



ILO EVALUATION

- **Evaluation Title:** Final Independent Evaluation - Sustaining Strengthened National Capacities to Improve International Labour Standards Compliance and Reporting in Relevant European Union Trading Partners
- **ILO TC/SYMBOL:** GLO/17/29/EUR
- **Type of Evaluation** INDEPENDENT FINAL
- **Country(ies) :** El Salvador, Guatemala, Pakistan, Mongolia
- **Date of the evaluation:** October – December 2020
- **Name of consultant(s):** Seán J. Burke, Evaluation Lead (New Frontier Services); Norman Tilos, Evaluation Consultant (New Frontier Services)
- **ILO Administrative Office:** ILO OFFICES IN BEIJING, ISLAMABAD and SAN JOSE
- **ILO Technical Backstopping Office** INTERNATIONAL LABOUR STANDARDS DEPARTMENT (NORMES)
- **Other agencies involved in joint evaluation** N/A
- **Date project ends** 31 July 2020
- **Donor: country and budget** EUROPEAN COMMISSION (DG TRADE)
US\$ USD1,000,109
- **Evaluation Manager:** Maria Borsos
- **Evaluation Office oversight:** Peter E. Wichmand
- **Key Words:** ILS, fundamental principles and rights

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
GLOSSARY	4
1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	8
1.1 Evaluation Objectives and Context	8
1.1.1 Project Overview	8
1.1.2 About the Evaluation	8
1.2 Evaluation Findings	9
1.3 Final Evaluation Conclusions (Summary Table)	12
1.4 Final Evaluation Lessons Learned and Good Practices (Summary Table).....	15
1.5 Final Evaluation Recommendations (Summary Table)	16
2 ABOUT THIS FINAL EVALUATION	20
2.1 About this Report.....	20
2.2 Project Background.....	20
2.3 Evaluation Objectives, Scope and Approach	22
2.4 Project Background Context in Beneficiary Countries.....	23
2.4.1 El Salvador.....	23
2.4.2 Guatemala.....	23
2.4.3 Mongolia.....	24
2.4.4 Pakistan.....	25
3 EVALUATION FINDINGS	26
3.1 Relevance and Validity of Design	26
3.2 Coherence/ Strategic Fit	27
3.3 Project Results and Effectiveness	28
3.4 Efficiency of Resource Use	32
3.5 Progress Towards Impact.....	34
3.6 Sustainability	35
3.7 Gender Issues Assessment.....	36
4 LESSONS LEARNED, GOOD PRACTICES AND GOING FORWARD	37
4.1 Lessons Learned and Good Practices.....	37
4.2 Some Points for Reflection on the EU-ILO Partnership and Added Value Proposition in the Context of the Project.....	38

4.2.1	Improved EU-ILO communication, in particular at the country-level	39
4.2.2	A conceptual framework to capture the full spectrum of potential EU-ILO complementarity, synergy and value	39
4.3	Reflection and Looking to the Future (Reflection Questions)	40
4.3.1	Why Reflection Questions (RQs)?.....	40
4.3.2	Scope to increase ILO impact through increased use of technology?.....	40
4.3.3	Scope to amplify medium-term impact through a more strategic and systemic partnership approach?	41
4.3.4	More impact through increased focus on creating and supporting systemic change?	41
4.3.5	Scope to strengthen nexus between ILS and COVID-19 recovery?	42
5	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS, LEARNING & RECOMMENDATIONS	43
5.1	Evaluation Conclusions	43
5.2	Lessons Learned and Emerging Good Practices.....	45
5.3	Evaluation Recommendations	47
6	ANNEXES	50
6.1	Annex I: Final Evaluation Bibliography.....	50
6.2	Annex II: List of Stakeholders Consulted.....	51
6.3	Annex III: Evaluation Questions and Approach.....	53
6.4	Annex IV: Lessons Learned.....	56
6.5	Annex V: Emerging Good Practices.....	60
6.6	Annex VI: Final Evaluation Terms of Reference	66

GLOSSARY

ACRONYM	FULL TITLE
ACTEMP	ILO Bureau for Employers' Activities
ACTRAV	ILO Bureau for Workers' Activities
AFCYD	Authority for Family, Children and Youth
ANEP	National Association of Private Enterprises
BHC	Baluchistan High Court
BIRA	Baluchistan Industrial Relations Act
CACIF	Coordinating Committee of Agricultural, Commercial, Industrial and Financial Associations
CEACR	Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations
CFA	Committee on Freedom of Association
CLBL	Child Labour and Bonded Labour
CLS	Child Labour Survey
CM	Chief Minister
CMTU	Confederation of Mongolian Trade Unions
CODAPETIs	Department Committees of the Commission for the Elimination of Child Labour
CONAPETI	National Commission for the Elimination of Child Labour
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
DG DEVCO	Directorate General for International Cooperation and Development (EU)
DGLW	Directorate General of Labour Welfare, Baluchistan
DG TRADE	Directorate General for Trade (EU)
DoL	Directorate of Labour (KP)
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme (ILO)
DWT	Decent Work Team (ILO)
EC	European Committee
EEAS	European External Action Service
EFP	Employers' Federation of Pakistan
EVAL	Evaluation Office (ILO)
EU	European Union
EU-CAAA	European Union-Central American Association Agreement

