learning, knowledge base, and adaptive programme management. This gap is demonstrated by the following examples:

- There is a lack of indicators to track progress made toward the 35 planned outputs.
- Although the DWCP indicators and targets were to a large extent sufficiently defined in the DWCP and are specific, measurable, agreed, realistic and time-bound (SMART), there is a lack of baselines and targets for seven of the 18 outcome indicators.
- There was a lack of an M&E plan, provision of human and financial resources for M&E, and clear reporting lines.
- Although a labour force survey (LFS) was conducted in 2019, its results were not used to contribute to the monitoring of the DWCP. As such, there was a detachment between the LFS and the monitoring of the labour market and the effectiveness of the DWCP.
- There were some fragmented and disjointed monitoring systems of the DWCP by different actors, particularly MOPSLE and ILO.
- Some components of the DWCP, notably OSH had an implementation plan and M&E system while other components did not have such a system.
- The ILO had an online database, which has information on the implementation and results of the DWCP. However, the tools and mechanism that ILO used to collect the reported data were not clear.
- The programme lacked systematic reporting. This evaluation did not come across any progress reports or reports of any major events of the programme.
- The DWCP's learning processes were not adequately organized and executed effectively. There was no evidence showing that GOL, ILO, social partners, and other key stakeholders of the DWCP made significant efforts to learn from its implementation. Learning aspects of the DWCP were not reflected in the DWCP document, and budget.

To a large extent the programme document and implementation of the programme addressed International Labour Standards, the promotion of gender equality and non-discrimination, and social dialogue. Evidently, the focus of several of the outcomes, outputs, strategies and indicators, especially under priority 1 indicates the DWCP was keen in promoting gender equality and non-discrimination as well as social dialogue. For example, outcome 1.1 (More and better access to employment opportunities, particularly for young women and men in the rural and informal economies) is explicit in these issues. Outcome indicator 1.1.1 explicitly underlines a focus on youth, women, and persons with disabilities in the rural and informal economies. Many of the performance indicators were disaggregated by sex.

The theory of change for this programme is neither explicit nor clear and this undermined the evaluability of the DWCP. There has been no attempt to clarify the DWCP's theory of change among the stakeholders. Stakeholder interviews indicated that based on their experiences and aspirations, the tripartite partners had different understandings and visions for the DWCP. While some of the stakeholders emphasised the enhancement of social dialogue and tripartism as the core goal of the DWCP, others indicated the welfare of workers and employment as the main purpose of the DWCP. Other stakeholders perceived compliance with international labour laws as the main purpose of the DWCP. However, these standpoints point to relevant pathways for achieving the main goal of the DWCP – the attainment of decent work for all in Lesotho. In this sense, the implied theory of change of the DWCP is relevant and remains valid. The DWCP would have benefited from the development of a simple theory of change document or diagram to bring these visions together.

2.4 Programme Effectiveness

Stakeholder interviews indicated a less-than-expected performance of the DWCP. This is because the programme was not fully implemented. Noticeably, the DWCP was not mainstreamed into plans and budgets of many of the GOL entities and the social partners, despite being the principal implementers of the programme.

Assessed along the three priorities, good progress toward the planned outputs and outcomes was made in priority 2. Not much was achieved under priorities 1 and 3. There was an overwhelming consensus that the DWCP did not fully achieve the expected results because it was not fully implemented.

The outstanding achievements of the DWCP included the ratification of ILO Conventions 151, 187, and 190, as well as the development of at least eleven labour policies, bills, guidelines, regulations and agreements identified in section 2.2 above. These achievements represent a positive step towards the aspirations for the decent work agenda in Lesotho.

The issue of social dialogue is substantially covered under priority 3, particularly under outcome 3.1 (Strengthened fully-fledged and gender inclusive social dialogues institutions promoting decent work in all sectors including the informal sector). Commendably, the tripartite partners recognised tripartism and social dialogue to be critical factors in the decent work agenda in Lesotho. However, tripartism and social dialogue were not entirely effective mainly due to a lack of proper functioning of statutory social dialogue institutions, especially NACOLA, lack of regular tripartite meetings, and technical capacity gaps among the workers' organisations.

Not all the expected outputs have been produced as planned. Also, there were substantial delays in activity implementation and hence attainment of the planned outputs. This was attributed to various factors, notably the COVID-19 pandemic, financial constraints, political instability and ineffective governance, and a lack of adequate coordination, monitoring and reporting in the programme. The DWCP document had correctly predicted these factors to be major risks for the effective implementation of the programme.

The lack of adequate monitoring and reporting in this programme made it difficult to establish precisely whether or not the planned activities and expected results were achieved on time, in the required quality, and within the budget.

The DWCP had greater achievements in certain components and priorities than in other areas. The programme had outstanding achievements in law and policy development (policies, guidelines, regulations, agreements and ratification of ILO Conventions). Most of these achievements fall largely under priority 2 on social protection.

Regarding the level of implementation and achievement of planned results, the DWCP generally received low scores, averaging 4 out of 10 from its stakeholders. While ILO appeared to give much higher scores of 5 out of 10, the tripartite partners (GOL, workers, and employers) gave a low rating of 3 to 4 scores out of 10.

In terms of priorities, Priority 2 received a higher score generally (on average 5 out of 10 scores), priority 3 received on average 4 scores out of 10, while priority 1 had the least performance rating of 2 scores out of 10.

The reasons for the relatively higher rating for Priority 2 were because of the various policies achieved and the ratification of the stated ILO conventions. Not much was achieved under priority 1, where it was noted that employment rates and job opportunities had declined between 2018 and 2023. Priority 3 had some positive results in terms of the development of policies, tripartism spirit especially in the development of the policies, and ongoing social dialogue that took place between the tripartite partners.

Various internal and external factors (enablers and hindrances) influenced the implementation and performance of the DWCP. These factors related to the internal context (relating to the ILO tripartite partners) and the external context of the DWCP.

The following four factors were major enablers in the programme:

- (i) **Alignment and linkages to other plans/initiatives:** The DWCP was implemented to some extent because it was not a stand-alone document but one that was linked to the NSDP II, UNDAF, SDGs, and ministerial mandates of relevant ministries. As such, its planned activities and results were implemented in the course of implementing the other plans by the various actors. It appeared that a considerable number of the activities planned in the DWCP were not new but already catered for in the work plans of the line ministries. The triangulation of the evaluation data revealed that substantial work planned in the DWCP had been done or was underway within different GOL ministries, especially by the Ministry of Gender, Youth, Sports, Arts, Culture and Social Development (MOGYSACSD), Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA), Ministry of Trade and Industry (MOTI) and Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Employment (MOPSLE). Clearly, MOGYSACSD was one of the major contributors to the DWCP. For example, in 2022, the ministry finalised the Lesotho National Social Protection Strategy II 2021 – 2031 through an inclusive process that involved the ministry, MOPSLE and other GOL agencies, and development partners. It also developed an M&E framework and Action Plan for the strategy. In addition, there are several ongoing social protection programmes and activities implemented by MOGYSACSD which are relevant to the DWCP. These programmes aim at empowering people to become economically self-reliant and reduce dependency on social assistance and are implemented in all districts of Lesotho.
- (ii) **Partnerships among the key stakeholders of the DWCP:** Several partnerships were created in the programme and these brought about complementarities and synergies

beneficial to the DWCP. These partnerships included projects funded by the World Bank and IOM as well as work by other government ministries. For example, MOHA has a strategic plan that runs for 5 years and the same period as the DWCP and some of the issues handled by MOHA are relevant to a decent work agenda. For example, MOHA worked closely with MOPSLE in the development of the labour migration policy in 2019.

- (iii) **ILO's technical assistance:** ILO provided technical assistance in programme implementation through the work of the Decent Work Team/Country Office Pretoria and backstopping support from ILO Geneva Office. Stakeholder interviews indicated that ILO's technical support towards the delivery of the DWCP was critical and much appreciated although not well coordinated with the MOPSLE. ILO's support to the DWCP occurred within the context of ILO's biennial programme and budget plan (ILO P&B) and UN joint work plans.
- (iv) **Political good will:** This was demonstrated by the fact that the new GOL was able to ratify three Conventions, OSH, and other policies, and is working on the finalisation of the social security law.

On the other hand, several factors affected the smooth and full implementation of the programme culminating in less than expected performance. These hindrances included the following factors:

- (a) **COVID-19:** The outbreak of COVID-19 caused a social crisis that disrupted implementation plans to the extent that not much happened between 2019 and 2020. Resources that would have been systematically spent on implementation were diverted to addressing health and socio-economic challenges caused by the pandemic.
- (b) **Political instability:** This relates to changes in government and frequent transfers of senior staff in MOPSLE, which affected political and operational leadership for the DWCP. During much of the DWCP implementation period, the Lesotho government has been led by coalitions of political parties hence the lack of political stability.
- (c) **Weak coordination:** The coordination of implementation of the programme was weak. As such, what is reported in this evaluation as achieved in the DWCP is mostly an aggregation of what different actors have done, rather than the result of systematic and well-coordinated work. These implementation gaps were tied to several issues, which included frequent transfer of key staff within MOPSLE and the ineffectiveness of NACOLA. The latter had responsibilities for coordinating implementation, monitoring, and reporting on the programme.
- (d) **Inadequate resources:** The DWCP lacked adequate inputs, notably funds and human resources. For example, no funds were allocated by MOPSLE for collecting missing baseline data on seven out of 18 outcomes indicators. Also, labour inspectors lacked transport and other inputs to conduct their work effectively. No clear financing plan for the resource gaps for the various priorities, outcomes, outputs, and activities. Also, like other sectoral plans, the available resources (time and financial, human, and physical resources) within MOPSLE and other GOL entities had to be shared with the implementation of NSDP II.

(e) **Communication and visibility gaps:** The DWCP was not widely known within GOL ministries because of a lack of adequate sensitisation and implementation structures. As such, many of the GOL ministries did not incorporate all aspects of the DWCP that were relevant to their work.

(f) **Capacity challenges facing social partners:** The workers acknowledged they faced technical capacity gaps to engage effectively with GOL and employers within the various social dialogue institutions and to develop projects that contributed to the DWCP. The fragmentation of workers' organisations also limited their ability to influence social dialogue issues and to effectively implement the DWCP.

2.5 Efficiency of Resource Use

During the development of the programme the funding from ILO was used appropriately to convene meetings as well as the design and printing of the DWCP document. However, the tripartite partners were not able to mobilise adequate resources to fund the implementation of the planned activities. ILO's contribution, although valuable, was not sufficient. No wastage of resources was noted.

Stakeholder interviews indicated that ILO was one of the main and critical partners in the delivery of the DWCP. ILO's support comprised mainly capacity building, training, and limited financial support. Interviews with the ILO specialists revealed that the ILO Decent Work Team based in Pretoria worked harmoniously to provide technical assistance support for the delivery of the DWCP. The backstopping support provided by the ILO including Geneva HQ Units to the DWCP was largely effective in delivering various trainings including on gender equality and OSH.

Some of the stakeholder interviews indicated that ILO should have done more, especially in coordinating with GOL and the social partners to mobilise financial resources for the DWCP and to improve social dialogue/tripartism. Also, while different ILO specialists provided highly useful technical support to the tripartite partners and in the delivery of the DWCP generally, experts dedicated to employers and workers' issues were not in place during a considerable part of the programme period.

To a fair extent, the DWCP created complementarity and synergies with other actors and benefited from it. As already noted, there were several projects funded or implemented by diverse actors that were relevant to the planned outputs and outcomes of the DWCP. The notable ones include the following:

- World Bank Internship Project.
- MOPSLE Apprenticeship Project.
- A study was done with the support of IOM aimed at the analysis of the skills gap in Lesotho which will facilitate the work permits application for rare skills in the Country. The outcome of this study was Occupation in demand List
- Youth Employment Project implemented by MOGYSACSD.
- Volunteer Corps Project implemented by MOGYSACSD.
- Various social protection programmes and activities implemented by MOGYSACSD.
- Employers' Investment Law Initiative.
- Database on SMEs developed by the Ministry of Trade with funding from UNDP.

- Labour migration initiatives undertaken by MOHA through the National Consultation Committee on Migration and Development and supported by IOM.
- Development of an Integrated Migration Information Management system with the Support of IOM. The purpose of the system is to enhance timely and accurate migration data (labour migration as part).
- Violence and harassment at the workplace project implemented by workers from August 2019.
- World Bank funded the Southern Africa TB project with MOH, through which OSH policy and OSH regulations were developed.
- EU’s Southern Africa labour migration programme, from which Lesotho benefits.
- Labour project sponsored by the US Department of labour 2017 – 2029 to strengthen the labour inspectors to develop tools, etc, and how to do good inspections and take to court.
- ILO-funded “Competitiveness and Financial Inclusion Project” (ILO Reference No.: LSO/22/01/IDA).

The creation of complementarity and synergies would have been greater if the programme had achieved a well-coordinated implementation.

The DWCP implementation budget does not explicitly factor in the cost of specific activities, outputs, or outcomes to gender equality, disability, and other non-discrimination issues. Of the total project budget of USD 6,479,890, no funds were allocated specifically for gender equality, disability, and other non-discrimination issues. It is not enough to include gender issues in design of the programme; these intentions have to be backed by tangible and well funded interventions.

2.6 Effectiveness of Management Arrangements

The DWCP design had elaborate implementation arrangements although these were not fully implemented. NACOLA was vested with the overall oversight and governance of the programme but the institution did not function as expected. It did not hold quarterly meetings, nor did it effectively oversee the implementation of planned activities, monitoring, and learning activities in the programme.

The DWCP tripartite drafting team was to transition into a steering committee of the programme but this did not happen. The MOPSLE was expected to develop annual work plans and coordinate implementation activities of other actors, within and outside the government. However, this did not happen. No officer within MOPSLE was assigned the responsibility to steer the DWCP.

The ILO was responsible for providing technical support to the DWCP, guided by its annual priorities and biennial P&B, as well as joint work plans agreed by UN agencies in Lesotho. Beyond technical assistance in form of capacity building initiatives, ILO provided targeted financial support to the programme. This came in form of providing partial funding for social dialogue meetings held by NACOLA and the other social dialogue institutions, and mobilising resources for the DWCP through linkages and partnerships creation with other UN agencies, notably UNDP and IOM. Commendably, ILO signed on July 7, 2022 a funding agreement with the GOL for the “Competitiveness and Financial Inclusion Project” (ILO Reference No.: LSO/22/01/IDA) ending July 31, 2028. The project focuses on the delivery of outputs for expanding enterprise participation by Lesotho in the textile and clothing global value chain.

This project contributes directly to the DWCP objectives, especially under Priority 1 on employment creation. Although ILO did a lot of work in the programme, stakeholder interviews revealed a need for better coordination with MOPSLE on the work of the ILO specialists.

The ILO Director in collaboration with the Principal Secretary of MOPSLE, employers' representatives, and workers' representatives were to assume overall responsibility for providing support for the implementation of the DWCP. To a large extent, this was not achieved due to a lack of regular meetings by NACOLA and the other labour statutory bodies (NACOSH, WAB, and IRC).

To some extent, the tripartite plus constituents effectively used existing linkages to promote the DWCP and contribute towards resource mobilization efforts. There are notable examples showing how the programme, with the support of ILO, created complementarity and synergies or leveraged other interventions to achieve some of its planned results. For example, ILO created partnerships with MoH/Southern Africa TB Health Systems Support (MoH/SATBHSS) funded by the World Bank. This partnership helped the programme to achieve a number of important activities and outputs. These included a situational analysis of OSH in 2019 and subsequent development of a national health profile for Lesotho in 2019. The profile recommended the development of occupational and safety standards in the country.

In view of the appropriate design of the DWCP, the ILO constituents have the ability to integrate the DWCP activities into the different SDGs in the country at the level of implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. What missed out in this programme was adequate coordination of the planned activities, and monitoring and evaluation practice.

Under the UNDAF/UNSDCF, the UN encourages partners to support the implementation of the DWCP. Stakeholder interviews indicated that various UN agencies carried out specific projects or supported the work of the tripartite partners in delivering the DWCP. Notably, partnerships and synergies were created with UNDP, WB, FAO, UNRCO, and IOM, which enabled the performance of various activities and outputs across the 3 priority areas. For example, IOM worked closely with MOHA in the development of the Labour Migration Policy in 2021.

Not all key stakeholders of the DWCP had full understanding of their main roles and responsibilities in the implementation of the DWCP. This was largely due to a lack of targeted and comprehensive sensitisation of the programme, and other necessary actions including launch of the programme, regular meetings by NACOLA, having a dedicated unit within MOPSLE to steer the project, establishment of a steering committee, and effective communication, monitoring and reporting on the programme.

The programme lacked an adequate monitoring and evaluation system to aid monitoring of the implementation of the programme and to support management, reporting, and learning from implementation. As already noted, there were some fragmented and disjointed monitoring systems of the DWCP by different actors particularly GOL/MOPSLE and ILO that they used to collect data on the progress of the DWCP. ILO's online database (ILO Decent Work Results at <https://www.ilo.org/IRDashboard/index.jsp#country>) has useful information on the implementation and results of the DWCP but lacked clear tools and mechanism for the collection and analysis of data that went into the data base.

This evaluation did not come across any major reports on the programme. Also, there was no evidence showing that GOL, ILO, social partners, and other key stakeholders of the DWCP

made significant efforts to learn from implementation. Learning is not emphasised in the DWCP document, the implementation matrix lacked learning activities, and no budgetary allocations were made for learning.