ACRONYM	FULL TITLE
EUD	European Union Delegation in Pakistan
FE	Final Evaluation
FJA	Federal Judicial Academy
FoA/CB	Freedom of association and collective bargaining
FPRW	Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work
GASI	General Agency for Specialized Inspection
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GSP	General Scheme of Preferences
GSP+	General Scheme of Preferences Plus
HRPF	Human Rights Policy Framework
ILES	International Labour and Environmental Standards
ILO	International Labour Organisation
ILO CO	International Labour Organisation Country Office
ILO HQ	International Labour Organisation Headquarters
ILS	International Labour Standards
ITC/ILO	International Training Centre (ITC) of the ILO, Turin
JS	Joint Secretary
KP	Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
KPJA	Judicial Academy of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
LFS	Labour Force Survey
LSGSC	Labour Standards in Global Supply Chains
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MBA	Mongolian Bar Association
MLSP	Ministry of Labour and Social Protection
MoHR	Ministry of Human Rights
MoOPHRD	Ministry of Overseas Pakistanis and Human Resource Development
MTPS	Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NHRCM	National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia
NLPF	National Labour Protection Framework
NORMLEX	ILO information system on international labour standards
OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
P29	Protocol 29 to the Forced Labour Convention (1930)

ACRONYM	FULL TITLE
PTCC	Provincial Tripartite Consultation Committee
PWF	Pakistan Workers' Federation
ROB	Rules of Business
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
TA	Technical Assistance
ToR	Terms of Reference
TU	Technical Unit
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Fund for Children
UNRCO	United Nations Resident Coordinator Office

Acknowledgements

The review team would like to thank all those who gave their time to be consulted during the course of this final evaluation.

A special word of thanks to Maria Borsos, evaluation manager at ILO headquarters (ILO-HQ) and Katerina Tsotroudi, departmental evaluation focal point at ILO Headquarters in Geneva, and from Peter E. Wichmand, the Senior Evaluation Officer at ILO independent evaluation office (EVAL). Our sincere thanks to the project national co-ordinators Carlos Linares, Lkhagvademberel Amgalan, and Abid Niaz Khan for their support in setting up the country interviews in El Salvador, Guatemala, Mongolia, and Pakistan. Our thanks also to the evaluation counterparts at the European Commission, Rikard Nordeman and Indre Vaicekauskaite at DG Trade, and Sara Gondy (ex DG Trade) for making time and sharing their views and insights, as well as counterpart EU Delegation Staff.

Last, but certainly not least, our warm thanks to all ILO, government, and ILO and project partner staff members and stakeholders that made themselves available to speak, all the more at this busy time of the year.

Evaluation Team

Evaluation Team

Seán J. Burke, Evaluation Lead (New Frontier Services)

Norman Tilos, Evaluation Consultant (New Frontier Services)

Evaluation Support

Dr Bernardita Cardenas, Internal QA and Backstopping (New Frontier Services)

Wilson Ramos, Desk Research Support and Backstopping (New Frontier Services)

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Evaluation Objectives and Context

1.1.1 Project Overview

The project '*Sustaining Strengthened National Capacities to Improve International Labour Standards (ILS) Compliance and Reporting in Relevant European Union Trading Partners*' was funded by the European Commission (DG TRADE), with a budget of USD: USD 1,000,109. Technical cooperation and assistance are a commitment of ILO with countries when ILO's supervisory bodies note continuous or serious failures to effectively apply and report compliance on ILS. Actions allow countries to carry out activities focusing on reducing the gap with respect to the ILO Conventions they have ratified. Beneficiary countries receive ILO's technical advice and training with the objective of improving their reporting practices and building their reporting capacity in both quantitative and qualitative terms.

The project focuses in particular on the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8, implementing improved labour relations and working conditions in the target countries. The selected countries are provided technical assistance to resolve critical issues raised by the ILO supervisory bodies and reflected under the EU GSP+/EU CAAA monitoring. The strategy was to act on several fronts to improve implementation of International Labour Standards (ILS), especially the Fundamental Conventions, and compliance with reporting obligations to the supervisory bodies within ILO. The EU special incentive arrangement for sustainable development and good governance arrangement (**GSP+**) provides advantageous tariff preferences (removal of tariffs on over 66% of tariff lines) to vulnerable developing countries that commit to ratify and effectively implement 27 core international conventions on human and labour rights, environment protection and good governance, including the eight fundamental ILO Conventions. Regarding duration, the project ran for a period of 28 months, from April 2018 to July 2020, following a no-cost extension of 6 months.