Although the DWCP obtained political, technical, and administrative support from the GOL and the national partners, this was not sufficient for the full delivery of the programme. This is demonstrated by the high number and type of constraints faced in the implementation of the DWCP. These included the following challenges:

- Lack of clear leadership structures within MOPSLE for the DWCP implementation.
- Lack of operational effectiveness of NACOLA despite its prominent role in overseeing implementation of the programme. Also, less than expected functioning of the other social dialogue institutions (NACOSH, WAB, and IRC).
- Failure to and transition the drafting committee into a steering committee for the programme as envisaged in the implementation plan.
- Limited budgetary allocation to the DWCP implementation by MOPSLE and other GOL ministries.
- Lack of demand for systematic monitoring and reporting on the programme.
- Lethargy within GOL regarding the finalisation of critical outputs of the programme, notably the social security law.
- Lack of DWCP-related projects by employers and workers' organisations.

Financing of the DWCP was one of the major challenges identified in this evaluation. While ILO and the social partners did not have strong views about it, GOL stakeholders noted that the DWCP lacked adequate financial resources (as well as human resources) to implement it fully.

2.7 Impact Orientation

All concrete changes associated with the DWCP were positive and were around the development of policies and regulations, enactment of three ILO conventions, and increased capacity (knowledge and skills) in labour matters among the employers and workers following targeted capacity building initiatives conducted by ILO.

The review of the social security law was the most outstanding achievement of the DWCP. It was also the main initiative under the DWCP, in which the tripartite partners worked harmoniously. There was a widespread recognition that the enactment of this law, and its eventual implementation will address many of the prevailing labour market concerns in Lesotho.

Under Priority 2 on social protection, several concrete changes occurred. Notably, the DWCP achieved the development of the National Occupation and Health Safety framework, paving the way for the development of an Occupation and Health Safety policy and Act of Parliament. Also, 4 OSH inspectors were trained in occupational hygiene.

In efforts to ensure tripartism and social dialogue worked nationally and within the auspices of the DWCP, ILO conducted capacity building initiatives for the GOL and the social partners to improve working relations. This enabled the programme to achieve at least 5 important policies, regulations, and guidelines, as well as good progress made in the social security law reforms. The implementation of these achievements are expected to enhance compliance with

international labour standards and laws for the benefit of the tripartite partners and the people of Lesotho generally.

The ratification of three ILO Conventions by Lesotho (ILO Conventions 151, 187, and 190) after many attempts was also an important development that aligned with the decent work agenda and compliance with international labour standards and laws in Lesotho. In the development of the policies and regulations, as well as the social security bill, the tripartite partners engaged meaningfully and to a large extent worked harmoniously. These aspects are the cornerstone of the decent work agenda and DWCP in the country.

At the same time, stakeholder interviews revealed the following concerns and unresolved issues relating to what came out as ineffective conduct of tripartism and social dialogue in the course of implementing the DWCP:

- Lack of regular tripartite meetings; usually ILO reportedly engaged with the tripartite partners separately.
- Ineffective functioning of statutory social dialogue institutions due to various factors, including adequate financing by the GOL.
- Ratification of the three ILO Conventions No. 151, 187, and 190 by GOL occurred, reportedly, without adequate consultations with the social partners and NACOLA.
- Continued push for workmanship compensation by workers' organisations yet the issues was reportedly covered in the social security bill.
- Ineffective dispute-resolution mechanisms and contestations regarding the relevance of Labour Court Assessors.
- Failure by GOL to call for regular meetings to discuss and address labour matters in the country.
- Delays by GOL in the enactment of the social security law.
- ILO's reporting on progress made in DWCP and other labour issues without adequate consultation and input of the tripartite partners.
- Over representation of GOL and underrepresentation of social partners' delegations to the annual Labour Conference in Geneva. This reportedly disempowered the social partners during thematic discussions.

Stakeholder sentiments underlined that these unresolved issues continued to negatively impact on tripartism and social dialogue in Lesotho. As such, addressing these issues adequately remained a top priority going forward.

The DWCP produced one unexpected positive result relating to improved capacities (knowledge, skills and attitude) of the social partners to engage with other development actors positively in labour matters in Lesotho. Following capacity-building measures and encouragement of ILO, workers' and employers' organisations meaningfully engaged in the process of developing the current UNDCF from 2019 onwards. Also, the social partners reportedly participated meaningfully in the development of the UNSDCF 2024 – 2028. Working relationships were also established between the workers' and employers' organisations and UN agencies in Lesotho.

There was no evidence showing that the DWCP produced negative un-intended results. Also, there was no evidence showing that other interventions, actors, or government policies undermined the DWCP in any significant way.

Although the programme had the potential for catalytic/multiplier effect, this was not realised due to a lack of complete and well-coordinated implementation of the planned work. Also, no empirical evidence was adduced showing that the programme (achievements, components, or aspects) or part of it was being replicated in Lesotho or beyond.

2.8 Sustainability

The results of the DWCP are to a large extent sustainable. This assessment relates to the results that have been achieved relating mainly to the policies, laws, and conventions passed.

The level of ownership of both the expected and achieved results of the DWCP by partners and target groups was high. As already noted, all key stakeholders of the programme participated in its design, where they contributed to the decision on the final results captured in the results framework, which they viewed to be highly relevant and useful solutions to the challenges the DWCP sought to address.

Although some of the key stakeholders (social partners) did not participate in the implementation of the DWCP in a significant way, this was mainly due to various constraints encountered rather than a lack of ownership or commitment to the programme. Commendably, there was no indication that the tripartite partners perceived the DWCP as ILO's programme; rather they identified themselves as principal stakeholders of the programme.

The following five main factors influenced the sustainability of the results achieved in the programme:

- (i) **Ownership of the results:** All key stakeholders of the programme own the results, have a positive attitude towards them, and recognise them to be important milestones of the decent work agenda in Lesotho. As such, they are likely to continue using them or supporting their implementation going forward.
- (ii) **Political will:** There is notable political will in Lesotho, indicated by the fact that at least 5 policies and regulations have been attained, relevant labour regulations developed, and 3 conventions ratified within a 5-year duration. Based on this, there is a likelihood that GOL will support the implementation of the results achieved so far.
- (iii) **Internal capacity within MOPSLE:** The department of planning within MOPSLE has been revamped with the appointment of a director following the merger of the former ministries of Public Service and MOLE. The department is expected to lead the promoting of the decent work agenda within GOL and in Lesotho generally. One of the mandates of the department is to ensure the sustainability of the achievements of the three DCWPs implemented in Lesotho so far.
- (iv) **ILO support:** It is expected that ILO will continue supporting decent work agenda in Lesotho going forward, including the continuity of gains realised through this and previous DWCPs. This will be pursued under the biennial P&B, the "Competitiveness and Financial Inclusion Project" (ILO Reference No.: LSO/22/01/IDA), new DWCP, and through joint work plans under the UNSDCF. Other UN agencies are also expected to continue supporting Lesotho under the UNSDCF.

- (v) **New DWCP:** ILO tripartite plus partners in Lesotho are committed to developing a new DWCP. Among others, the new programme is expected to utilise lessons from the experiences of the evaluated DWCP and support the continuity of its positive results.

On the flip side, there was no evidence indicating that strategies have been considered to ensure that institutions at various levels (local, and national) will sustainably take ownership of the results of the DWCP. Also, there was no evidence showing that the positive results would be replicated by the various agencies within GOL and other actors in Lesotho. Additionally, the evaluation noted that the DWCP lacked a documented sustainability plan or exit strategy that would have spelt out sustainability efforts and measures to be put in place to ensure continuity of the results and benefits of the programme. These issues tended to undermine the sustainability potential of the programme.

2.9 Cross-cutting Themes

The design and implementation of the DWCP promoted various cross cutting issues, including gender equality, disability inclusion, non-discrimination, among others. For example, the OSH policy developed between 2019 and 2021 and approved by the cabinet mainstreamed gender equality, health promotion for workers, and HIV/AIDs.

The benefits of the DWCP that have been achieved accrue equally to men and women, people with disabilities, youth, and informal economy men and women. Stakeholder interviews did not reveal any known cases of discrimination on account of gender, age, disability, or other social status of the target groups.

To a large extent, the DWCP took into account tripartism, social dialogue, international labour standards in its design and implementation. These issues are reflected in particularly the activities and outputs of the programme.

The following three factors facilitated the contribution of the DWCP to issues relating to gender, disability, non-discrimination, tripartite, and international labour standards:

- (i) *Appropriate design:* The planned results of the DWCP clearly targeted to benefit both men and women in Lesotho without discrimination on account of gender, disability, social status, or other dimensions. This is evident in the outcome and output statements, as well as strategies adopted to achieve these. Also, the DWCP has gender-sensitive indicators.
- (ii) *Relevant capacity building initiatives:* In efforts to promote gender equality, disability inclusion and non-discrimination, ILO provided targeted training to the tripartite partners.
- (iii) *Existence of relevant policies and guidelines:* ILO guidelines on the design, implementation, and reporting of DWCP emphasise gender equality, disability inclusion and non-discrimination. Also, the GOL has a gender and development policy and non-discrimination policy, which the programme was bound to comply with.

There was no evidence showing that the DWCP considered a fair transition to environmental sustainability in both its design and implementation. This issue was identified for assessment in this evaluation but stakeholder interviews did not reveal much information on it. Clearly, none

of the expected outcomes, outputs, strategies and their corresponding indicators contained in the DWCP document dealt with environmental sustainability issues¹⁰.

2.10 Overall Assessment

Although the evaluation faced considerable data gaps, it was possible to develop, based on insights from desk review and stakeholder consultations, best estimates on the performance of the DWCP across the different evaluation criteria and specific issues of interest to the ILO and the tripartite partners. Table 2 below presents the estimated performance scores for various issues assessed in the evaluation.

Table 2. Estimated performance scores of the DWCP by evaluation criteria

Evaluation criteria/issue	Estimated performance score (Maximum 10 points)*	Comments
Relevance and Coherence	8	Developed through a highly participatory and inclusive process. Focused on the priority needs, rights and circumstances of the tripartite partners and Lesotho generally.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment with NSDP II, SDGs and other national, regional and international frameworks 	9	Explicitly covered and explained in the DWCP document, notably in Table 1 (Alignment of DWCP priorities to SDGs and national planning frameworks in Lesotho) and in chapter 3 (programme priorities). Also covered and linkages clearly shown in ILO online data base.
Validity of Design and Evaluability	6	Developed in line with RBM principles but has a high number of planned activities and weak monitoring, reporting and learning practice.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adherence to RBM principles 	6	Several areas for improvement noted, relating mostly to lack of effective monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning system.
Programme Effectiveness	4	Low level of implementation of planned activities leading to low achievement of expected results (outputs, outcomes and impacts)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achievement of results for priority 1 – employment creation 	2	Substantial decline in employment levels since 2018, especially in the textile and manufacturing sector. Need for reviewing strategies employed and greater involvement of private sector entities in job creation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achievement of results for priority 2 – social protection 	5	Achievement of relevant policies and regulations, and ratification of three ILO conventions 151, 187 and 190.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achievement of results for priority 3 – Labour market governance 	4	Social dialogue and tripartism is considered important but requires strengthening, including addressing various unresolved issues. Social dialogue institutions are not functioning optimally.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tripartism 	7	Explicitly covered in the DWCP document. Significant involvement of all Tripartite partners in the development of the DWCP and its major outputs, including at least 5 policies and regulations, ratification

¹⁰ However, it should be noted that DWCP is a time bound intervention reflecting the current priorities of tripartite constituents. These priorities change with the needs of the constituents. As such, the DWCP may not equally cover all crosscutting issues all the time.

		of conventions 151, 187 and 190, social security law reforms, and in the development of UNSDCF 2024 – 2028. Lack of regular tripartite meetings.
• Social dialogue	6	Explicitly covered in the DWCP document. Widely recognised by the tripartite partners and ILO as the cornerstone of decent work agenda in Lesotho. Not entirely effective due to weaknesses in the functioning of the statutory social dialogue institutions, especially NACOLA. Technical capacity weaknesses among the social partners, especially the workers’ organisations.
• Labour inspections	3	Explicitly covered in the DWCP as one of the results areas. Did not function as expected due to various challenges, including low number of inspectors, lack of adequate resources (e.g. transport), and lack of follow up, action and feedback by GOL on reported violations.
Efficiency of Resource Use	7	Substantial technical assistance from ILO to the DWCP. No wastage of available resources. There are several examples of creation of complementarities and synergies beneficial to the programme.
Effectiveness of Management Arrangements	3	Implementation arrangements described in the DWCP were not fully operationalised.
Impact Orientation	3	Significantly undermined by incomplete implementation of the programme.
Sustainability	6	Substantial stakeholders’ ownership of results achieved in the programme. Lack of documented sustainability plan and/or exit strategy.
Cross-cutting Themes	6	Explicitly covered in the DWCP document.
• International labour standards	8	Explicitly covered in the DWCP document. Outstanding results achieved, including at least eleven policies, guidelines, regulations, agreements, and ILO Conventions 151, 187 and 190, and good progress made in social security law reforms. Full implementation of these achievements remains work in progress.
• Fair transition to environmental sustainability	0	Not explicitly covered in the DWCP document nor in implementation. No evidence to demonstrate that environmental issues were mainstreamed in programme implementation, monitoring and reporting.
• Gender quality	6	Explicitly covered in the DWCP document, notably gender specific indicators. No gender action plan and gender specific activities.
• Disability inclusion	6	Explicitly covered in the DWCP document. Lack of data on programme reach of vulnerable groups, including persons with disability. Lack of specific activities targeting vulnerable groups.
• Non-discrimination	9	Explicitly covered in the DWCP document. No instances reported in the participation and access to benefits of the programme on account of gender, disability, age or other dimensions.

**Performance is assessed in terms of achievement of planned activities and results against the set targets and/or adherence to the expected quality.*

Based on the above best estimates, the programme performed highly in relation to the following issues: relevance; coherence; alignment with national, regional and international frameworks; tripartism; use of available resources; promotion of international labour standards; and adherence to the principle of non-discrimination. It performed poorly in terms of completion of planned activities; achievement of expected results, especially under priority 1; having effective management arrangements; achievement of effective labour inspections; making a significant difference (impact orientation); and promoting environmental sustainability.

2.11 Stakeholders' Views regarding a Successor Programme

One of the specific objectives of this evaluation as to develop recommendations towards the implementation of the remaining period of the DWCP and for the successor programme. To start with, the evaluation has been concluded at the tail end of the implementation period of the DWCP, which ends in December 2023 practically only one month away. In view of this, there are two potential options going forward as follows:

Option 1: Extend the implementation period of the DWCP

As already noted, the remaining work of the DWCP are estimated at 60% of planned activities. This is estimated to take approximately 2-3 years. Some of the stakeholder interviews indicated that option 1 was desirable because, faced with similar challenges as the DWCP, the GOL had decided to extend the implementation period of the NSDP II. However, interviews with GOL officials were not clear on the duration of the extension. Because the DWCP was not also fully implemented, it could be extended to align with extension timeline adopted for the NSDP II. By adopting this option, the implementation period of the next DWCP for Lesotho would be perfectly aligned to that of an anticipated NSDP III.

Option 2: Develop a new DWCP

Stakeholder views appeared to gravitate towards this option and presented useful suggestions on the potential focus and scope of a 5-year successor programme. The main focus of the new DWCP should be implementing the pending activities and on other priorities that the ILO and the tripartite plus partners may determine after a thorough consultative process. By adopting this option, Lesotho would break away from the trend of extensions of both the DWCPs and NSDPs. Adopting this alternative would require ILO and the tripartite partners to lobby for the priorities of the new DWCP to be included in a future NSDP III. The challenges addressed by the DWCP had not been fully solved such as high rate of youth unemployment hence the need for continuity through a new DWCP.

Also, stakeholders felt that a new DWCP would perfectly align with the new UNSDCF 2024 – 2028 hence tap into the funding, technical capacity development, synergies, and other opportunities presented by the latter. It was argued that by having a new DWCP in place, the stakeholders of the programme, especially MOPSLE and ILO will have an opportunity to lobby and advocate for inclusion of the objectives of the new programme into NDSP III. If successful, these endeavours were expected to enhance the uptake and systematic implementation of activities relevant to the DWCP by other GOL ministries beyond MOPSLE.

The above point is important because the design and implementation modalities of the NSDP appeared to influence, to a large extent, the level of implementation and achievement of results of DWCPs in Lesotho. In a sense, any sectoral plan such as the DWCP was bound to face challenges in implementation and financing by GOL entities when resources were to be shared

with the NSDP. Stakeholder interviews revealed that Government line ministries, including MOPSLE paid greater attention to the NSDP in resource allocation and work planning. This relegated the DWCP into a lower priority issue. Similarly, multi-lateral development partners, including UN agencies operating in Lesotho were likely to focus greater portions of their resources on supporting the national-level development plans.

2.12 Lessons Learned

The following six lessons emerge from the design, implementation, and results of the DWCP:

- (i) Greater alignment of the DWCP with the strategic objectives of MOPSLE/GOL, NSDP, UNSDCF, and SDGs is important for securing adequate political, financial, and administrative support and to tap into available opportunities and resources in support of the decent work agenda in Lesotho.
- (ii) Effective internal monitoring, reporting, and learning from implementation are critical elements for supporting the successful implementation of DWCP and these need to be explicitly reflected in the DWCP document, implementation plan, and budget.
- (iii) Effective communication, sensitisation, and coordination were critical for the successful implementation of the DWCP. These aspects need to be explicitly reflected in the DWCP document, implementation plan, and budget and operationalised throughout the programme cycle.
- (iv) Compliance with roles and responsibilities highlighted in the DWCP financing plan by the tripartite plus partners and ILO is critical for ensuring the programme has the necessary resources to implement planned activities smoothly.
- (v) Increased technical capacity of workers' organisations was critical for their meaningful participation in decent work processes in Lesotho, including the delivery of the DWCP, social dialogue, and their representation role generally.
- (vi) Social dialogue was a critical element in the work and success of DWCPs hence the need to ensure social dialogue institutions functioned properly in Lesotho, including the conduct of regular tripartite meetings. Over the last 5 years, no tripartite meeting convened by ILO has taken place yet these are included in the DWCP implementation plan and budgeted for by ILO.

These lessons are significant and can be applied in the future phases of DWCP in Lesotho as well as in other countries to improve programme performance, maximise impact, and enhance the sustainability of the results (benefits and services).

2.13 Emerging Good Practices

The evaluation identified one good practice in the DWCP relating to the development process of the programme. The DWCP was developed through a participatory and inclusive process and encompassed all key stakeholders of the programme. A national working group comprising academia, key government ministries, civil society, and social partners led the DWCP development process, from which a tripartite plus drafting team with 16 members with specialisation in the four decent work pillars was established. Unfortunately, the drafting committee did not transition into a steering committee as envisaged in the DWCP document.

CHAPTER 3: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Conclusions

This evaluation has come up with five major conclusions, which are based on the synthesis of the findings across all eight themes pursued in the evaluation. The conclusions, together with the lessons learned, give rise to the five recommendations presented in section 3.2 below.

Conclusion 1: The programme, similar to previous DWCPs in Lesotho was a highly relevant and coherent intervention that focused on the right things. Its planned activities and results that have been achieved were all appropriate and aligned to the decent work agenda in Lesotho and addressed issues of great concern to the tripartite partners, ILO and the people of Lesotho generally. However, the DWCP was a fairly ambitious programme as it had a high number of planned activities that were to be implemented within the context of significant resource constraints and political instability in the country.

Conclusion 2: The level of implementation of planned activities and the achievement of the expected results were below expectation. This occurred in previous DWCPs in Lesotho, indicating a worrying trend of non-completion of DWCPs in the country.

Conclusion 3: Contrary to the requirements of results-based management approach, the programme lacked adequate coordination, adaptive management, monitoring and evaluation, reporting, learning, and financing of the planned work. These issues undermined its implementation and overall performance.

Conclusion 4: Although tripartism and social dialogue were widely recognised to be critical factors for the decent work agenda in Lesotho, these were negatively affected by a lack of proper functioning of statutory social dialogue institutions (especially NACOLA), various unresolved issues, and technical capacity gaps among the social partners (especially workers' organisations).

Conclusion 5: The DWCP was implemented during a period of significant difficulty and uncertainty associated with COVID-19 pandemic and its effects on the economy and society generally, political instability in Lesotho following changes in government, and frequent transfers of key officials in MOPSLE with critical roles in the implementation of the DWCP. As such, the context of the programme must be taken into consideration in interpreting the findings presented in this report.

3.2 Recommendations

Recommendation 1: The tripartite plus partners, ILO, and other stakeholders of decent work agenda in Lesotho should halt the emerging trend of incomplete implementation of Decent Work Country Programmes in the country by adopting appropriate measures. These include well-coordinated activity implementation and adequate financing of Decent Work Country Programmes. This is a high priority recommendation that should apply to the next phase of the Decent Work Country Programme. No additional resources are anticipated beyond the agreed Decent Work Country Programme budget.

Recommendation 2: Going forward, the tripartite plus partners, ILO, and other stakeholders of decent work agenda in Lesotho should ensure future Decent Work Country Programmes

comply fully with results based management principles. Necessary actions include having effective monitoring, evaluation, accountability, and learning practice. This is a high priority recommendation that should apply to the next phase of the Decent Work Country Programme. No additional resources are anticipated beyond the agreed Decent Work Country Programme budget.

Recommendation 3: The tripartite plus partners, ILO, and other stakeholders should improve the coordination, communication and visibility of the Decent Work Country Programme by undertaking appropriate actions, including launch of the programme, sensitisation meetings, developing a simplified version of the DWCP, and regular sharing of information on the programme with key stakeholders. This is a high priority recommendation that should apply to the next phase of the Decent Work Country Programme. No additional resources are anticipated beyond the Decent Work Country Programme budget.

Recommendation 4: The tripartite plus partners, ILO, and other stakeholders should strengthen tripartism and social dialogue in Lesotho by implementing appropriate measures. These include supporting the proper functioning of social dialogue institutions, regular tripartite meetings, and addressing various unresolved issues and technical capacity gaps among the tripartite partners, especially workers' organisations. This is a high priority recommendation that should apply to the next phase of the Decent Work Country Programmes. No additional resources are anticipated beyond of the agreed Decent Work Country Programme budget.

Recommendation 5: The tripartite plus partners, ILO, and other stakeholders of decent work agenda in Lesotho should provide adequate financing for the Decent Work Country Programme to achieve smooth implementation. This is a high priority recommendation that should apply to the next phase of the Decent Work Country Programme. No additional resources are anticipated outside of the agreed Decent Work Country Programme budget.

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE LESOTHO DECENT WORK COUNTRY PROGRAMME (2018-2023) REVIEW

I. CONTEXT AND JUSTIFICATION FOR THE REVIEW

Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) is an International Labour Organisation (ILO) vehicle to deliver its mandate in Member States. The Programme defines how in each country, the ILO constituents (government, and employers and workers' organizations) and other key partners work together towards the attainment of promoting full employment and ensuring access for every man and woman to decent and productive work in conditions of freedom, equity, security and human dignity.

Under the DWCP the ILO provides technical and institutional assistance to its tripartite constituents (Governments, Employers' and Workers' organizations) in its Member States to achieve this goal articulated around four strategic objectives:

- the application of international standards and respect for fundamental rights at work;
- the creation of employment and income opportunities for men and women;
- improving coverage and extending social protection to all and
- strengthening tripartism and social dialogue.

Following the results-based management (RBM) approach, the DWCP is based on a causal analysis of problems of decent work leading to the identification of priority areas of intervention, the delineation of short and medium-term strategic outcomes and an operational implementation plan. The DWCP is, thus, the strategic results framework set up, around which the Government and the social partners (employers and workers) are committed to working in partnership with ILO and other key partners to achieve the goals of decent work in the country. The DWCP formulation is based on an integrated and participatory programmatic approach.

1.1. The DWCP 2018-2023

The priorities of the Lesotho Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP)¹¹ as have been determined by Tripartite plus are the following.

- (a) To create employment particularly for young women and men
- (b) To broaden social protection coverage; and
- (c) To promote good governance of the labour market.

These priorities align to the national, sub-regional, continental and global frameworks outlined in section 7 above, namely the National Strategic Development Plan, SADC DWP 2013-2019, the AU Agenda 2063, AU Declaration on Employment, Poverty Eradication and Inclusive Development in Africa, and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Lesotho UNDAF 2019/2023.

In line with the provisions of the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, the programmatic approach towards implementing the DWCP take due account of the inseparable, interrelated and mutually supportive nature of the four strategic pillars of decent work that necessitates collaborative work across all technical sectors of the ILO reflecting the integrated approach required by the Social Justice Declaration.

¹¹ Available [here](#)

1.2. Rationale for the review

DWCPs are formulated based on results-based management principles, the reviews and/or evaluations are mandated to ensure learning for the implementation of the DWCPs and in general decent work interventions. This review should draw lessons learned from the 2018 to date implementation and results of the DWCP and inform the remaining period, including a potential extension and a new DWCP to be aligned with the new United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (UNSDCF former UNDAF) planned to start in 2024, the national goals, not only in the world of work but also the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), National Strategies and Plans, and the Abidjan Declaration - Advancing Social Justice: Shaping the future of work in Africa (December 2019).

The ILO's recent experience with the evaluation of DWCPs has shown that to enhance DWCP learning, it is important that evaluations are conducted by independent evaluation experts.

II. Purpose, Clients, and Objectives

The purpose of the Country Programme Review (CPR) is to examine the achievements made so far in attaining the outcomes identified and take stock of recommendations, lessons learned, good practices and challenges to inform the current DWCP, understating also reasons for pitfalls and how to address them.

The clients of the CPR are specifically the ILO tripartite plus constituents and other key stakeholders participated and/or benefited for the implementation of the 2018-2023 DWCP and the ILO at country, regional and global levels.

The tripartite partners in Lesotho are the following

- Employers' organisations.
- Workers' organisations.
- Government.

The following objectives will guide the assignment for the consultant:

1. Examine the coherence and relevance of the 2018-2023 DWCP in relation to the Lesotho's National Strategic Development Plan, the Abidjan Declaration, the SDGs, the UNDAF 2013-2017 and the UNSDCF 2024-2028, and other international commitments and national frameworks.
2. Examine the degree of coherence between outcomes, outputs and implementation strategies of the DWCP with the ILO Programme and Budget 2018-19, 2020-21 and 2022-23.
3. Take stock of what has been accomplished in terms of changes compared to the expected results of its implementation and the unexpected, positive and negative results.
4. Examine the level of sustainability of results obtained.
5. Analyse the participation and contributions of different stakeholders, in terms of program implementation, monitoring and coordination (i.e. effective participation and ownership of the DWCP and its articulation with the SDGs);
6. Draw lessons and good practices from the development, implementation and monitoring of the DWCP 2018-23.
7. Develop the recommendations towards the implementation of the remaining period and potential next DWCP for the tripartite plus constituents, ILO for its work in Lesotho and similar contexts and other relevant stakeholders.

III. Criteria and review Questions

The ILO follows the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria for evaluating development assistance: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. In addition, the validity of design and evaluability criteria has been added.

ILO concerns on Decent Work, includes the International Labor Standards, the promotion of gender equality and non-discrimination, social dialogue, and fair transition to environment that should be explicitly considered when evaluating the DWCP.

The following key questions are intended to guide the information gathering, analysis, conclusions, and recommendations, as well as lessons learned and good practices.

Relevance and coherence of the DWCP

- Is the Programme relevant and coherent to the outcomes in the NSDP, the Abidjan Declaration UNDAF/UNSDCF and the priorities of social partners?
- Are the activities and outputs of the Programme consistent with the overall goal (s) and the attainment of its objectives?
- To what extent did the DWCP relevant to gender equality, disability inclusion and other non-discrimination issues?

Validity of design and evaluability

- Has the DWCP carried out a proper consultation and involvement of tripartite plus constituents during planning, implementation and monitoring?
- Is the DWCP evaluable? Was the DWCP developed in a results-based approach? Does the DWCP expressed in an implicit or explicit Theory of change?
- Were DWCP indicators and targets sufficiently defined in the DWCP?
- Does the DWCP have a monitoring and evaluation system that could have been effective towards understanding how and why the DWCP achieved specific results?
- Have International Labor Standards, the promotion of gender equality and non-discrimination (i.e., people with disabilities, youth, and informal economy men and women), social dialogue, and fair transition to environment issues been addressed in the Programme document, implementation and monitoring and evaluation system?

Programme effectiveness

- To what extent have the expected outputs and outcomes have been achieved?
- Which are the main reasons for the achievement or not of them?
- Have outputs been produced as planned? Which ones not and why?
- In which area (geographic, component, issue) does the DWCP have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors?
- Do the benefits accrue equally and strategically to men and women, people with disabilities, youth, and informal economy men and women?

Efficiency of resource use

- Were resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) allocated by the ILO and constituents used strategically, considering existing opportunities, to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader Programme outcomes?
- Have the results been achieved in a timely manner?
- How effective were the backstopping support provided so far by the ILO including Geneva HQ Units?
- To what extent did the DWCP implementation budget factor in cost of specific activities, outputs or outcomes to gender equality, disability and other non-discrimination issues?

Effectiveness of management arrangements

- Was the management and governance arrangement of the DWCP adequate to the implementation and monitoring needs? Has been a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?

- Has been a monitoring & evaluation system in place and used for management, reporting and learning. Has it included and analyzed data disaggregated by sex (and by other relevant characteristics if relevant)?
- Has the DWCP been receiving adequate political, technical, and administrative support from its national partners/implementing partners and ILO?
- Did the tripartite plus constituents effectively use existing linkages to promote the DWCP and contribute towards resource mobilization efforts?
- To what extent did the constituents have the capacity to integrate the DWCP activities into the different SDGs in the country at the level of implementation, monitoring and evaluation? What are the needs and gaps to be addressed to strengthen this capacity for each of them?

Impact orientation

- What concrete changes has the DWCP results brought to ILO tripartite plus constituents and ultimate beneficiaries of it?
- To what extent has the DWCP contributed to strengthen the capacities of tripartite plus constituents and relevant institutions and the national environment at dimensions such as policies, laws, skills, and attitudes towards decent work?

Sustainability

- To what extent are the results of the DWCP sustainable?
- What are the main factors that affect the viability or non-sustainability of the DWCP results? Have strategies been considered to ensure that institutions at various levels (local, national) will sustainably take ownership of the results?
- What is the level of ownership of the results by partners and target groups?

IV. Methodology

This review is an independent evaluation that will be conducted by a consultant. The participation of the tripartite plus constituents and relevant stakeholders involved from inception to implementation of the DWCP would be ensured. The review should follow the ILO Country Programme Reviews (CPR) guide (see Annex 1).

Gender and non-discrimination, including persons with disability, workers and economic units in the informal economy and youth will have to crosscutting the collection and analysis of data. These categories of people should be involved in the consultations.

To analyze the capacities of the tripartite plus constituents to link the decent work agenda (reflected in the DWCP) with the SDGs, the evaluator will use the methodology contained in the document "Diagnostic instrument to assess the evaluability of DWCPs in the context of the SDGs, especially with Component 3 tools¹².

The consultant will apply a variety of techniques such as desk review, stakeholder meetings, focus group discussions, field visits, triangulation, questionnaires, and interviews with the partners and the final beneficiaries. The collection, analysis and presentation of data will be disaggregated by sex (and other relevant characteristics where appropriate).

The DWCP review will take place in four phases: (i) Inception phase: preparation of the Inception Report, preliminary discussions with the ILO and the Chair of the Steering Committee and desk review; (ii) Data collection/fieldwork, (iii) Presentation of preliminary findings and recommendations in a stakeholders' workshop, and (iv) Developing the draft report and then, after receiving comments for stakeholders, the final report.

¹² https://www.ilo.org/eval/WCMS_625970/lang--en/index.htm

Desk Review and inception report

Before conducting field visits, the consultant will review the DWCP, the Lesotho UNDAF, national plans, and other strategic documents such as relevant progress reports, baseline surveys and National Strategic Development Plans and other relevant documents. In parallel, the consultant makes use of the findings from the review to feed into the draft country context as part of the inception report to be completed.

The approval of the inception report (guided by ILO/EVAL Checklist 3, see annex) by the CPR ILO Task force is a requirement to pass to the data collection phase.

Names of proposed individuals and groups to be met as well as a detailed timetable will be prepared for the consultant upon commencement of assignment.

Individual interviews, focus groups, observation, and others

The evaluator will conduct interviews with the tripartite plus DWCP committee collectively, including the relevant individuals from the Ministry of Employment and Labour, the Workers Organisations and the Employers' Organisation representatives, the ILO Country Office Pretoria, other implementing partners, and local actors in selected locations (to be defined at the inception phase). The selected locations should cover successful and less successful cases to learn from these "extreme" experiences.

Preliminary results discussion stakeholders' workshop

The evaluator will present preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendation at a stakeholder's workshop. The draft final report will subsequently be shared for comments before finalization.

Development of the draft and final version of the Review report

The consultant will develop a draft and then a final evaluation report following the Checklists 5 and 6 of ILO/EVAL (see annex). The report layout is presented below. The report should be not more than 30 pages plus annexes.

The draft report will be reviewed by the task force. Upon the approval of the draft report, it will be circulated among the tripartite plus constituents, ILO staff and other relevant stakeholders for factual and clarification errors. Then, those comments will be shared with the consultant to finalize the report.

The final report will be reviewed by the Task force and approved by ILO Regional Office for Africa/ Regional Programme Unit Chief as the final approval level.

V. Key deliverables of the consultancy

All deliverables will follow the ILO/EVAL checklists that are presented in the Annex I of these ToRs. The consultant will produce the following deliverables:

- An Inception report.
- A presentation to be delivered during the stakeholders' workshop.
- A draft evaluation report to be shared with constituents and relevant stakeholders for review and comments.
- A final evaluation report incorporating comments made on the draft report; and a compilation of lessons learnt and good practices.

All reports, including drafts, will be written in English. Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with the ILO and the evaluator. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written

agreement of the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

VI. Layout of the evaluation reports

The following outline is suggested for the CPR report, considering a maximum of 30 pages (sections 5-12) plus annexes:

1. Title page
2. Table of Contents
3. Acronyms
4. Executive Summary
5. Background and Programme Description
6. Purpose and scope of Evaluation
7. Evaluation Methodology and limitations
8. Programme Status
9. Findings by criteria
10. Conclusions
11. Lessons Learnt and Good Practices
12. Recommendations (maximum 8-10)
13. Annexes: including (i) The terms of reference (ii) Evaluation questions matrix, (iii) A summary matrix indicating for each defined outcome/outputs, targets and achievements and a comments section; (iv) Review schedule (v) List of people interviewed; (vi) References reviewed; and (vii) Others (optional).