The main outcomes of the project are the following: 1) **Outcome 1:** The selected countries increase their compliance with their reporting obligations with respect to the ILO's Fundamental Conventions through the development of administrative/institutional capacity; 2) **Outcome 2:** The output of the reporting process at country level is improved through the increased and effective participation of the tripartite partners; 3) **Outcome 3:** Tripartite constituents are enabled to increase their institutional capacity through training in ILS and their supervisory mechanisms, which they can adapt and replicate; 4) **Outcome 4:** National curricula on ILS are available and taught at national training institutions; and 5) **Outcome 5:** Application of fundamental ILS is strengthened through initiatives and action by tripartite constituents, parliamentarians and judges (at central and local level).

1.1.2 About the Evaluation

The purpose of this independent final evaluation (FE) is to give an assessment of the effectiveness and the sustainability of the project. As per the Terms of Reference (ToR), the FE is to assess major outcomes, performance as per the foreseen targets and indicators of achievement at output and outcome levels, assess strategies and implementation modalities chosen, evaluate partnership arrangements, constraints and opportunities, and finally draft lessons to improve performance and delivery of future project results. As per the evaluation guidelines for evaluation of ILO projects, this Final Evaluation includes generating an assessment of the following five categories of project progress: i) Relevance and Validity of Design, ii)

Coherence/Strategic fit, iii) Project results and effectiveness, iv) Efficiency of resource use, and v) Progress towards impact. The evaluation commenced in early November 2020, with the stakeholder interview programme involving consultation with more than 40 stakeholders from ILO HQ, European Commission, ILO country and regional offices, government representatives, employer and trade union stakeholders and other project staff. The evaluation approach also took account of ILO Guidance with regard to the COVID 19 pandemic, with all foreseen field interviews carried out remotely to ensure no risk to project stakeholders, ILO and EU personnel and the evaluation team.

1.2 Evaluation Findings

Relevance, Quality of Project Design and Strategic Coherence/Fit

Overall, the **project's objectives and design took into account the needs, policies, and priorities of beneficiaries and stakeholders (global, country, and partner/institutions)**. Regarding the **quality/appropriateness of project design**, the project was well-designed and set up to contribute to SDG 8 through improved labour relations and working conditions in the focus countries, consistent with the focus countries' ILO commitments. More specifically, it was aligned to improving the application of the eight fundamental ILO conventions among the four beneficiary countries of the EU preferential GSP+ Scheme. The interventions were therefore limited to building administrative capacity in implementing the ILS and focusing on institutional development. As labour standards tend to be embedded in trade agreements, there is some leeway to expand the design so as to accommodate the opportunity of leveraging trade relations in order to strengthen the application of the ILO's fundamental Conventions. Such an expanded design could for example include high-level engagement with relevant government officials on strengthening cooperation anchored on such opportunity.

There is also likely scope to further improve the project design in terms of making it more gender-sensitive and inclusive, in particular in the area of strengthening social dialogue and tripartism. A deliberate mechanism to include gender equality issues and the inequality issues of women and other vulnerable groups would not only improve the design of the project but also its impact. It should also be noted that the project serves the economic interest of the four countries as it is very much linked to supporting trade relations.

Efficiency

Project management

Overall, the project has been managed relatively satisfactorily, in particular given its multi-country focus, complexity and the strain on budget resources to deliver the work programme.

Regarding **cost efficiency**, the project has achieved significant savings vis-à-vis budget due to synergies established with other ILO projects along with benefits gained through use of regular ILO funds meant for single strategy across several projects. In some instances, for example in Pakistan, international consultants engaged for the Project happened to be in the country, thereby leading to savings on air-travel and accommodation costs. For approximately USD 200,000 Technical Assistance (TA) per country, the Project generated significant results which can be attributed to ILO's project management efficiency.

The total execution of the project considered for El Salvador and Guatemala as a whole, represented a little more than 98% of execution. The amount not executed is around 10,000 euros and was assigned to technical assistance in training, especially in the heading of transfers and travel of officials. Further efficiency and value for money has been created by the significant reservoir of country knowledge, trust/relationships, and in-country office and expertise that ILO brings to the project work in each country, compared with alternative

implementation scenarios such as implementation by a consultancy provider following a tendering procedure, where these assets/advantages would for the most part not exist.