VII. Responsibilities in the management of the review and deadlines

ILO task force

The ILO has set up a task team consisting of 1 member of ILO Pretoria, and 2 members of the Regional Program Unit at ROAF. This task team includes Siphon Ndlovu, Senior Programme Officer, and from ROAF/RPU by Na Pahimi Baizebbe, Analyst and Ricardo Furman, Regional Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. This taskforce will be responsible for the technical quality of the review. Among other tasks, the task force will:

- Coordinate the review
- Develop and validate the ToRs in collaboration with stakeholders.
- Approve the final TOR
- Consultant selection and recruitment.
- Technically support the review process.
- Submit the report of the review to stakeholders for comments
- Validate technically the report
- Brief partners on the process and their participation
- Develop the consultant's contract.
- Compile relevant documents – project and programming info including work plans, progress reports, evaluations, key communications, etc. and provide all documents, contacts, etc. to the consultant
- Propose the list of interviewees to the consultant.
- Support the field work
- Support the organization of the presentation and validation workshop of the review report.
- Disseminate the evaluation report to relevant Partners and stakeholders.
- Follow up on recommendations of the DWCP review
- Provide the management response, developed jointly with DWCP tripartite partners.

The Tripartite plus Task Team

- Involve the ILO tripartite plus constituencies involved in the implementation of the DWCP.
- Propose the list of contacts and stakeholders to be interviewed by the consultant.

- Make available to the consultant all the necessary documentation (reports, minutes of meetings, publications, regulatory and legal texts, etc.).
- Provide logistical support to the consultant in data collection (mobilize stakeholders to receive the consultant).
- Organize, with the technical and financial support of the ILO, the workshop of presentation of the preliminary results and collection of additional information.
- Comment on the version of the report after the workshop.
- Follow up on the implementation of the recommendations of the review.

The consultant

- Produce an Inception report that incorporates a mission comprehension note, a detailed and realistic agenda, information gathering tools and a report writing plan.
- Collect and compile information and evidence on stakeholder interventions.
- Review this information and analyse it on the basis of cause-effect links of the changes obtained and the DWCP outputs.
- Present provisional results during a workshop.
- Develop a draft version of the report.
- Write the final report taking into account relevant observations from the stakeholders
- Transmit the final report to the ILO for quality control.

VIII. Proposed Timeline

The Tentative timetable for the process of the review during the 20 working days involves the following:

Steps	Tasks	Responsible	Tentative schedule (2023)	Number of workdays consultant
1.	Share the Draft TOR with the MOLE, the tripartite task team on the evaluation of the DWCP and other relevant stakeholders for inputs.	ILO	Jan-March	0
2.	Recruitment of the Consultant/Evaluator	ILO	March-April	0
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review • Initial interviews with ILO Pretoria officials and as well representatives from Government, employers' and workers' organizations in Lesotho • Development and approval of the Inception Report 	Consultant	September 2023	5
4.	Interviews with the relevant Government institutions; workers and employers' representatives, the UN system in Lesotho and relevant stakeholders	Consultant	18 Sept – 02 Oct. 2023	10
5	Stakeholders' validation workshop	All stakeholders	03 rd October 2023	1
6	Development and submission of the first draft report of the review	Consultant	October 2023	5
7	Submission of the of the 1 st Draft Report of the review to the national stakeholders and ILO for comments	Consultant	October 2023	0
8	Finalization of the report integrating the comments	Consultant	October 2023	1

9	Approval and sharing of the final and report	ILO		0
10	Dissemination	ILO and national partners		0
	TOTAL			22

IX. Profile of the consultant

- To carry out this mission, the international or national consultant should have the following profile:
- Have a post-graduate degree in Economics, Development Planning, Social Sciences, Political Science, and Management of Organizations or in a similar field.
- Six to seven years of proven experience in the field of evaluations, particularly in evaluations of development programs or sectoral strategies and capacity building programmes with theory of change approach and use of quantitative and qualitative data, preferable as sole evaluator, or team leader.
- Have good knowledge of the United Nations and ILO evaluation policies including the results-based management methodology.
- Have good knowledge of Lesotho and SADC region, or similar countries in the region, particularly in the areas of decent work, informality and gender.
- Have strong analytical and drafting ability.
- Excellent spoken and written English, other local languages will be an asset.

X. Resources

- Fees that must not exceed 22 working days;
- Travel costs of the consultant in accordance with ILO regulations;
- Stakeholders' workshop at the end of the data collection phase.
- The ILO Pretoria Office in collaboration with the MOLE will facilitate the logistical aspects of the consultancy.
- ILO resources will cover the cost of the evaluation.

Annexe 1: All relevant ILO evaluation guidelines and standard templates

Country Programme Review Guidance note https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746714.pdf

ILO Policy Guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 4ed.

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

Guidance note 7 Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation

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

Guidance note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E of projects

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

ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX

EVALUATION CRITERIA	KEY QUESTIONS	SOURCES OF INFORMATION	METHODS
Relevance and coherence of the DWCP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the programme relevant and coherent to the outcomes in the NSDP, the Abidjan Declaration UNDAF/UNSDCF and the priorities of social partners? • Are the activities and outputs of the Programme consistent with the overall goal (s) and the attainment of its objectives? • To what extent did the DWCP relevant to gender equality, disability inclusion and other non-discrimination issues? 	Primary & secondary data	Desk review Stakeholder consultations (individual interviews and group meetings)
Validity of design and evaluability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the DWCP carried out a proper consultation and involvement of tripartite plus constituents during planning, implementation and monitoring? • Is the DWCP evaluable? Was the DWCP developed in a results-based approach? Does the DWCP expressed in an implicit or explicit Theory of change? • Were DWCP indicators and targets sufficiently defined in the DWCP? • Does the DWCP have a monitoring and evaluation system that could have been effective towards understanding how and why the DWCP achieved specific results? • Have International Labour Standards, the promotion of gender equality and non-discrimination (i.e., people with disabilities, youth, and informal economy men and women), social dialogue, and fair transition to environment issues been addressed in the Programme document, implementation and monitoring and evaluation system? 	Primary & secondary data	Desk review Stakeholder consultations (individual interviews and group meetings)
Programme effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have the expected outputs and outcomes have been achieved? • Which are the main reasons for the achievement or not of them? • Have outputs been produced as planned? Which ones not and why? • In which area (geographic, component, issue) does the DWCP have the greatest achievements? 	Primary & secondary data	Desk review Stakeholder consultations (individual interviews and group meetings)

	<p>Why and what have been the supporting factors?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the benefits accrue equally and strategically to men and women, people with disabilities, youth, and informal economy men and women? 		
Efficiency of resource use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) allocated by the ILO and constituents used strategically, considering existing opportunities, to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader Programme outcomes? Have the results been achieved in a timely manner? How effective were the backstopping support provided so far by the ILO including Geneva HQ Units? To what extent did the DWCP implementation budget factor in cost of specific activities, outputs or outcomes to gender equality, disability and other non-discrimination issues? 	Primary & secondary data	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Stakeholder consultations (individual interviews and group meetings)</p>
Effectiveness of management arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the management and governance arrangement of the DWCP adequate to the implementation and monitoring needs? Has there been a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved? Has been a monitoring & evaluation system in place and used for management, reporting and learning? Has it included and analysed data disaggregated by sex (and by other relevant characteristics if relevant)? Has the DWCP being receiving adequate political, technical, and administrative support from its national partners/implementing partners and ILO? Did the tripartite plus constituents effectively use existing linkages to promote the DWCP and contribute towards resource mobilization efforts? To what extent did the constituents have the capacity to integrate the DWCP activities into the different SDGs in the country at the level of implementation, monitoring and evaluation? 	Primary & secondary data	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Stakeholder consultations (individual interviews and group meetings)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the needs and gaps to be addressed to strengthen this capacity for each of them? 		
Impact orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What concrete changes has the DWCP results brought to ILO tripartite plus constituents and ultimate beneficiaries of it? • To what extent has the DWCP contributed to strengthen the capacities of tripartite plus constituents and relevant institutions and the national environment at dimensions such as policies, laws, skills, and attitudes towards decent work? 	Primary & secondary data	Desk review Stakeholder consultations (individual interviews and group meetings)
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are the results of the DWCP sustainable? • What are the main factors that affect the viability or non-sustainability of the DWCP results? • Have strategies been considered to ensure institutions at various levels (local, national) will sustainably take ownership of the results? • What is the level of ownership of the results by partners and target groups? 	Primary & secondary data	Desk review Stakeholder consultations (individual interviews and group meetings)
Cross-cutting themes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the project's thematic area, what were the facilitating and limiting factors in project's contribution/potential contribution to gender equality and non-discrimination? • Has the project taken into account tripartism, social dialogue, international labour standards and a fair transition to environmental sustainability in its design and implementation? 	Primary & secondary data	Desk review Stakeholder consultations (individual interviews and group meetings)

ANNEX 3A: DWCP ACTIVITY IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER

PRIORITY I: EMPLOYMENT CREATION PARTICULARY FOR YOUNG WOMEN AND MEN	
CPO value: Outcome 1.1 LSO XXX: More and better access to employment opportunities, particularly for young women and men in the rural and informal economies.	IMPLEMENTATION STATUS / ACHIEVEMENTS
Output 1.1.1.1: Pro-employment macro-economic and sectoral policies developed and promoted	
Activity 1: A comprehensive assessment of the policy and institutional environment for the development of a stronger labour market conducted including Identification of key stakeholders in job creation	Not achieved due to financial constraints
Activity 2: Strengthen technical support to tripartite constituents to effectively engage in the development of pro-employment and macro-economic legislative and policy reforms.	Not achieved due to financial constraints
Activity 3: Develop National and Sectorial policies on job creation	Not achieved due to financial constraints
Activity 4: Raise awareness and disseminate developed policies and plans	Not achieved due to financial constraints
Activity 5: Develop regulations on Employment sector.	Not achieved due to financial constraints.
Output 1.1.1.2: The Employment Intensive Programme rolled out in all the country's 10 districts to enhance investment in rural infrastructure.	
Activity 1: Capacitate public institutions and rural stakeholders on employment intensive programmes and methods	Status not clear
Activity 2: Conduct a social dialogue with relevant stakeholders to prioritize and plan the implementation of the Employment Intensive Programme	Status not clear
Activity 3: Implement the role out plan	Status not clear
Activity 4: Conduct on going monitoring and evaluation of programme implementation and success	Status not clear
Output 1.1.1.3: Knowledge base on gender equality strengthened and gender mainstreamed.	
Activity 1: Conduct comprehensive gender leadership training with key stakeholders	Status not clear
Activity 2: Monitor and evaluate implementation plan from a gender equality perspective	Status not clear
CPO value: Outcome 1.2 LSO XXX: Strengthened employable skills for young women and men responsive to labour market dynamics.	
Output 1.2.1.1: Human Resource Development policy and plan adopted and implemented.	
	Status not clear

Activity 1: Coordinate government ministries and private sector on issues of human development	
Activity 2: Implement recommendations of conducted diagnostic studies on human development needs assessment.	Status not clear
Activity 3: Strengthen accreditation and qualification framework.	Status not clear
Output 1.2.1. 2: Work-based training opportunities promoted (apprenticeships, internships, industry attachments etc) for young women and men including those working in informal economy.	
Activity 1: Coordinate apprenticeship initiatives	Not achieved due to financial constraints
Activity 2: Conduct assessment on apprenticeship	Not achieved due to financial constraints
Activity 3: Disseminate the finding of the assessment	Not achieved due to financial constraints
Activity 4: Develop a toolkit for employers	Not Achieved due to financial constraints
Activity 5: Develop code of conduct for apprenticeship	Not achieved due to financial constraints
Activity 6: Develop strategies for apprenticeship	Not achieved due to financial constraints
Output 1.2.1.3: Outreach training programmes aimed at skilling out of school vulnerable groups developed and implemented.	
Activity 1: Conduct needs assessment for outreach programmes based on geographical/location comparative advantage	Status not clear
Activity 2: Disseminate findings of needs assessment	Status not clear
Activity 3: Design and implement tailor made skills training programmes	Status not clear
Activity 4: Establish linkages between institutions that are responsible for vulnerable groups, training providers and enterprises for improved absorption of young women and men and retrenched workers in employment.	Status not clear
Output 1.2.1.4: Knowledge base on gender equality strengthened and gender mainstreamed.	
Activity 1: Conduct comprehensive gender leadership training with key stakeholders and out-of-school representatives	Status not clear
Activity 2: Monitor and evaluate implementation plan from a gender equality perspective	Status not clear
CPO value: Outcome 1.3	
LSO XXX: Improved enabling environment for the development of sustainable enterprises.	

Output 1.3.1.1 Legal and regulatory frameworks and institutional reforms developed and adopted.	
Activity 1: Facilitate dialogue between relevant stakeholders in the key sectors	Status not clear
Activity 2: Prepare position papers for lobbying government	Status not clear
Activity 3: Draw drafting instructions for legislative reforms	Status not clear
Output 1.3.1.2. Programmes and projects promoting entrepreneurship including informal economy developed and implemented.	
Activity 1: Identify entrepreneurship needs	Not achieved due to financial constraints
Activity 2: Coordinate already existing entrepreneurs programmes	Not achieved due to financial constraints
Activity 3: Develop programme and projects on entrepreneurs	Not achieved due to financial constraints
Activity 4: Implement programmes and projects on entrepreneurs	Not achieved due to financial constraints
Activity 5: Sectors for green jobs generation identified and promoted	Not achieved due to financial constraints
Output 1.3.1.3: Gender sensitive interventions to directly assist MSMEs' to increase productivity developed.	
Activity 1: Resuscitate and technically support Federation of Women Entrepreneurship Lesotho	Status not clear
Activity 2: Re-introduce the Women's Entrepreneurship Development and Gender equality	Status not clear
Activity 3: Train MSMEs on financial management	Status not clear
Output 1.3.1.4: National Strategy promoting transition from informal to formal economy developed and implemented.	
Activity 1: Conduct research on the informal economy.	Diagnostics on informal economy conducted.
Activity 2: Register the economic units in the informal economy	The economic units have been registered.
Activity 3: Raise awareness in the informal economy on the formalization of the informal economy	Awareness raising has been done but not comprehensive.
Output 1.3.1.5: Access to finance expanded and improved for enterprises particularly small businesses and women owned, by 2019.	
Activity 1: Develop partnerships for entrepreneurship and micro-finance	Status not clear
Activity 2: Improve cooperation of financial institutions to expand access to small businesses.	Status not clear

Activity 3: Review collateral schemes	Status not clear
Activity 4: Advocate for credit insurance for agriculture sector	Status not clear
Activity 5: Establish competitive grants for youth in training institutions.	Status not clear
Output 1.3.1.6: Business development service providers capacitated in key sectors.	
Activity 1: Identify type of training to be delivered to business development services providers	Status not clear
Activity 2: Conduct training of trainers	Status not clear
Activity 3: Conduct follow-up and provide technical and financial support to the BDS	Status not clear
Activity 4: Monitor and evaluate trainings conducted	Status not clear
PRIORITY II: ACCESS TO SOCIAL SECURITY	
CPO Value: Outcome 2.1	
LSO XXX: Improved management, coverage and portability of social security benefits for all women and men including migrant workers.	
Output 2.1.1.1: National policy and legal frameworks supporting the social protection coverage for all sectors, including migrant workers and those in precarious employment developed and implemented.	
Activity 1: Social dialogue with key stakeholders to develop Social Security Strategy	Not achieved
Activity 2: Advocate for promulgation of social security bill	Social Security Policy was adopted in 2021. Tripartite Task Team is working on the social security draft bill which is in the final drafting stage with the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel. Tripartite consultations with key stakeholders have been held on the social security draft bill. Cabinet has been sensitized on the social security bill.
Output 2.1.1.2: Contributory Comprehensive social security scheme including portability of social security benefits established.	
Activity 1: Develop Social security strategy	Not achieved
Activity 2: Advocate for promulgation of social security bill	Draft sensitization plan is currently with ILO for finalization and roll-out.
CPO Value: Outcome 2.3	
LSOXXX: Strengthened labour migration management and governance.	
OUTPUT 2.3.1.1: Legislative, institutional and operational structures for labour migration developed and implemented.	
Activity 1: Develop specific labour migration legislation	