Regarding communication, the project has for the most part being effective towards core stakeholder groups and constituents, while it has also registered a number of innovations. Of particular note has been the volume and increased reach of online communication and dissemination, which has seen significant outreach, such as the video on ILS in a COVID-19 crisis period, as well as infographics on COVID-19 mitigation and prevention in the workplace. Regarding internal **project communication** between ILO and the EU this has at times however not been sufficiently strong (or defined) to ensure EU stakeholders are obtaining information on the countries' situation, progress and developments in a timely manner. To some extent, communication has been overly focused on formal reporting and too much focus was placed on communication between ILO country office and ILO Headquarters before information being transmitted to the EC. This has sometimes meant that EU Delegations in the target countries received information late or were not aware of specific developments in their respective countries. A strengthened communication flow between ILO country offices and EU Delegations would be one action that could go a long way to addressing this (see Recommendations). Regarding **project reporting**, this can be improved in terms of quality and timely delivery, possibly through greater emphasis on learning/lessons learned.

Effectiveness

Overall, the project successfully achieved most of its objectives and correspondingly implemented the planned activities in each of the four countries. In particular, the project successfully promoted social dialogue by providing training and orientation, supporting establishment of structures and building trust among constituents, all of which significantly improved capacity and commitment to social dialogue. In view of its focus on institutional development, the Project carried out relevant training activities, targeting social partners and government institutions thereby improving the knowledge and understanding on ILS in all four countries. The training successfully built capacity in enhancing ILS reporting in terms of quality, participation, coordination with other line ministries and conformance to overall reporting requirements. In addition to the above, training materials have been produced and circulated which will be valuable beyond the completion of the project. In some countries, the COVID-19 pandemic propelled some stakeholders to covert training into online formats allowing for broader dissemination. In fact, such training has been integrated in their respective institutions for delivery using their own budget beyond the life span of the project.

Key constraints on the achievement of the project's expected results include the COVID-19 pandemic and national elections, with the latter leading to turnover of senior and middle-management staff in government departments, as well as the generally below-par capacity levels of these institutions. However, through adaptive management, the project reoriented their strategies in the four countries to overcome those challenges by orienting and training new staff to ensure momentum and continuity. In some instances, COVID-19 led to innovation in the delivery of training.

The project's focus on taking into account partner's national needs can also be seen in the project inception work, where the capacity of ministries of labour, social partners and other stakeholders to fulfil their mandate by leading national efforts and demanding accountability for implementation of the ILO Fundamental conventions, was deemed to be generally weak. In **El Salvador** and **Guatemala**, for example, due to the recommendations and observations of the ILO supervisory bodies inviting the governments to improve and strengthen processes, through ILO technical assistance, the Government of Guatemala was eligible to receive such assistance from the ILO including training and capacity development support to result in enhanced

capacity in terms of better understanding of ILS and enhanced coordination and consultation among social partners.

Progress Towards Impact

One impact of this project is the Institutionalization of tripartite committees which look into reporting and the comments of ILO supervisory bodies pertaining to implementation. Through the tripartite committees, the ILO is then able to provide further technical assistance and support through other projects and programs within ILO and/or with other related initiatives by other UN agencies and development partners.

Another important impact has been an improved understanding and knowledge on ILS among government staff, policy makers and social partners leading to overall improvement in national capacity to apply ILS in law reform, judicial processes and other relevant fields. The various training and orientation activities ensured sustained momentum even when there was change of Administration in government. A further impact is improved reporting on ILS both in terms of the quality of reporting and in terms of the systems and processes within ministries of labour to coordinate and consult with social partners and with other line ministries. Improved quality of reporting emanates from the project's support to improved capacity and social dialogue.

Any full assessment of sustained impact and change will require impact assessment over the medium-term for example starting 6 months from now and when a year will have elapsed since project end. Many factors will influence sustained impact, including enforcement of legislation adopted (and the impact of same). Similarly, for much of the capacity development and institutional development support work, it is also likely that some follow-on impact will manifest itself over time, an example being the work of ILO in building a strong women's committee within the Trade Union movement and making it visible, such that this might pave the way for the generation of ideas that can be picked up by local institutions.

Sustainability

As mentioned, ILO is an important sustainability anchor of the project as it continues to pursue its normative and tripartite mandate in these countries, while the ILO supervisory bodies continue to function and supervise application of ratified Conventions. For instance, some of the related components of this project can be carried over to its work under the Trade for Decent Work Umbrella, Trade for Decent Work Project, among others to ensure that they will be sustained beyond the life span of the project. It also collaborates with other UN agencies and development partners who may have initiatives related to the project. More importantly, ILO also continues to work with the government and social partners on the issues of compliance or sustained participation of tripartite partners.

Thus, alignment of the project with ILO's general work priorities in the project countries should also contribute to strengthening sustainability prospects. The increased development of online training resources will also contribute to sustained impact. Similarly, the capacities developed and support actions delivered to ILO partners (such as for example strengthening the capacity of the Women's Committee in the Trade Union in Mongolia) and the nurturing of social dialogue and related institutional support will continue, even if it is difficult to predict at this point how much momentum will be sustained and how much further support would be required from ILO. Going forward, it is however worth reflecting on whether there is scope for a more strategic and systemic view of the desired change and future situation in a country, coupled with a new and/more systemic approach to change and to sustainability, that could contribute to strengthening sustainability prospects.

Lessons Learned and the Future

Regarding lessons learned, the project has provided a number of learnings/lessons learned, as set out in Section 1.4 of this Executive Summary and elaborated in Section 4.1. These include i) LL1 - Inclusion of Equality Issues of Women and vulnerable groups in Social Dialogues and within Trade Unions. ii) LL2 - Value of Periodic engagement with EU-Delegation and Government Stakeholders. iii) LL3 - Promotion of social dialogue and tripartism amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. iv) GP1 - Training of journalists to report on forced labour. v) GP2 - Institutionalization of training by stakeholders in their respective organizations. vi) GP3 - Building Strong Women’s Committees within Trade Unions.

Covid-19 and the Future

While COVID-19 did not dramatically affect the implementation of the project, it did affect the timing and delivery of some training activities and general project communication. More importantly, however, COVID-19 will likely have far-reaching socio-economic consequences and likely related impact on tripartite social dialogue. In Pakistan, for example, the Pakistan Worker’s Federation (PWF) issued its stance last March 2020 on the outbreak of COVID-19 in view of the suffering of the working community in Pakistan in terms of job loss, inadequate social protection and insufficient rehabilitation measures. Businesses are also heavily affected and Government, not just in Pakistan, has to come up with short-term and long-term solutions. While dealing with COVID-19 pandemic may not be part of the project per se, it presents an opportunity for ILO to promote social dialogue and tripartism as drivers for economic and social resilience, inclusive growth and development.

1.3 Final Evaluation Conclusions (Summary Table)

The table below summarises the final evaluation conclusions

Table 1.1 - Summary of Final Evaluation Conclusions

No.	Conclusion
C1	Relevance and Quality of Design: Overall, the project has been highly relevant to the needs, policies, and priorities of beneficiaries and stakeholders, at both the country-level and at the global level, and significant effort was invested in the project design to ensure it reflected these priorities and needs.
C2	Progress against results: Overall, the project has achieved most of its objectives and correspondingly implemented the planned activities in each of the four countries. The project has successfully supported social dialogue through training provision, supported the putting in place of structures and built trust among constituents, all of which significantly improved capacity and commitment to social dialogue. Within its focus on institutional development, the Project has improved knowledge and understanding on ILS through the wide range of training activities for government institutions social partners that it has delivered, and this capacity development and knowledge transfer has led to improved ILS reporting in terms of quality, better participation, improved coordination with other line ministries and conformance to overall reporting requirements. Above all, the project has contributed to strengthen social dialogue across the project countries, nurturing a culture of social dialogue and tripartism around ILS requirements, application and reporting requirements, and this result should not be underestimated, particularly in national contexts such as El Salvador and Guatemala characterised by low trust levels, tension and very weak capacities.

No.	Conclusion
C3	<p>Implementation Challenges: The project’s results and achievements also need to be interpreted in the context of challenging national implementation environments, a relatively short project timeframe for this kind of work, and the challenges faced such as national elections, changing government priorities, and turnover of key staff within government ministries. However, some of these risks and uncertainties could have been better identified in the project scoping. Going forward, there is scope for ILO to further invest in its future project scoping to account for any risks, uncertainties, and assumptions that might affect the implementation of ILS-related project interventions, including a comprehensive theory of change in its project document, with a view to strengthening project results frameworks. In particular, a theory of change would establish valuable pathways to anticipate changes in government and potential synergies with projects and initiatives of EU (country and regional) and other development partners.</p>
C4	<p>Efficiency of use of resources: The Project has performed well for the most part in terms of efficient use of resources, managing to deliver a significant volume of activities and work within what were relatively small country-level project budgets. On a wider level, the project also offered significant efficiency gains by building on ILO technical experience and in-country presence, relationships and understanding, compared with at least some other alternative implementation means, such as contracting private service providers via a tender procedure.</p>
C5	<p>Project management: Project management has been efficient for the most part, notwithstanding the specific challenges of co-ordination of a project targeting four countries in 2 different sub-continent, and where this kind of activity was relatively new to the ILO Department managing the project. However, project reporting can be improved in terms of quality and timely delivery.</p>
C6	<p>Country-level Project Communication Flow: Communication between the different project stakeholders has at times not been sufficiently strong (or defined) to ensure EU stakeholders are obtaining information on the countries’ situation, progress and developments in a timely manner. To some extent, there has been over focus on formal reporting, and too much focus on ILO country communication via ILO Headquarters before being transmitted to the EC, and this has sometimes meant that EU Delegations receive information late or were not aware of specific developments in their respective countries. A strengthened communication flow between ILO country offices and EU Delegations would be one action that could go a long way to addressing this (see Recommendations).</p>
C7	<p>EU-ILO Partnership: The EU-ILO partnership is a highly complementary one that is bringing mutual value added to both partners. Like many good partnerships, it has evolved organically in the years leading up to this project. This project is valuable not only because it was delivered, but also because of the learning and implications about how and where the partnership might/could evolve.</p>
C8	<p>Progress towards Impacts: A key impact of the project has been the institutionalization of tripartite committees, which discuss reporting and look into the comments of ILO supervisory bodies pertaining to implementation. A second key impact has been an improved understanding and knowledge on ILS among government staff, policy makers and social partners leading to overall improvement in national capacity to apply ILS in law reform, judicial processes and other relevant fields. A third impact of the project is improved reporting on ILS both in terms of the</p>