	<p>There is currently no specific labour Guidelines specific to the recruitment of migrant workers have been developed. The check list has been developed which helps inspectors to identify indicators of trafficking. These are the main steps being followed towards the development of the legislation. Labour migration policy was developed in 2021.</p>
Activity 2: Establish an advisory committee on labour migration to strengthen governance and inter-ministerial coordination to ensure regular programming of labour migration issues	<p>The draft of terms of reference has been developed. Launch of the committee is expected to occur in November 2023.</p>
Activity 3: Conduct studies and develop advocacy plans for the ratification of C.97 and C.143	<p>A gap analysis is being conducted on the laws and policies in the extent to which they cover the provisions of labour migration conventions : C97 and 143.</p>
Activity 4: Develop capacity building programmes to raise general knowledge and understanding of labour migration issues in collaboration with academia and all relevant stakeholders	<p>The activity has not been conducted due to lack of funding, but the proposals has been made to SAMM project.</p>
<p>OUTPUT 2.3.1.2 : A transparent and effective work-permit system designed.</p>	
Activity 1: Commission a study of the overhaul of the work permit system	<p>Not achieved</p>
Activity 2: Coordinate digitalization and modernization of the work permit system.	<p>Not achieved</p>
Activity 3: Re-design the work permit process.	<p>Work permits requirements have been drafted.</p>
<p>OUTPUT 2.3.1.3: Comprehensive return and reintegration plan into the labour market for migrant workers developed.</p>	
Activity 1: Conduct periodic assessment of return process and job opportunities for returning migrants workers	<p>IOM conducted a labour market assessment after COVID-19 to mitigate livelihoods to 200 beneficiaries who lost jobs. The activity was done.</p>
Activity 2: Develop a strategy framework for civil society organizations to support reintegration and empowerment of migrant workers	<p>MOPSLE works on different aspects with the CSOs. However, the strategy has not been developed.</p>

<p>Activity 3: Engage transnational communities-Diaspora to mobilize expertise and resources.</p>	<p>Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) is leading the processes with active collaboration with other ministries including MOPSLE. There is an association of Basotho Diaspora and Diaspora Policy of 2022. The mapping exercise was done to show various countries that Basotho live. There are regular interventions with LNDC aimed at meeting Diaspora for investment. The Constitution has been amended to allow dual citizenship to allow nations in diaspora to still have their Lesotho citizenship. There is a planned home coming event in December 2023 for Basotho living abroad.</p>
<p>Activity 4: Exhaust outstanding benefit, pensions and compensation claims to assist ex-mineworkers and other workers in need of such assistance.</p>	<p>Road shows were conducted in collaboration with the SA institutions in which Basotho are beneficiaries. The office of pension funds is to be introduced</p>
<p>OUTPUT 2.3.1. 4: National model Bilateral Labour agreements (BLA) developed and implemented.</p>	
<p>Activity 1: Develop bilateral labour agreements guidelines and a model agreement for future negotiations.</p>	<p>The guidelines have been developed in 2019.</p>
<p>Activity 2: Develop and disseminate guidelines on the inclusion of labour provisions in national trade investment agreements.</p>	<p>The activity has not been achieved but the guidelines on recruitment gives the obligations of the Employer and Workers and that will address this activity. As such, there is a need to sensitize different stakeholders.</p>
<p>Activity 3: Negotiate bilateral labour agreements with at least 3 countries.</p>	<p>MOPSLE is currently negotiating with Seychelles and Mauritius and a draft agreements have been done. Draft bilateral labour agreement with Qatar has been completed.</p>
<p>CPO Value: Outcome 2.2 LSO XXX: Improved occupational safety and health and secure workig environment for workers in all economic sectors including migrant workers and those in precarious employment.</p>	
<p>Output 2.2.1.1: OSH policy and legal frameworks developed and implemented.</p>	
<p>Activity 1: Review Labour Code (Construction Safety) Regulations 2002 to include self-employed workers.</p>	<p>A Consultant has been engaged under the SATBHSS Project and was currently developing these regulations.</p>
<p>Activity 2: Establish coherent coordination of NACOSH and other relevant structures.</p>	<p>Clear structures have been established under the OSH Bill 2022.</p>
<p>Activity 3: Workers and employers including labour migrants and those in informal economy capacitated on OSH legislation and standards.</p>	<p>A Consultant has been engaged under the SATBHSS Project and was currently developing the regulations.</p>

OUTPUT 2.2.1.2: The impact of HIV/AIDS at the workplace mitigated	
Activity 1: Develop and implement business and Labour Coalition Action plan on HIV/AIDS; tuberculosis as well as other chronic illnesses	Collaboration has been established between the MOPSLE and the NAC to have a representative from the ministry in the committee.
Activity 2: Coordinate and resuscitate mechanisms for effective implementation of HIV work place programmes including the informal sector	A workshop was conducted in September 2023 where the NAC was invited to present on the latest HIV trends and the NHASP 2023-28 with the assistance of the ILO to strengthen the capacity of MOPSLE Labour Inspectors on matters related to Workplace Wellness, Gender, HIV and TB.
Activity 3: Review a National work place policy and or /frameworks on HIV/AIDS in line with ILO Recommendation 200.	A committee has been established and tasked to develop the policy.
OUTPUT 2.2.1.3. Occupational safety and health services improved.	
Activity 1: Expand Occupational Health Services to all regions.	Two Occupational Health Service Centers have been established by the Ministry of Health and collaborative mechanisms have been put in place.
Activity 2: Establish National OSH laboratory services	Not achieved
Activity 3: Adopt measures for waste disposal management	Status not clear
OUTPUT 2.2.1.4. Harmonized tool for occupational accidents and diseases reporting and notification is developed and adopted.	
Activity 1: Establish an advisory committee with all key stakeholders to guide the development of the harmonized national tool	Not achieved
Activity 2: Develop and finalise the tool	Not achieved
Activity 3: Implement to the role out of the national tool	Not achieved
OUTPUT 2.2.1.5. Knowledge base on OSH and the concept of gender equality strengthened.	
Activity 1: Capacity building to all stakeholders on OSH and gender equality	Not achieved
Activity 2: Conduct comprehensive gender leadership training with key stakeholders and out-of-school representatives	Not achieved
Activity 3: Monitor and evaluate implementation plan from a gender equality perspective	Not achieved
OUTPUT 2.2.1.3. NACOSH coordination and social dialogue facilitated.	
Activity 1: Hold a national dialogue with the NACOSH and other key stakeholders	Not achieved

Activity 2: Develop and implement a costed role out plan to support the implementation of OSH issues across all sectors and regions	Not achieved
PRIORITY III: GOOD GOVERNANCE OF THE LABOUR MARKET	
CPO Value: Outcome 3.1 LSO XXX: Strengthened, fully-fledged social dialogue institutions promoting decent work for women and men in all sectors including the informal economy.	
Output 3.1.1.1: Tripartite plus social dialogue institutions with full time secretariat established.	
Activity 1: Consultations with NACOLA	Consultations have taken place and NACOLA is on board.
Activity 2: Enactment of legislation providing for establishment of tripartite plus social dialogue institutions	NACOLA through the task team has completed its task of reviewing the law, legal department to take all necessary steps towards enactment of the law.
Activity 3: Establishment of a full-time secretariat within the MoLE	Not achieved
Output 3.1.1.2: Collective Bargaining Councils promoted and established.	
Activity 1: Sensitize stakeholders on bargaining councils establishment	Sensitization is continuing.
Activity 2: Establish sectoral Bargaining Councils	Not achieved; awaiting the new labour legislation.
Output 3.1.1.3: Capacity building initiatives for representatives of social dialogue organizations provided, including in gender mainstreaming of collective bargaining agreements provided.	
Activity 1: Conduct gender-sensitive social dialogue capacity building.	Status not clear.
Activity 2: Strengthen the capacity of workers' and employers' organizations to extend services to existing and potential members in the informal economy.	No capacity building initiatives were held due to lack of funds.
Activity 3: Resuscitate Institute Labour studies	Status not clear.
Activity 4: Development of training manuals on social dialogue and implementation of international labour standards (especially Conventions 87, 98, 144 and 151)	Not done
Activity 5: Develop and implement Sector specific awareness programmes on the revised legislation and international labour standards.	Not done; awaiting the new labour legislation.
CPO Value: Outcome 3.2 LSO XXX: Effective application of international Labour standards and fundamental principles including rights at work for all, particularly young women and men	
Output 3.2.1.1. Enforcement mechanisms through improved Labour Inspections strengthened.	
Activity 1: Finalize MoLE structure and professionalize inspectorate	Not much progress has been made.
Activity 2: Appoint of Labour inspections officers	Only vacant positions are being filled. In the past two financial years temporary Inspectors were engaged

	on government apprenticeship programme. Justification of engagement of at least 20 Inspectors in the 2024/5 financial year is pending.
Activity 3: Extend labour inspections in the informal and public sector	A refresher workshop on Extending Labour Inspection into the informal economy was held in May 2023; a plan was drawn to focus on transport, construction and agricultural sectors as well as domestic work. Regarding the public sector, the Labour Law review is at advanced stage (it provides for conducting inspection in the public sector).
Activity 4: Establish a coordinating mechanism on inspectorate activities	Status not clear
Output 3.2.1.2: Mechanisms for preventative resolution for labour disputes strengthened.	
Activity 1: Implement an integrated electronic case management system	Status not clear
Activity 2: Provide technical support for expansion of services provided by DDR and Labour court and Labour Appeal Court	Status not clear
Activity 3: Produce and publish annual information bulletin on workers' rights	Status not clear
Activity 4: Conduct trainings for workers and employers on Labour Laws.	Status not clear
Activity 5: Provide technical support for the expansion of Labour Court and Labour Appeal court services to all litigations in all the country's region- central, Northern and Southern.	Status not clear
Activity 6: Provide trainings for statutory bodies to effectively carry out their mandate.	Status not clear
Output 3.2.1.3: Compliance on ratified ILS and ILO core gender conventions and domestication of unratified ILS improved.	
Activity 1: Ensure timely submission of reports to the ILO supervisory bodies	Status not clear
Activity 2: Develop strategies to implement unratified relevant ILS to Lesotho context.	Status not clear
Activity 3: Enhance the capacity of Government and social partners to implement and comply and to report in accordance with the requirements of ratified conventions	Status not clear
Output 3.2.1.4: Integrated National Action Plan on elimination of Child labour developed and implemented.	
Activity 1: Adopt and implement the Integrated National Action plan.	2023-2028 Integrated National action plan has been developed and validated by members of the Programme Advisory Committee on Child Labour (PACC).

Activity 2: Establish reporting and coordinating mechanisms for child labour	The Child Labour Unit still operate under the Labour Inspectorate.
Activity 3: Conduct, validate and disseminate the rapid assessment on the worst forms of child labour	Data collection for the rapid assessment on the worst forms on the child labour was completed in November 2021. However, salient issues on the worst forms of child labour that the assessment was meant to discover and to elaborate on were not reflected in the preliminary report of the assessment. The results of the assessment have not been validated and disseminated to the key stakeholders.
CPO Value: Outcome 3.3 LSOXXX: Strengthened, comprehensive and fully functional labour market information system.	
OUTPUT 3.3.1.1: Tripartite LMI observatory established.	
Activity 1: Identify LMIS key stakeholders	The LMIS key stakeholders have been identified
Activity 2: Consultations with key stakeholders	Consultation were to be mapped through a stakeholder workshop which did not take place due financial constraints.
Activity 3: Draft terms of reference for tripartite LMIS committee	Terms of reference have been drafted but not yet shared with stakeholders for comments.
Activity 4: Conduct a consensus meeting for the committee and other key stakeholders for validation	The meeting was not conducted due to lack of funds.
Activity 5: Gazette the governance committee on LMIS	The activity depends on activity 1.4, which was not successful.
Output 3.3.1.2: Capacity building initiatives in collecting, collating, analysis and disseminating labour market information and statistics provided.	
Activity 1: Advocate for training and availing of statistical software	Statistical software not available within the leading ministry/MOPSLE.
Activity 2: Develop and implement a costed training plan for continuous training of personnel performing statistical and M&E functions	The plan was not developed because of financial/budget constraints in MOPSLE.
Activity 3: Advocate for technical support strength LMI producers generate relevant data required in the labour market and exploit administrative data.	MOPSLE has requested ILO's support on the administrative data. The Ministry is in the process of establishing LMIS system , which will address this need.
Activity 4: Ensure continuous engagement into national, regional and international statistical platform to ensure data collected at national level can be comparable	Not achieved due to financial constraints.
Output 3.3.1.3: Collaboration and co-ordination between social partners and relevant stakeholders-users and producers enhanced.	
Activity 1:Harmonize the concepts and methods of data collection , processing and dissemination	The concepts have been harmonized with National statistical office but not

	with other key LMI stakeholders (Education, Trade, social development, etc).
Activity 2: Agree on formats and timelines on LMI and statistics and information sharing	The activity has not been achieved.
Activity 3: Strengthen the statistical literacy of users to effectively utilize statistical information	The activity has not been achieved due to limited funds.
Activity 4: Advocate for enforcement of legislation that supports collection, processing and dissemination of LMI promoted.	The activity has been incorporated in the revised labour law, which awaits approval.
OUTPUT 3.3.1.4: Labour Market information surveys and research conducted timeously and regularly.	
Activity 1 : Lobby for funds for conduction of Labour force Survey 2019 and at least once every 5 years	A labour force survey (LFS) was conducted in 2019.
Activity 2: Solicit for technical support for conduction of Continuous Multipurpose survey to produce relevant decent work indicators	The project document was drafted by the National statistical office and shared with EU but the activity did not obtained required funding.
Activity 3: Ensure integration of 20th ICL resolutions into LMI surveys	The resolutions have been integrated into the 2024 Labour Force Survey.
Output 3.3.1.5: Comprehensive and operational web based LMIS developed.	
Activity 1: Hold stakeholders consultative workshop	Not achieved. However, the system has been developed with one module of skills registration and job seeker registration. This will work as a platform for jobseekers and employers to meet.
Activity 2 Advertise request for proposal and tender document.	The activity was funded under the project of AfDB to the Government of Lesotho.
Activity 3: Procure hardware and software	No procurement has been done due to lack of funds.
Activity 4: Installation, networking, interfacing with other systems	The system has been interfaced.
Activity 5: Design agreed user friendly access formats to information	Formats have been designed for only one module of skill and jobseeker registration.
Activity 6: Train system staff and end users of the system	The National Employment staff have been trained; the module is administered within the same department.

ANNEX 3B: DWCP RESULTS MONITORING TRACKER

	Means of verification	Responsible staff/entity	Baseline and date	Assessment / Achievements
CP PRIORITY 1: EMPLOYMENT CREATION PARTICULARLY FOR YOUNG WOMEN AND MEN				
CP outcome 1.1: More and better access to employment opportunities, particularly for young women and men in the rural and informal economies				
CP Outcome Indicator 1.1.1: Implementation of National Labour policy and reviewed labour and investment laws to strengthen investment in the labour market and promote employment, with a particular focus on youth, women and persons with disabilities in the rural and informal economies.	Administrative records and interviews with key stakeholders	Ministry of Labour and Employment, Lesotho Bureau of Statistics and ILO	The supreme labour law Labour Code order 1992 and the Public Service Act do not promote employment efficiently. On the other hand, the investment Acts are not in line with Labour Laws.	The National Law Policy has been adopted by the Parliament but has not been implemented and the investment laws have not been revised.
CP Outcome Indicator 1.1.2: Number of jobs created through the implementation of the National Employment Intensive Programme [disaggregated by sex, age, sector and location(rural and urban).	Half year and annual reports prepared by the Ministry of Labour and ILO, CMS, Administrative records and 2019 Integrated Labour Force Survey.	Ministry of Labour and Employment, Lesotho Bureau of Statistics and ILO	Lesotho does not have a comprehensive and integrated legal framework to extend social protection to all women, men, migrant workers and workers in precarious employment.	The 2019 LFS reveals that a total of 175 185 of which 90 732 and 84 454 were males and females respectively. These were employed as elementary occupations.
CP outcome 1.2: Strengthened employable skills for young women and men responsive to labour market dynamics				
CP outcome Indicator 1.2.1: Number and percentage of unemployed and underemployed young women and men in the labour	Continuous Multi-Purpose Survey and 2019 Integrated Labour Force Survey.	Ministry of Labour and Employment, Lesotho Bureau of Statistics and ILO	By June 2019, gender responsive formative research will be conducted through desk review research and interviews with key stakeholders to establish the levels of unemployment and	A total of unemployed youth according LFS 2019 is 39 189 where males constituted of 19 958 with 19 231 females. 13 907 had primary 12548 secondary; 10 138 high school; 1 873 had vocational or diploma

force[disaggregated by sex, age level of education, sector and location(including rural and urban)]			underemployment of men and women within the labour force.	while 564 were graduates and 118 never attended school. 14 450 youth were under employed with 7 446 males and 7 048 females. 4 534 had primary; 3 243 secondary; 3 706 high school; 71 did not complete, 1 967 had vocational/Diploma while 532 were graduates and 394 never attended.
DWCP Outcome 1.3: Improved enabling environment for the development of sustainable enterprises.				
CP outcome indicator 1.3.1: Number of legal and institutional reforms adopted and implemented to promote an enabling business environment.		Ministry of Labour and Employment, Ministry of Trade, Ministry of Small Business, Lesotho Bureau of Statistics , Lesotho National Development Corporation, ILO and other Relevant stakeholders	Baseline data is not readily available. This data including the identification of which legislation and policies require reforms, will be collected through a study on the Enabling Environment for Sustainable Enterprises for Lesotho by June 2019.	Data not available.
CP Outcome indicator 1.3.2: Number and percentage of enterprises transitioning from informal to the formal economy (disaggregated by owner's sex, age, sector, location (including rural and urban)	Continuous Multi-Purpose Survey, Integrated Labour Force Survey	Ministry of Labour and Employment, Ministry of Small Business, Lesotho Bureau of Statistics, ILO and other relevant stakeholders	Baseline data is not readily available. By April 2019, formative research will be conducted through desk review research and interviews with key stakeholders to establish the baseline of present number of informal enterprises by industry, location (rural and urban).	Data not available.