No.	Conclusion
	<p>quality of reporting and in terms of the systems and processes within ministries of labour to coordinate and consult with social partners and with other line ministries.</p>
C9	<p>Sustainability: ILO is continuing to support some activities that were not completed during the project duration, either through other donor-funded projects or own country office efforts, and in this respect ILO itself is an important sustainability anchor for the project. In some areas, sustainability returns are higher than average from this project, for example through the training and capacity development work moved online, where these tools and resources continue to be available to country-based partners and stakeholders. Moreover, alignment of the project with ILO’s general work priorities in the project countries should also contribute to strengthening sustainability prospects. Notwithstanding the above, it is possible that a more strategic and systemic view of the desired change and future situation in a country, coupled with new and/more systemic approach to change and to sustainability, could lead to strengthened sustainability prospects.</p>
C10	<p>Learning: The project work, and wider implementation experience, has generated numerous lessons learned and good practices, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lessons learned: Inclusion of Equality Issues of Women and vulnerable groups in Social Dialogues and within Trade Unions (LL1); Value of Periodic engagement with EU-Delegation and Government Stakeholders (LL2); Promotion of social dialogue and tripartism amidst the COVID-19 pandemic (LL3); 2. Good/Emerging Good Practices: Training of journalists to report on forced labour (GP1); GP2 - Institutionalization of training by stakeholders in their respective organizations (GP2); and Building Strong Women’s Committees within Trade Unions (GP3).
C11	<p>Reflections for the Future: Drawing on the evaluation, the evaluation team has generated some further reflection questions for ILO. It should be noted that while these questions emanate from the evaluation work on this project, they are rather wide-ranging in scope, extending beyond ILO’s work on ILS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ RQ1 -Can ILO do more – and achieve more – with increased use of technology, including e-learning and e-guidance? ✓ RQ2 -Should ILO look anew at its approach to partnering, with a view to developing a partnership strategy and support that can amplify its impact? ✓ RQ3 -Can ILO do more in terms of increasing sustained impact in partner countries over the medium-term? ✓ RQ4 -Covid 19 Recovery - Can ILO strengthen linkages between its work around ILS and effort to support Covid 19 recovery and building back better?

1.4 Final Evaluation Lessons Learned and Good Practices (Summary Table)

The table below summarises the final evaluation Lessons Learned and Good Practices:

Table 1.2 - Summary of the Lessons Learned and Good Practices

No.	Lesson Learned / Good Practice
LL1	<p>Inclusion of equality issues of women and vulnerable groups in Social Dialogues and within Trade Unions:</p> <p>Women and vulnerable groups need to be included in the focus on ILS, or at least their issues have to be represented in social dialogues and within Trade Unions. While the project experience has showing that identifying, engaging and organising these groups can be challenging given that many tend to be part of the informal economy, this also presents an opportunity to engage relevant CSOs to play a crucial role especially in countries where the informal sector thrives. The project work in Mongolia has for example provided learning and emerging good practice in this respect.</p>
LL2	<p>Value of Periodic engagement with EU Delegations and Government Stakeholders</p> <p>Periodic engagement with government and EU stakeholders is important in leveraging trade relations vis-a-vis core international labour standards, without which the Project could miss out important insights that could add value in terms of project implementation, expected results and outcomes. Moreover, while it is good to focus on the project per se, it should be noted that ILO can leverage on GSP3 not just to engage with the government but also to strengthen cooperation with it. In fact, the engagement should not only be limited to the Labour Ministry but also include national trade ministries and any relevant government agencies tasked with studying the impact of tariff policies and programs on national competitiveness and consumer welfare. These other government agencies should be made aware of the project and the responsibility of the government to retain its GSP+3 status so they can influence the executive and legislative branches of the national government. The idea is to gain top support and full ownership of the GSP+3 project.</p>
LL3	<p>Promotion of social dialogue and tripartism amidst the COVID-10 pandemic.</p> <p>According to stakeholders, COVID19 did not affect significantly the implementation of the project, coming as it did in the final few months of the project implementation period, but going forward, the COVID-19 pandemic has significant socio-economic consequences and knock-on impacts on tripartite social dialogue.</p> <p>All parties in social dialogue cannot afford to ignore the socio-economic consequences of Covid19 not just for the workers but also for the business owners. And if social dialogue and tripartism can constructively capture these issues and solutions, its promotion and development becomes more compelling in the country as they can be utilized as drivers not just for economic and social resilience but also for inclusive growth and development of a country.</p>
GP1	<p>Training of journalists to report on forced labour.</p>