<p>CP Outcome Indicator 1.3.3: Number and percentage of enterprises with access to finance (disaggregated by owner's sex, age, sector, location (including rural and urban))</p>	<p>Continuous Multi-Purpose Survey and 2019 Integrated Labour Force Survey, Financial institution administrative records</p>	<p>Ministry of Labour and Employment, Financial Institutions, BEDCO, Lesotho Bureau of Statistics ILO and other relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>Baseline data is not readily available. By April 2019, gender-responsive formative research will be conducted through desk review research and interviews with key stakeholders to establish the percentage of sustainable enterprises that have access to financial development services.</p>	<p>Data not available.</p>
<p>CP PRIORITY 2: ACCESS TO SOCIAL PROTECTION AND DECENT WORK</p>				
<p>DWCP Outcome 2.1: Improved management, coverage of social protection benefits in all economic sectors for all, including migrant workers and those workers in precarious employment.</p>				
<p>CP Outcome indicator 2.1.1: Existence and implementation of legal frameworks on social protection covering all economic sectors for all, including migrant workers and workers in precarious employment</p>	<p>Government Gazette; Parliamentary Records; Annual Report of the Ministry of Labour and Employment, and other administrative records</p>	<p>Ministry of Labour and Employment, Ministry of Social Development, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Development planning, Lesotho Bureau of Statistics, ILO and other relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>Lesotho does not have a comprehensive and integrated legal framework to extend social protection to all women, men, migrant workers and workers in precarious employment.</p>	<p>Data not available.</p>

<p>CP Outcome indicator 2.1.2: Number and percentage of population covered by social protection programme (disaggregated by age, sex, sector,, migrants and location including rural/urban)</p>	<p>Continuous Multi-Purpose Survey and 2019 Integrated Labour Force Survey</p>	<p>Ministry of Labour and Employment, Ministry of Social Development, Ministry of Finance, Lesotho Bureau of Statistics, ILO and other relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>9% of their population is covered by one social protection scheme or programme .</p>	<p>Data on population covered by social security currently not available. However LFS depicts that Social cash transfer program 30,351;Public Welfare assistance scheme 11,620;Farming Inputs 8,503;Food Security Pack (FSP) 16,941;School feeding program 112,033;Women Empowerment program 5,124;Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC) bursary 6,386;Child Grand program 7,319;Tertiary Bursary scheme 12,549. The available data not disaggregated by sex.</p>
<p>CP outcome 2.2: Strengthened labour migration management and governance.</p>				
<p>Outcome indicator 2.2.1 Number of priority activities outlined in the National Plan Action for Labour Migration implemented and completed.</p>	<p>Administrative records and interviews with key stakeholders</p>	<p>Ministry of Labour and Employment, Home Affairs, Foreign affairs, IOM, TEBA and ILO</p>	<p>There is no labour migration policy or strategy for labour migration regulation and management.</p>	<p>Data not available.</p>
<p>CP Outcome 2.3: Improved occupational safety and health and secure working environment for all workers in all economic sectors including migrant workers and those in precarious employment.</p>				
<p>CP Outcome indicator 2.3.1: Number of Legal framework and OSH programme formulated, adopted and implemented.</p>	<p>Half year and annual reports prepared by the Ministry of Labour and ILO</p>	<p>Ministry of Labour and Employment and ILO</p>	<p>National OSH profile has been developed and validated by the key National stakeholders</p>	<p>No frameworks have been formulated since 2018.</p>

<p>CP Outcome indicator 2.3.2: Number of fatal and non-fatal occupational injuries and illnesses [disaggregated by sex, age, industry, occupation, migrant status and location ,including rural and urban]</p>	<p>Continuous Multi-Purpose Survey</p>	<p>Ministry of Labour and Employment, Lesotho Bureau of Statistics and ILO</p>	<p>Baseline data is not readily available. By June 2019,gender-responsive formative research will be conducted in to the present situation of OSH within Lesotho related to this indicator and investigation will focus on the levels of compliance within each sector, industry and geographic location.</p>	<p>Data available is on Non-fatal occupational injuries according to 2019 LFS. 8 246 persons suffered occupational injuries of which 5 528 were males while 2 718 were females.</p>
<p>CP PRIORITY 3: GOOD GOVERNANCE OF THE LABOUR MARKET</p>				
<p>DWCP Outcome 3.1: Strengthened, fully-fledged social dialogue institutions promoting decent work for women and men in all sectors including the informal economy</p>				
<p>CP Outcome indicator 3.1.1: Number of national and sectoral policies, programmes, and strategies promoting decent work developed in consultation with social dialogue institutions.</p>	<p>Government Gazette; Parliamentary Records; Annual Report of the Ministry of Labour and Employment</p>	<p>Ministry of Labour and Employment, Workers and Employers administrative records</p>	<p>Social dialogue institutions have limited participation in the broader national socio-economic policy and legislation development issues</p>	<p>No policies developed.</p>
<p>CP Outcome indicator 3.1.3: Number and percentage of workers covered by collective bargaining agreements (Disaggregated by sex, occupation, industry and location(including rural and urban)</p>	<p>Continuous Multi-Purpose Survey and administrative records.</p>	<p>Ministry of Labour and Employment, workers administrative records, Lesotho Bureau of Statistics and ILO</p>	<p>The level at which workers are directly or indirectly involved in collective bargaining platforms has not been established at present and gender-responsive formative research will be conducted to investigate this further by May 2019.</p>	<p>Data not available.</p>
<p>DWCP Outcome 3.2: Improved application of international labour standards on fundamental principles including rights at work for all, particularly young women and men</p>				

CP Outcome indicator 3.2.1: Number of labour inspections conducted [Disaggregated by industry and location (including rural and urban)]	Half year and annual reports prepared by the Ministry of Labour and ILO	Ministry of Labour and Employment and ILO	Currently the labour inspectors are only able to conduct XXX labour inspections per year.	Data not available
CP Outcome indicator 3.2.2: Number of labour disputes prevented and resolved using Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms, with a particular focus on young women and men.			Baseline data is not readily available. By April 2019, gender-responsive formative research will be conducted through desk review research and interviews with key stakeholders to establish the proportion of labour disputes that are resolved using the ADR mechanism.	Achievements not clear.
CP Outcome indicator 3.2.3: Measures taken on the elimination of child labour, forced labour and human trafficking as requested by ILO supervisory bodies, AU and UN.	Multi-Indicator Cluster Survey and Administrative records and Rapid Assessments.	Ministry of Labour and Employment, Lesotho Bureau of Statistics and ILO	A desk review on the status of pending requests by the ILO supervisory bodies on elimination of child labour, forced labour and human trafficking is established by April 2019.	Achievements not clear.
CP outcome 3.3: Strengthened, comprehensive and fully functional labour market information system.				
CP Outcome Indicator 3.3.1: Number of timely, relevant and reliable LMI and statistical reports produced.	Continuous Multi-Purpose Survey and interviews with key LMI data users.	Ministry of Labour and Employment, Ministry of Education, Lesotho Bureau of Statistics , ILO and another relevant stakeholders.	Currently Labour Market information and statistical reports are not produced timeously and regularly.	A labour force survey (LFS) was conducted in 2019.

<p>CP Indicator 3.3.2: Number of policies, plans and programmes informed by LMI and labour statistics.</p>	<p>Administrative records and interviews with key stakeholders.</p>	<p>Ministry of Labour and Employment, Ministry of Development planning, Ministry of Finance, ILO and other relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>The link between LMI and national policies, plans and programmes is currently limited.</p>	<p>No policies developed.</p>
---	---	--	---	-------------------------------

ANNEX 4: EVALUATION SCHEDULE

	TASKS	TIMEFRAME
1	Share the Draft TOR with the MOPSLE, the tripartite task team on the evaluation of the DWCP and other relevant stakeholders for inputs	Jan - March 2023
2	Recruitment of the Consultant/Evaluator	March-April 2023
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review • Initial interviews with ILO Pretoria officials as well as representatives from Government, employers' and workers' organizations in Lesotho. • Development and approval of the Inception Report. 	4 – 15 September 2023
4	Interviews with relevant Government institutions; workers and employers' representatives; the UN system in Lesotho; and other relevant DWCP stakeholders.	18 Sept – 13 October 2023
5	Data analysis	16 – 20 October 2023
6	Development and submission of the draft evaluation report.	23 – 27 October 2023
7	Review of the draft evaluation report.	1 – 10 November 2023
8	Stakeholders' validation workshop.	13 November 2023
9	Finalization of the report integrating the comments.	14 – 24 November 2023
10	Approval and sharing of the final evaluation report.	27 November 2023
11	Dissemination	30 November 2023

ANNEX 5: LIST OF EVALUATION PARTICIPANTS

	NAME	DESIGNATION	ORGANISATION
1	Sipho Ndlovu	DWT/Focal Person	ILO DWT/CO-Pretoria
2	Nomaswazi Dlamini	DWT	ILO DWT/CO-Pretoria
3	Mamotsoane Mofolo	Principal Employment Officer – LMI	GOL/MOPSLE
4	Pacome Dessero	M&E Regional Office	ILO
5	Na Pahimi Baizebbe	M&E Regional Office	ILO
6	Dr. Joni Musabayana	ILO Director – Pretoria	ILO DWT/CO-Pretoria
7	Simphiwe Mabhele	ILO Specialist	ILO DWT/CO-Pretoria
8	Kabelo Maema	Principal Employment Officer – EP	GOL/MOPSLE
9	Limpho Mandoro	ILO Specialist	ILO DWT/CO-Pretoria
10	David Dorkenoo	ILO Specialist	ILO DWT/CO-Pretoria
11	Peneyambeko Munkwana	ILO Specialist	ILO DWT/CO-Pretoria
12	Maria Machailo	ILO Specialist	ILO DWT/CO-Pretoria
13	Mamohale Matsoso	Labour Commissioner	GOL/MOPSLE
14	Makhaobane Ledimo	Permanent Secretary	GOL/MOPSLE
15	Cecilia Seema	Ag. Director, NES	GOL/MOPSLE
16	Lironco Lechoba	Principal OSH Inspector	GOL/MOPSLE
17	Molmahed Philome	OSH Inspector	GOL/MOPSLE
18	Thabang Moeketsi	District Labour Officer	GOL/MOPSLE
19	Limpho Ranabela	Labour Inspector	GOL/MOPSLE
20	Maletsie Letsie	Labour Inspector	GOL/MOPSLE
21	Manaleli Sehlabi	OSH Inspector	GOL/MOPSLE
22	Hlalele Mosoatsi	Labour Inspector	GOL/MOPSLE
23	Mpho Manyeli	Labour Inspector	GOL/MOPSLE
24	Mamokhele Ihele	Labour Inspector	GOL/MOPSLE
25	Seilatsatsi Selebelo	OSH Inspector	GOL/MOPSLE
26	Matsela Matsela	Assistant Economic Planner	GOL/MoGYSACSD
27	Phaello Mosala	M&E Officer	GOL/MoGYSACSD
28	Nkoe Majara	Economic Planner	GOL/MoGYSACSD
29	Itumeleng Mosala	Chief Economic Planner	GOL/MoGYSACSD
30	Itali Maphomane	M&E Officer	GOL/MoGYSACSD
31	Kemong Masupha	Senior Industry Officer	GOL/ Ministry of Trade and Industry
32	Nzuatisi Tunbane Nthatisi Thabane	Refugee Migration Liaison Officer	GOL/MOHA
33	Tsepiso Mosasaine	Immigration Manager	GOL/MOHA
34	Koali Koali	National Organising Secretary	PALT/LLC
35	Paulinah Tohapi	Deputy General Secretary	Lentsoe Lasechaba Workers Union
36	Robert Mokhahlane	General Secretary	CMQ/LLC
37	Lebonejoang Molefi	General Secretary	LEWCAWU/LLC
38	Marorisang Letseka	Senior Organiser	IDUL/LLC
39	Raymond Mothedu	President	LTUC
40	Simon Jonathan	Treasurer	LTUC
41	Khotso Mohale	DRO	LTUC
42	Teboho Tolo	President	LFTU
43	Mosesanyone Masebe	Member	LFTU
44	Tseliso Ramochela	Secretay General	LFTU
45	Malikhabiso Majara	Secretary General	LTEA

46	Lindiwe Sephomolo	CEO & Executive Director	ALEB
47	Hlalele Tsolo	Director – Legal and Industrial Relations	ALEB
48	Puseletso Mokhosi	Assistant Economic Planner	GOL/MoGYSACSD
49	Daniel Potso Sofonia	Development Coordination Officer	UN Resident Coordination Office

ANNEX 6: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

A: DWCP AND GOVERNMENT OF LESOTHO DOCUMENTS

1. Lesotho DWCP 2018 – 2023.
2. Lesotho DWCP 2018 – 2023 Implementation Plan (2019).
3. Lesotho DWCP 2018 – 2023 Results Monitoring Plan (2019).
4. Approved Lesotho National OSH Policy 2020.
5. Lesotho Decent Work Country Programme 2012 – 2017.
6. 2017 Report on the Independent Evaluation of the Lesotho 2012 – 2017.
7. Lesotho National Strategic Development Plan II 2018-9 - 2022-3.
8. April 2021 Report on the Mid-term Review of the National Strategic Development Plan II 2018/19 – 2022/23.
9. May 2023 Report on the Extension of the National Strategic Development Plan II 2018-9 – 2022-3
10. Strategic Plan 2019 – 2023 for the Ministry of Gender, Youth, Sports, Arts, Culture and Social Development
11. The National Youth Policy 2017-2030.
12. Lesotho Gender and Development Policy 2018 – 2028.
13. Lesotho National Social Protection Strategy II 2021 – 2031.
14. M&E Framework for the Lesotho National Social Protection Strategy II 2021 – 2031.
15. Action Plan for the Lesotho National Social Protection Strategy II 2021 – 2031.
16. National Occupational Safety and Health Profile conducted under the Southern Africa Tuberculosis Health System Support Project in Lesotho, May 2018.
17. National Volunteer Corps Programme Brief (February 2023).

B: ILO AND UNITED NATIONS DOCUMENTS

1. ILO Biennial Programme and Budget for 2018 – 2019
2. ILO Biennial Programme and Budget for 2020–21
3. ILO Biennial Programme and Budget Proposals for 2022 – 2023
4. ILO Decent Work Results for 2018-2019 (Online data base <https://www.ilo.org/IRDashboard/index.jsp#country>)
5. ILO Decent Work Results for 2020 – 2021(Online data base <https://www.ilo.org/IRDashboard/index.jsp#country>)
6. ILO Decent Work Results for 2022 – 2023 (Online data base <https://www.ilo.org/IRDashboard/index.jsp#country>)
7. ILO - Decent Work and the 2023 Agenda SDGs
8. ILO Decent Work Agenda
9. SDG 8 Decent Work and Economic Growth
10. SDGs - Decent Work and Evaluation – ILO
11. The implications of the SDGs on ILO’s Results framework – ILO
12. The implications of the SDGs on ILO’s results framework
13. Measurement of decent work discussion paper 2008 – ILO
14. Measurement of decent work report 2008
15. Mainstreaming decent work https://www.ilo.org/integration/themes/dw_mainstreaming/lang-en/index.htm
16. Decent work measurement Indicators - ILO 2008
17. ILO Africa Success stories 2019 and 2021
18. Summary Report on the Status of Decent Work Country Programme Development by Region (as at 15 May 2023)
19. ILO Decent Work Results 2018-2019, 2020 – 2021 and 2022 – 2023 <https://www.ilo.org/IRDashboard/index.jsp#country>
20. Status of ILO Work LSO 25082023
21. Lesotho IR 2019
22. 2023 ILC Briefing Note Lesotho 12052023

23. Monitoring and Assessing Decent Work in Developing Countries (MAP) (Final Evaluation Summary) - ILO 2014
24. 2008 Report on the Independent Evaluation of the ILO's Decent Work Country Programme for Zambia: 2001 - 2007
25. 2010 Report on the Independent Evaluation of the ILO's Decent Work Country Programme for Kyrgyzstan: 2006-2009
26. 2012 Report on the Independent Evaluation of the ILO's Decent Work Country Programme for India: 2007–2012.
27. 2019 Report on the Independent Evaluation Report of ILO's Programme of Work in Four Selected Member Countries of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) (Lesotho, Madagascar, South Africa and the United Republic of Tanzania), 2014-2018.
28. 2021 Report on the High-level independent evaluation of the ILO's Decent Work Programme in Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Pakistan, 2018–21
29. 2022 Report on the High-level independent evaluation of the ILO's Decent Work Country Programme in Central Asia, 2018-22.
30. 2015 Summary Report on the Midterm Evaluation of “More and Better Jobs for Women: Women's Empowerment through Decent Work in Turkey”.
31. ILO evaluation guidelines and standard templates
 - Country Programme Review Guidance note https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746714.pdf
 - ILO Policy Guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 4ed.
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
 - Guidance note 7 Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm
 - Guidance note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E of projects
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm
32. Lesotho United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2019-2023
33. United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation and the Decent Work Agenda: A Trade Union Reference Manual, 2020.
34. UNSDG's Global Accountability Framework on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.
35. “Social protection and decent rural employment”, FAO's Decent rural employment Information Note #3, 2023.
36. Summary document on the Chronology of UN Milestones for Human Rights and Development

C: SADC DOCUMENTS

1. SADC/ELS/M&SP/2022/5 Code of Conduct On Child Labour (Revised): Accelerating Action to Eradicate Child Labour in SADC, March 2022.
2. SADC/CM/2/2023/5.1D Draft Protocol on Employment and Labour, July 2023.
3. SADC/ELS/M&SP/2020/7 SADC Labour Migration Action Plan (2020-2025), 2020.
4. SADC Decent Work Programme.
5. Action Plan for the SADC Employment and Labour Policy Framework 2021-2025.
6. SADC/ELS/M&SP/2022/4 Accelerating Eradication of Child Labour in the SADC Region: Background Paper On Revised SADC Code of Conduct On Child Labour, December 2021.
7. SADC policy documents, including SADC Industrialisation Strategy and Roadmap 2015 – 2063.