No.	Lesson Learned / Good Practice
	<p>This initiative has helped raise awareness beyond the circle of stakeholders by the general public. Topics that used to be considered taboo such as forced labour, are openly discussed. The causes of forced labour are complex and understanding these causes is vital to finding solutions. Media can influence public perceptions and opinions about forced labour. The news that they report will bring the issue into the mainstream by engaging the public and generating support for relevant policy changes. Through this initiative, National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia (NHCRM) is essentially creating demand for P29. Through public clamour for better labour legislation, Government may improve and align its national legislative framework on the prevention and elimination of forced labour and eventually ratify P29.</p>
<p>GP2</p>	<p>Institutionalization of training by stakeholders in their respective organizations.</p> <p>Some stakeholders have institutionalized the relevant training in their respective organizations mainly because such an initiative is very well-aligned to their objectives and priorities. This means that ILO, the ILO engaged well with these organizations providing them the initial training through this Project. It's also noteworthy to note how the ILO tapped into NGOs to expand the geographic coverage of the training through different channels. By way of example, the Authority for Family, Children and Youth (AFCYD) has trained 3206 children and 170 public officers using different modules in 2020, in cooperation with its local offices and NGOs. Further trainings will be delivered in children's camps and centres, institutional care centres, youth development centres and family support centres. Reaching out to NGOs has created a multiplier effect not only in terms of raising awareness but also in terms of training.</p>
<p>GP3</p>	<p>Building Strong Women's Committees within Trade Unions.</p> <p>In Mongolia, the ILO, through its stakeholders, has strengthened the capacity of the women's committee within the national trade union by supporting a nation-wide campaign for violence and harassment-free workplaces. Relevant Women's issues are therefore included in discussions, thereby ensuring that women's voices are heard. By bringing them to the fore, ILO's technical assistance helps to build the capacity of tripartite bodies on equality issues faced by women, allowing social dialogue and tripartism to become more gender-sensitive and part of vital mechanisms for inclusive development.</p>

1.5 Final Evaluation Recommendations (Summary Table)

The table below summarises the final evaluation recommendations

Table 1.3 - Summary of the Final Evaluation Recommendations

No.	Recommendations
<p>R1</p>	<p>Develop communication materials to help EU Staff understand the work of ILO, its specificities and challenges: ILO should develop some communication materials (e.g., PowerPoint Presentations) explaining the key features of its work , the linkages to trade, and the ingredients/factors facilitating success including through examples of achievements recorded in</p>

No.	Recommendations
	<p>the past. While direct EU project counterparts in DG Trade may understand the specificities and challenges involved in ILO’s work, it does not necessarily follow that other EC staff will.</p> <p>Such presentational material could be circulated to relevant EC DGs and EU Delegations around the world. In any case, easily accessible and understandable material will be needed for new EU staff taking up roles in the EC or EEAS that involve interaction or engagement with the project. Similarly, this presentational material could explain the complementarity of the EU-ILO partnership.</p> <p>Priority: Medium Addressed to: ILO HQ (NORMES) – Development of communications material, dissemination within ILO and ILO networks; EC (DG Trade) – Review of material, dissemination within EC and to EEAS Timeframe: 1st Quarter of 2021 Resource implications: Budget/staff time allocation for the preparation of relevant materials.</p>
R2	<p>Develop communication materials to broadcast some of the Project’s successes, and the complementarity of the EU-ILO partnership: ILO should develop some communication and dissemination materials (e.g., video, PowerPoint, web pages) that explain the complementarity and value of the partnership, as well as using some of the project’s results and achievements to showcase the same.</p> <p>Priority: High Addressed to: ILO HQ (NORMES) – Development of communications material, ILO dissemination EC (DG Trade) – Review of material, dissemination within EC, EEAS, etc. Timeframe: 1st Quarter of 2021 Resource implications: Budget/staff time allocation for the preparation of relevant communication materials</p>
R3	<p>Strengthen communication, dialogue and information flow between ILO country offices and EU Delegations: Part of the value of EC-ILO collaboration around ILS is that EU staff can access readily ILO expertise and knowledge on the situation and developments in the target countries. However, this value has not been fully leveraged due to over focus on formal reporting, and too much focus on ILO country office communication via ILO Headquarters before information is transmitted to the EC (HQ).</p> <p>It is recommended that ILO in particular makes communication more value-focussed and results focussed, with a view to immediately strengthening the EU-ILO country-level dimension of the partnership (some ILO offices are already to some extent dialoguing with EU counterparts). This means being clear what is valuable for the other partner to have, what the other partner could bring at different points in the project or activity cycle in terms of knowledge or advice, and possibly creating an online (or even Microsoft Word) dashboard that could allow more effective country-level and global-level communication around progress.</p> <p>Priority: High Addressed to: ILO HQ (NORMES), with consultation with DG Trade.</p>