D: OTHER DOCUMENTS

1. Atlas of Sustainable Development Goals: From World Development Indicators 2018, World Bank.
2. Global Accountability Framework on Gender equality and women empowerment - GEWE_2019_0
3. Bipartite, Tripartite, Tripartite-Plus Social Dialogue Mechanisms and Best Practices in the EU Member States, paper by Prof. Dr. E. Murat Engin (2018).

ANNEX 7: LESOTHO DWCP 2018 – 2023 EVALUATION INCEPTION REPORT

1. THE LESOTHO DECENT WORK COUNTRY PROGRAMME 2018 – 2023

Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) is an International Labour Organisation (ILO) vehicle to deliver its mandate in Member States. ILO introduced DWCPs in 2004 to promote the decent work agenda in the member countries. DWCPs defines how in each country, the ILO constituents (government, and employers and workers' organizations) and other key partners work together towards the attainment of promoting full employment and ensuring access for every man and woman to decent and productive work in conditions of freedom, equity, security and human dignity.

DWCPs pursue and implement the decent work agenda in ILO Member countries through the cooperation of various key actors, notably the Government, employers, workers, ILO, development partners and other stakeholders. These actors own and are centrally involved in the process of development of the DWCP. Memorandum of Understanding (MoUs) are signed between ILO and Government on behalf of the government, employers and workers for the implementation of the DWCP. ILO provides technical support to countries within the DWCP framework.

DWCPs are generally designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated based on results-based management principles, with the log frame being a central planning and monitoring tool. Following the results-based management (RBM) approach, the DWCP is based on a causal analysis of problems of decent work leading to the identification of priority areas of intervention, the delineation of short and medium-term strategic outcomes and an operational implementation plan.

In practice, DWCP is the strategic results framework set up around Governments and the social partners (employers and workers) commit themselves to work in partnership with ILO and other key partners to achieve the goals of decent work in each country. The DWCP formulation is based on an integrated and participatory programmatic approach.

In each country, the goal of DWCP is articulated around the following four strategic objectives:

- The application of international standards and respect for fundamental rights at work;
- The creation of employment and income opportunities for men and women;
- Improving coverage and extending social protection to all; and
- Strengthening tripartism and social dialogue.

In line with the provisions of the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, the programmatic approach towards implementing the DWCP take due account of the inseparable, interrelated and mutually supportive nature of the four strategic pillars of decent work that necessitates collaborative work across all technical sectors of the ILO reflecting the integrated approach required by the Social Justice Declaration.

The priorities of the Lesotho Decent Work Country Programme 2018 – 2023 that were determined by Tripartite and other stakeholders were as follows:

- (a) To create employment particularly for young women and men;
- (b) To broaden social protection coverage; and
- (c) To promote good governance of the labour market.

These priorities align to the national, sub-regional, continental and global frameworks, namely the National Strategic Development Plan, SADC DWP 2013-2019, the AU Agenda 2063, AU Declaration on Employment, Poverty Eradication and Inclusive Development in Africa, and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Lesotho UNDAF 2019/2023.

The results framework for the Lesotho DWCP 2018 – 2023 has a total of nine country programme outcomes and 35 outputs. These are monitored through 18 outcome indicators and xx output indicators.

The Lesotho DWCP 2018 – 2023 is the third phase of DWCPs in the country. The first one covered the period 2006 – 2009. The second DWCP covered the period 2012 – 2017, which was extended to December 2018 to allow for alignment of the DWCP with the second National Strategic Development Plan (NSP II) covering the same period.

The ILO's recent experience with the evaluation of DWCPs has shown that to enhance DWCP learning, it is important that evaluations are conducted by independent evaluation experts. As such, ILO has commissioned an independent evaluation of the Lesotho DWCP 2018 – 2023.

2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE COUNTRY PROGRAMME REVIEW

The purpose of the evaluation is to examine the achievements made so far in attaining the outcomes identified and take stock of recommendations, lessons learned, good practices and challenges to inform the current programme, understating also reasons for pitfalls and how to address them.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:

- i. Examine the coherence and relevance of the 2018-2023 DWCP in relation to the Lesotho's National Strategic Development Plan, the Abidjan Declaration, the SDGs, the UNDAF 2013-2017 and the UNSDCF 2024-2028, and other international commitments and national frameworks.
- ii. Examine the degree of coherence between outcomes, outputs and implementation strategies of the DWCP with the ILO Programme and Budget 2018-19, 2020-21 and 2022-23.
- iii. Take stock of what has been accomplished in terms of changes compared to the expected results of its implementation and the unexpected, positive and negative results.
- iv. Examine the level of sustainability of results obtained.
- v. Analyse the participation and contributions of different stakeholders, in terms of program implementation, monitoring and coordination (i.e. effective participation and ownership of the DWCP and its articulation with the SDGs);
- vi. Draw lessons and good practices from the development, implementation and monitoring of the DWCP 2018-23.
- vii. Develop the recommendations towards the implementation of the remaining period and potential next DWCP for the tripartite plus constituents, ILO for its work in Lesotho and similar contexts and other relevant stakeholders

The clients of the evaluation are the ILO tripartite plus constituents and other key stakeholders participated and/or benefited for the implementation of the programme and the ILO at country, regional and global levels. The tripartite partners in Lesotho comprise Government of Lesotho (GOL), employers' organisations and workers' organisations.

3. FOCUS AND SCOPE OF THE COUNTRY PROGRAMME REVIEW

The evaluation will cover all components of the programme, namely its three priority areas, outcomes, outputs and activities contributing to these. The interventions of the DWCP have been implemented or supported mainly by ILO, GOL, employers, and workers, as well as other key stakeholders who participated and/or benefited for its implementation.

The CPR will cover the entire life of the DWCP from 2018 to the time of this review (September 2023). The review will focus on answering the key evaluation questions set out in the ToR (Annex 1), which are amplified in this report, evaluation questions matrix (Annex 2) and data collection tools (Annex 6). These questions are organized around the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria as follows: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Under the effectiveness criteria, progress made on all the programme's performance indicators (impact, outcome and output indicators) will be examined.

Lessons learned and good practices in the programme as well as stakeholders' ambitions and aspirations for the next phase of the Lesotho DWCP will also be explored.

The geographical scope of the evaluation will be the entire country. This is because the DWCP is by design a nation-wide programme.

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND REVIEW QUESTIONS

The ILO follows the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria for evaluating development assistance: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. In addition, the validity of design and evaluability criteria has been added.

ILO concerns on Decent Work, includes the International Labor Standards, the promotion of gender equality and non-discrimination, social dialogue, and fair transition to environment that should be explicitly considered when evaluating the DWCP.

The following key questions are intended to guide the information gathering, analysis, conclusions, and recommendations, as well as lessons learned and good practices:

Relevance and coherence of the DWCP

- Is the Programme relevant and coherent to the outcomes in the NSDP, the Abidjan Declaration UNDAF/UNSDCF and the priorities of social partners?
- Are the activities and outputs of the Programme consistent with the overall goal (s) and the attainment of its objectives?
- To what extent did the DWCP relevant to gender equality, disability inclusion and other non-discrimination issues?

Validity of design and evaluability

- Has the DWCP carried out a proper consultation and involvement of tripartite plus constituents during planning, implementation and monitoring?
- Is the DWCP evaluable? Was the DWCP developed in a results-based approach? Does the DWCP expressed in an implicit or explicit Theory of change?
- Were DWCP indicators and targets sufficiently defined in the DWCP?
- Does the DWCP have a monitoring and evaluation system that could have been effective towards understanding how and why the DWCP achieved specific results?
- Have International Labor Standards, the promotion of gender equality and non-discrimination (i.e., people with disabilities, youth, and informal economy men and women), social dialogue, and fair transition to environment issues been addressed in the Programme document, implementation and monitoring and evaluation system?

Programme effectiveness

- To what extent have the expected outputs and outcomes have been achieved?
- Which are the main reasons for the achievement or not of them?
- Have outputs been produced as planned? Which ones not and why?
- In which area (geographic, component, issue) does the DWCP have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors?
- Do the benefits accrue equally and strategically to men and women, people with disabilities, youth, and informal economy men and women?

Efficiency of resource use

- Were resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) allocated by the ILO and constituents used strategically, considering existing opportunities, to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader Programme outcomes?
- Have the results been achieved in a timely manner?
- How effective were the backstopping support provided so far by the ILO including Geneva HQ Units?
- To what extent did the DWCP implementation budget factor in cost of specific activities, outputs or outcomes to gender equality, disability and other non-discrimination issues?

Effectiveness of management arrangements

- Was the management and governance arrangement of the DWCP adequate to the implementation and monitoring needs? Has been a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?
- Has been a monitoring and evaluation system in place and used for management, reporting and learning? Has it included and analyzed data disaggregated by sex (and by other relevant characteristics if relevant)?
- Has the DWCP being receiving adequate political, technical, and administrative support from its national partners/implementing partners and ILO?
- Did the tripartite plus constituents effectively use existing linkages to promote the DWCP and contribute towards resource mobilization efforts?
- To what extent did the constituents have the capacity to integrate the DWCP activities into the different SDGs in the country at the level of implementation, monitoring and evaluation?
- What are the needs and gaps to be addressed to strengthen this capacity for each of them?

Impact orientation

- What concrete changes has the DWCP results brought to ILO tripartite plus constituents and ultimate beneficiaries of it?
- To what extent has the DWCP contributed to strengthen the capacities of tripartite plus constituents and relevant institutions and the national environment at dimensions such as policies, laws, skills, and attitudes towards decent work?

Sustainability

- To what extent are the results of the DWCP sustainable?
- What are the main factors that affect the viability or non-sustainability of the DWCP results?
- Have strategies being considered to ensure that institutions at various levels (local, national) will sustainably take ownership of the results?
- What is the level of ownership of the results by partners and target groups?

Cross-cutting themes

- Within the project's thematic area, what were the facilitating and limiting factors in project's contribution/potential contribution to gender equality and non-discrimination?
- Has the project taken into account tripartism, social dialogue, international labour standards and a fair transition to environmental sustainability in its design and implementation?

5. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

5.1 Participation and inclusiveness

There will be meaningful stakeholder participation throughout the evaluation process. For example, the ILO Evaluation Task Manager and the CPR Taskforce will work closely with the evaluator to provide guidance and input. This will aid efficiency of the evaluation process, inform the findings, and help in achieving ownership and effective utilization of the evaluation results. As far as possible, the evaluation will mainstream gender and social inclusion by utilising a gender, social inclusion and non-discrimination lens in data collection, data analysis and reporting. Stakeholder consultations will cover both men and women and vulnerable groups (persons with disabilities, people living with HIV, migrants, youth, informal sector workers, among others) will participate in the evaluation process and their opinions and voices will be captured in the evaluation report.

5.2 Organisation of the evaluation process

To achieve systematic execution, the evaluation is organized under the following four inter-linked phases: inception/planning, data collection, data analysis, and reporting and feedback. Each phase has specific activities and deliverables, which are organized logically as outlined in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1: The evaluation process

Evaluation Phase	Inception/ Preparation	Data Collection	Data Analysis & Interpretation	Reporting & Feedback
Specific activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inception meetings/ /discussion confirming evaluation objectives, expectations, etc. • Gather and review relevant documentation. • Inception report. • Develop data collection tools. • Sampling. • Field logistics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collection. • Preliminary data analysis. • Presentation of preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations to DWCP stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further data analysis. • Recording and interpretation of findings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare draft report. • Submit draft to ILO for review by key DWCP stakeholders. • Incorporate feedback from DWCP stakeholders. • Submit final evaluation report.
Participants	Consultant CPR Taskforce	Consultant DWCP stakeholders CPR Taskforce	Consultant	Consultant CPR Taskforce & other DWCP stakeholders

3.3 Types and sources of data

The evaluation data will comprise both quantitative and qualitative data collected from primary and secondary sources using multiple methods. The use of a mixture of data types, sources and methods. This approach will aid the collection of adequate data required to achieve the stated evaluation objectives.

Secondary data will be obtained from the review of relevant DWCP documents and external documents, for example, by ILO, Government of Lesotho (GOL), UN agencies, development partners, CSOs, Media, and academia. Primary data will be obtained mainly from DWCP stakeholders, notably ILO and the tripartite parties (GOL, employers and workers). Other sources of primary data will be other key stakeholders who participated and/or benefited from the implementation of the programme. These include the UN agencies, civil society organisations (CSOs), development partners, among others. Annex 3 presents the potential participants in the evaluation.

Desk review will form a key source of information in this evaluation. Preliminary desk review conducted so far indicates the availability of substantial data on the programme that is useful to answering the evaluation questions. As such, primary data collection will concentrate on filling information gaps and to verify information from the review of documents.

5.4 Data collection methods and tools

The evaluation data will be obtained using the following five specific methods and techniques: desk review, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, most significant change stories and programme sustainability questionnaire. As far as possible, data collection in Lesotho will be conducted through face-face encounters. Where this will not be possible, virtual interviews will be conducted using digital channels such as Zoom, MS Teams, or Skype. Telephone interviews may also be used. The programme sustainability questionnaire will be administered through email.

The consultant will utilise the first two interviews in each respondent category to pre-test the data collection tools. He will adjust the tools drawing on the insights from the pre-test. The data collection methods and tools used are described below.

Table 1. Description of data collection tools

Method of data collection	Description of target and mode of application
Desk review	Systematic review of available DWCP documents (DWCP III, progress reports, meeting reports, m&e data, etc) and other relevant literature will be undertaken prior, during and after the fieldwork to inform the evaluation findings. These documents will include Lesotho strategic documents (NSDP I and II, policies, laws/legislation, etc), labour market and employment statistics, ILO documents, media reports, research reports, and other published literature.
Stakeholder consultations	<p>These will be semi-structured interviews conducted among the key stakeholders of the DWCP. These include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILO staff: Director, DWCP support team, and technical specialists. • Government of Lesotho (GOL): Officials from the Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Employment, and other relevant ministries. • Employers' organisations. • Workers' organisations¹³. • Other entities with a role in programme implementation or governance e.g. steering committee, NACOLA, NACOSH, WAB and IRC. • Other DWCP stakeholder groups e.g. UN agencies, and development partners. <p>Key informants will be persons with good knowledge of or have participated in the development or implementation of the DWCP.</p> <p>A key informant interview (KII) guide with open-ended questions will be used (Annex 4). Each KII will take 1 – 1.5 hours. While face-to-face interviews will be the ideal, virtual or online interviews (telephone, Skype, Zoom, or email interviews) will be applied in cases where the circumstances of the key informants demand their application. Approximately 35 – 60 stakeholders will be involved in individual or group meetings.</p>
Most significant change stories	Stories of change already documented on the DWCP will be reviewed. Where possible, the evaluator will collect new stories of change (positive as well as negative) across the DWCP priorities during the stakeholder consultations. The consultant will record the stories of change guided by a story of change format. Some of these stories of change will be presented as an annex in the final evaluation report. The obtained data will inform findings particularly under the effectiveness and impact evaluation criteria.
Programme sustainability questionnaire	This tool will seek stakeholders' views on the sustainability potential of the DWCP. The obtained data will inform findings particularly under the sustainability criteria. The tool is based on eight programme sustainability domains: Environmental support, funding stability, partnership, organizational capacity, program evaluation, program adaptation, communications and strategic planning. Each domain has 5 sustainability indicators, which are scored between 1 (to little extent/no extent) and 7 (to a very great extent). The tool will be emailed to ILO Decent Work Support Team for Lesotho and representatives of the Tripartite parties (Government, Employers and workers). The responses will be

¹³ Group meetings will be held with representatives of workers' organisations. If possible, at least one focus group discussion will be conducted with workers (male and female). These will be drawn from various trades / trade unions to shed light on the working conditions, experiences, and views on the evaluated DWCP. The workers will include those involved in formal and informal sector employment, persons with disabilities, people living with HIV, migrants, youth, among others. A FGD guide containing open ended questions will be utilised. Each FGD will run for 1 to 1.5 hours.

	analyzed to gauge the sustainability potential of the programme. The scores from this tool will be triangulated with other evaluation data.
--	---

The choice of the above methods and tools of data collection and their application has been carefully made and aligns with the data requirements of this evaluation and in considering the time timeframe allocated for the field phase (7 to 10 days).

5.5 Data management

In compliance with ILO evaluation policy, best practice in evaluation, and data protection laws, the consultant will treat all data as confidential material that will be handled carefully and safely. Only the consultant will have access to the raw data and he will keep them for at least 4 years after which the data may be destroyed. Any data sets that may be released to ILO will be in accordance with the contract agreement and will be in a redacted form to avoid traceability to the respondents.

5.6 Sampling and sample distribution

All key stakeholder groups of the programme will be covered in this evaluation in line with the ILO evaluation guidelines as well as best practice in the evaluation of development and humanitarian interventions. Within the stakeholder groups, adequate and objectively selected samples (randomly or purposively) will be enlisted.

The following stakeholder groups will participate in the evaluation:

- ILO staff (Director, Decent Work Support Team, and technical specialists).
- Government of Lesotho (Officials from the Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Employment; and from other relevant ministries/agencies).
- Employers/Employers' organisations (ALEB, LTEA, and others).
- Workers/Workers' organisations (LFTU, LLC, LTUC and others).
- Workers representing various trades (male and female).
- DWCP management and governance structures/organs (Steering committee, National Advisory Committee on Labour (NACOLA), National Advisory Council on Occupational Safety and Health (NACOSH), Wages Advisory Board (WAB), and Industrial Relations Council (IRC).
- UN Agencies (e.g. UNDP).
- Development partners (CSOs, World Bank, European Union, and others).
- Other stakeholders (academia/researchers, media, and others).

As shown in Annex 3, approximately 35 – 60 stakeholders of the DWCP will participate in the evaluation (individual interviews and group meetings). A list of DWCP stakeholders prepared by the CPR Taskforce will serve as the sampling frame. The consultant will work closely with the CPR Taskforce in the sample selection process.

Stakeholder consultations will take place mainly in Maseru. As such, no field visits or choice of site visits within the country is anticipated.

5.6 Data analysis

Data analysis will commence during the field phase to yield preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendation that the evaluator will present in a half day validation meeting to be held in Maseru. Further data analysis will take place immediately after the field phase. The data analysis results will be used in the preparation of the draft and final evaluation reports.

Quantitative data collected in the evaluation will be analysed using advanced excel. These data will be collected mainly from the review of programme documents, M&E data, and other sources of information. The results of quantitative data analysis processes will be presented in descriptive tables with frequencies and proportions.

Thematic content analysis technique will be used to analyse the qualitative data sets. Here, data from key informant interviews, focus group discussions, stories of change, and programme sustainability questionnaire will be synthesized to identify commonly occurring themes from opinions, feelings and experiences expressed by the stakeholders of the programme. The obtained insights will be captured in the evaluation report in the form of text and direct quotations where appropriate.

6. FIELDWORK ARRANGEMENTS

Fieldwork in Lesotho will take place for 7 - 10 working days between 18th and 29th September 2023 and will be rolled out after sufficient preparation has been made during the inception phase. These preparations include the finalisation of evaluation work schedule, sampling, field logistics, development of data collection tools, and other preparatory phase tasks.

Fieldwork will commence with virtual interviews with ILO staff in Pretoria, Lesotho and IO HQs. The participants in these interviews will include the CPR taskforce members, Decent Work Support Team members based in Pretoria, LIO Director in Pretoria, technical specialists and other relevant staff. Thereafter, the consultant will undertake stakeholder consultations with the ILO Tripartite constituents – Government officials, employers’ representatives, workers’ representatives – development partners, and other stakeholders of the DWCP.

The CPR Taskforce will organise these stakeholder consultations including venue for the meetings. Virtual meetings with some of the selected stakeholders will take place where necessary. Annex 3 (Stakeholders consultations schedule) presents the scheduling of the data collection activities.

To aid effective field phase communication, the evaluator will form a WhatsApp group to facilitate effective communication with the CPR Taskforce throughout the field phase.

7. VALIDATION OF THE FINDINGS

A presentation of preliminary findings is scheduled for Friday 29th September 2023 in Maseru. The duration of the validation meeting is tentatively five hours from 9.00 AM to 4.00 PM as outlined in Annex 3 (Validation meeting programme).

The meeting will be attended by the consultant, ILO staff, Government officials, employers’ representatives, workers’ representations and other key stakeholders of the Decent Work Agenda in Lesotho.

The purpose of the validation meeting will be threefold:

- To present and discuss the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- To provide additional feedback on the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations for incorporation in the draft and final reports.
- To share and capture ideas, ambitions and aspirations of the programme stakeholders for the next phase of the Lesotho DWCP.

The evaluator will incorporate additional information provided in the workshop into the draft and final reports. This will ensure the findings, conclusions and recommendations are evidence-based and useful to the intended users.

8. ACHIEVING EFFICIENCY AND QUALITY IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

To enhance the quality of the evaluation process and outputs, the consultant will undertake necessary steps and actions across all the four phases of the evaluation. These measures are captured in Box 1 below.

Box 1. Key quality assurance measures

- Adequate design of the evaluation (approach, methods, questions, and sampling).
- Adequate preparation (inception phase and fieldwork) by the consultant, CPR Taskforce and other DWCP stakeholders.
- Compliance with the agreed work plan.
- Effective field data collection plan.
- Collection of data among the different respondent categories using the correct tools.
- Triangulation of data types, sources and methods.
- Careful data management by the consultant
- Systematic data processing and analysis by the Consultant.
- Adhere to the set quality standards for the draft and final evaluation reports.
- Review and validation of the findings, conclusions and recommendations by DWCP stakeholders.
- Active involvement of the CPR Taskforce to provide technical and logistical support throughout the evaluation process.

9. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND CODE OF CONDUCT

The evaluation will be conducted in strict adherence to ethical norms and standards for research and evaluation studies. Data will only be solicited from consenting adults who are eligible to participate based on pre-specified criteria and sampling requirements. Participants will have an opportunity to make an informed choice to voluntarily participate (or not) in the study and will be informed regarding the procedures of the evaluation using an introductory statement. Further, the evaluation design reduces traceability of participants, by minimizing the collection of personal details that may provide obvious identities of the participants. The obtained data will be securely stored and will be only accessible to the consultant for analysis and report writing purposes. The consultant has read, is familiar with, and will adhere to all relevant ILO policies and terms and conditions applicable to this evaluation.

Box 2. Core ethical considerations

- Informed consent.
- Respect for the respondents.
- Sensitivity to the needs of respondents.
- Safety and security of respondents and self.
- “do no harm” / safeguarding.
- Desisting from any act of commission or omission that can cause harm to any respondent, and the reputation of ILO and its constituents.
- Confidentiality and safe custody of data.
- Informing the CPR taskforce of any challenges encountered with a view to finding amicable solutions.
- Observing conflict sensitivity through objective sampling, framing of questions, asking questions, entry and exit.

10. RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE MANAGEMENT OF THE REVIEW AND DEADLINES

ILO task force

The ILO has set up a task team consisting of 1 member of ILO Pretoria, and 2 members of the Regional Program Unit at ROAF. This task team includes Siphon Ndlovu, Senior Programme Officer, and from ROAF/RPU by Na Pahimi Baizebbe, Analyst and Ricardo Furman, Regional Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. This taskforce will be responsible for the technical quality of the review. Among other tasks, the task force will:

- Coordinate the review.
- Develop and validate the ToRs in collaboration with stakeholders.
- Approve the final TOR.
- Consultant selection and recruitment.
- Technically support the review process.
- Submit the report of the review to stakeholders for comments
- Validate technically the report.
- Brief partners on the process and their participation.
- Develop the consultant's contract.

- Compile relevant documents – project and programming info including work plans, progress reports, evaluations, key communications, etc. and provide all documents, contacts, etc. to the consultant.
- Propose the list of interviewees to the consultant.
- Support the field work.
- Support the organization of the presentation and validation workshop of the review report.
- Disseminate the evaluation report to relevant Partners and stakeholders.
- Follow up on recommendations of the DWCP review
- Provide the management response, developed jointly with DWCP tripartite partners.

The Tripartite plus Task Team

- Involve the ILO tripartite plus constituencies involved in the implementation of the DWCP.
- Propose the list of contacts and stakeholders to be interviewed by the consultant.
- Make available to the consultant all the necessary documentation (reports, minutes of meetings, publications, regulatory and legal texts, etc.).
- Provide logistical support to the consultant in data collection (mobilize stakeholders to receive the consultant).
- Organize, with the technical and financial support of the ILO, the workshop of presentation of the preliminary results and collection of additional information.
- Comment on the version of the report after the workshop.
- Follow up on the implementation of the recommendations of the review.

The consultant

- Produce an Inception report that incorporates a mission comprehension note, a detailed and realistic agenda, information gathering tools and a report writing plan.
- Collect and compile information and evidence on stakeholder interventions.
- Review this information and analyse it on the basis of cause-effect links of the changes obtained and the DWCP outputs.
- Present provisional results during a workshop.
- Develop a draft version of the report.
- Write the final report taking into account relevant observations from the stakeholders
- Transmit the final report to the ILO for quality control.

11. WORK PLAN

The inception, execution and reporting phases of the evaluation process will take 9 weeks as outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Evaluation schedule

Activity/outputs	Weeks									Actual dates (2023)	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
Inception meetings	■										6 - 8 September
Desk review											11 – 15 September
Development of the Inception Report, data collection tools, work plan, and other in outputs.		■									11 – 15 September
Completion of field logistics		■									11 – 15 September
Fieldwork in Lesotho			■	■							18 – 28 September
Validation meeting				■							29 September
Data analysis					■						2 – 6 October

Preparation and submission of the draft evaluation report to ILO										9 – 20 October
Review and provide feedback on the draft evaluation report										23 – 27 October
Finalisation and submission of the final evaluation report										30 – 31 October

12. REPORTING AND FEEDBACK

The evaluator will develop the draft and final reports and submit them to ILO as per the agreed work plan. The draft and final reports will follow the format and quality standards established in the ToR as well as in ILO evaluation policy and guidelines.

The draft and final evaluation reports will not exceed 30 pages (excluding annexes) and will take the following lay out:

- Title page
- Table of Contents
- Acronyms
- Executive Summary
- Background and Programme Description
- Purpose and scope of Evaluation
- Evaluation Methodology and limitations
- Programme Status
- Findings by criteria
- Conclusions
- Lessons Learned and Good Practices
- Recommendations (maximum 8-10)

Annexes will include the following:

- The terms of reference.
- Evaluation questions matrix.
- A summary matrix indicating for each defined outcome/outputs, targets and achievements and a comments section.
- Review schedule.
- List of people interviewed.
- References reviewed.
- Others (optional).

It is expected that ILO and other key stakeholders of the Lesotho DWCP will review the draft report and accompanying annexes and share consolidated feedback with the consultant to facilitate timely preparation of the final evaluation report. One week has been allocated in the work plan for the review of the draft report.

ANNEX 8: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS¹⁴

Relevance – *Is the intervention doing the right things?*

1. What process was followed in developing the programme?
2. Were there challenges in the development of the programme?
3. Who participated in developing the programme and how?
4. Do the objectives and design of the programme respond to the needs, rights, priorities, and policies of the target groups and key stakeholders?
5. Are the objectives of the programme still relevant to the stakeholder groups?
6. Are the planned interventions technically adequate solutions to the problems the programme sought to address?
7. What criteria was used for selecting the target groups and was it appropriate?
8. Are the programme interventions aligned with the priorities, strategies, policies and plans of the Government of Lesotho and other stakeholders?
9. Are the objectives and expected results of the programme in tune with relevant national, regional and international covenants, commitments, frameworks and standards such as the SDGs?
10. Is the programme design and implementation well aligned to gender equality, social inclusion and conflict sensitivity principles?
11. Who has benefited from the programme, how many, and how?
12. Have the target groups and key stakeholders been meaningfully involved in implementation decision making, monitoring and reporting processes?
13. What do the target groups and key stakeholders like or dislike about this programme?

Coherence - *How well does the intervention fit?*

1. Is the programme compatible with other labour sector interventions and those of the key stakeholders (ILO, Government of Lesotho, employers' organizations, and workers' organizations)?
2. Is the programme consistent with the relevant national, ILO and other international labour norms and standards?
3. Is the programme's intervention logic realistic, logical, and coherent with clearly defined outcomes, outputs, indicators and targets?
4. How well does the programme align or respond to the socio-cultural, economic, political and policy context it operates?
5. How well has the programme coordinated and collaborated with other actors for support, creation of complementarity and synergies, and avoiding overlaps?
6. What new areas of collaboration and synergies with other actors has the programme created?
7. Did the programme create or benefit from complementarities and synergies with other interventions of ILO, Government of Lesotho, employers' organizations, workers' organizations and of other actors in Lesotho?
8. Has the programme brought about specific added value or benefits to other interventions of ILO, Government of Lesotho, employers, and workers or of other actors in Lesotho?
9. Have other interventions, actors, or government policies supported or undermined the programme in any way?
10. Has the programme undermined other interventions, actors or government policies in any way?

Validity of design and evaluability - *Is the programme well designed and evaluable?*

1. Have all key stakeholders of the programme (ILO and tripartite plus constituents) been meaningfully involved in the planning, implementation, decision-making, monitoring and reporting processes?
2. Is the DWCP evaluable?
3. Does the design, implementation and reporting on DWCP follow a results-based approach?

¹⁴ This is a General Checklist of Questions used in Desk Review and Stakeholder consultations.

4. Does the DWCP have a clear theory of change?
5. Is the programme's theory of change still valid?
6. How is the quality of the results framework of this DWCP?
7. Are both the horizontal and vertical logic coherent?
8. Are there SMART performance indicators and realistic targets?
9. Does the DWCP have a robust monitoring and evaluation system that enhanced accountability, learning, and contributed to knowledge base and programme management?
10. Does the programme have an adequate implementation plan with clear roles and responsibilities for ILO, Government of Lesotho, employers' organizations, workers' organizations and other key stakeholders?
11. Have programme document, implementation and monitoring and evaluation system paid sufficient attention to International Labor Standards, the promotion of gender equality and non-discrimination, social dialogue, and fair transition to environment issues?
12. Has the programme mainstreamed gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) in its design, implementation, monitoring and reporting?

Effectiveness - *To what extent did the programme achieve its objectives and intended results?*

1. What are the major achievements of this programme?
2. Has the programme achieved all its planned results and of good quality?
3. Has the programme produced any un-intended results (positive or negative)?
4. What measures have been taken to deal with any negative effects associated with the programme?
5. Have the achievements of the programme (benefits, services and results) been accessible to all intended beneficiaries including vulnerable stakeholder groups such as women, people with disabilities, youth, and informal economy men and women?
6. Are the target groups and stakeholders satisfied with the project results?
7. What internal and external factors facilitated or hindered the achievement of intended results?
8. Did the COVID-19 pandemic influence the achievement of the programme objectives and results?

Efficiency - *How well were available resources used?*

1. Have the planned activities and expected results been achieved on time?
2. Have the planned activities and expected results been achieved in the required quality, and within the budget?
3. Have there been delays in activity implementation and why?
4. Have the programme inputs (funds, human resources, time, physical) adequate and provided on time?
5. Are there been instances of waste or inefficiency in the programme?
6. Has the programme's M&E, learning and reporting processes been organized and executed effectively?
7. Has the programme's internal monitoring system delivered robust and useful information?
8. How is the quality of the internal monitoring data and progress reports?
9. How were the relationships between the entities involved in implementation?
10. Were the implementation arrangements/mechanisms adopted adequate for the achievement of the programme objectives and results?
11. How well did the management structures support the achievement of the objectives and results of the programme?
12. Are there specific factors that have supported or hindered the achievement of the planned activities and outputs?
13. Have the implementers and other stakeholder groups encounter any major challenges during the implementation phase?

Impact – *Is the programming making a difference?*

1. Has the programme made or making a difference among the target groups?

2. Has the programme contributed or contributing to significant changes to the wider context in Lesotho or labour issues generally?
3. Has the programme brought or bringing about significant changes that are relevant to the identified SDGs and relevant targets?
4. Does the programme have any negative impacts (unanticipated changes or developments)?
5. Is this programme likely to have a catalytic/multiplier effect?
6. Are there other actors who are replicating or likely to replicate the achievements, components or aspects of the programme in Lesotho or beyond?

Sustainability - *Will the benefits and services of the programme last?*

1. Are the benefits, services and results of the programme likely to continue going forward?
2. Are there particular components or results of the programme that will continue?
3. Are there particular components or results of the programme that are unlikely to continue?
4. What sustainability efforts and measures has the programme put in place?
5. Are there additional measures the programme should have had ensure its benefits/services continue when it ends?
6. Does the programme have a documented sustainability plan or exit strategy, and if so, have these been effectively implemented?
7. What is being done and by whom to support the continuation of the services and benefits of this programme?
8. What factors affect or are likely to affect either positively or negatively the continuity of achievements (services, benefits, and results) of this programme?

Lessons learned - *What lessons emerge from this programme?*

1. What worked well in this programme and why?
2. What did not work well in this programme and why?
3. What new insights emerge from the design, implementation, and results of the programme?
4. Are there aspects of this programme that should have been designed or implemented differently?
5. Are there aspects of this programme that should have not have been included at all in the design or implemented in this programme?

Good practices - *What good practices emerge from this programme?*

1. Are there specific things, ways of working, practices, methods, strategies, tools or other aspects of this programme that are considered important and perhaps different from those of other DWCPs or interventions in Lesotho and beyond?
2. Does the programme stand out in any way from previous DWCP phases implemented in Lesotho or DWCPs in other countries?
3. Are there aspects of the programme that should be repeated or not repeated in similar interventions in the future?
4. Have other social actors replicated or likely to replicate any component or aspects of this programme?

Priorities for a future phase – *What aspirations do stakeholders have for the Decent Work Agenda in Lesotho going forward?*

1. What issues or priorities should the next phase of DWCP for Lesotho focus on and why?
2. Who should be the main target groups and key stakeholders of the next phase of Lesotho DWCP and why?
3. Reflecting on the experience of this DWCP, are there aspects or elements the next phase of DWCP for Lesotho should avoid or handle differently?