No.	Recommendations
	<p>Timeframe: 1st Quarter of 2021</p> <p>Resource implications: Budget/staff time allocation for communication process management, orientation of key people involved, and other materials</p>
R4	<p>Develop a stronger conceptual framework for the EU-ILO Partnership, as a first step to Strengthening the Value Proposition and Partnership</p> <p>The EU-ILO partnership is a highly complementary one that is bringing mutual value added to both partners. It is strongly recommended that a (rigorous) conceptual framework for the EU-ILO Partnership Is developed, as a first step to Strengthening the Value Proposition and Partnership.</p> <p>Priority: High</p> <p>Addressed to: ILO HQ (NORMES, other DGs) EU - EC (DG Trade, DG DEVCO), EU Delegations</p> <p>Timeframe: 1st Quarter of 2021</p> <p>Resource implications: Allocation of budget/staff time/TA for this undertaking as a project.</p>
R5	<p>Explore how operational mechanisms can be adapted or developed to grow ILO’s value (and that of the partnership with the EU)</p> <p>Potential most likely exists to improve the value of the partnership by a greater strategic view on what can be achieved during a project-based intervention, and what would need to happen outside of that intervention. In particular, more emphasis on a project “exit” strategy with a focus on maximising sustainability would bring further value to the partnership. Taking account of all stages of the project/intervention cycle, in particular pre-project (strategic situation/Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats analysis), project timeframe (and what is possible or can be made possible) and the post-project sustainability strategy, will likely help strengthen operational mechanisms and create the basis for a strengthened intervention logic and theory of change, as well as being highly complementary with the Reflection Questions set out in this evaluation report, and lead to a more strategic country-level framework and increased effectiveness and impact.</p> <p>Priority: High</p> <p>Addressed to: ILO HQ (NORMES, other ILO DGs)</p> <p>Timeframe: Q1-Q2 of 2021</p> <p>Resource implications: Allocation of budget for this as a project which can be integrated in other recommendations that pertain to the relationship between ILO and EU.</p>
R6	<p>Diplomatic Engagement and Strengthening of Cooperation. Continue the high-level engagement and strengthening of cooperation with high-ranking government officials not just from the Labour Ministry but probably also the Ministry of Trade. ILO can collaborate closely with the EU-Delegation on this undertaking. The goal is to raise awareness of high-ranking government officials on the benefits of GSP+ 3 and what has been accomplished to date in the country as far as the GSP Project on ILS, social dialogue and tripartism is concerned.</p> <p>Priority: High</p>

No.	Recommendations
	<p>Addressed to: ILO Country Director Timeframe: 1st Quarter of 2021 Resource implications: Allocation of time by ILO Country Directors.</p>
R7	<p>Operationalise within ILO a Discussion on the Reflection Questions</p> <p>It is recommended that ILO launch a structured reflection and discussion process on the questions below, as a contribution to its own ongoing organisational reflection and learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ RQ1 - Can ILO do more – and achieve more – with increased use of technology, including e-learning and e-guidance? ✓ RQ2 - Should ILO look anew at its approach to partnering, with a view to developing a partnership strategy and support that can amplify its impact? ✓ RQ3 - Can ILO do more in terms of increasing sustained impact in partner countries over the medium-term? ✓ RQ4 – COVID-19 Recovery - Can ILO strengthen linkages between its work around ILS and efforts to support COVID-19 recovery and building back better? <p>As can be seen, while these questions emanate from the evaluation work on this project, they are rather wide-ranging in scope, extending beyond ILO’s work on ILS. One option could be to do this with, for example, an Input Discussion Paper, supported by structured questions and an online or in situ discussion forum/fora. The questions could/should be adapted also to reflect existing internal reflection and policy development that is ongoing within ILO, or could be broadened or fine-tuned. For example, implicit in some questions is also the question whether there is a need to provide more systematic capacity development along with TA support?</p> <p>Priority: High Addressed to: ILO Senior Management, DG NORMES, ILO EVAL Timeframe: 1st Quarter of 2021 Resource implications: Allocation of time for such discussions to be included in relevant executive meetings within ILO.</p>

2 ABOUT THIS FINAL EVALUATION



Section Guide

This section sets out:

- *The overall report structure (Section 2.1)*
- *Project Background (Section 2.2)*
- *Evaluation Background (Section 2.3)*
- *Methodology (Section 2.4)*

2.1 About this Report

This document sets out the draft of the Final Evaluation (FE) report for the project Sustaining Strengthened National Capacities to Improve International Labour Standards Compliance and Reporting in Relevant European Union Trading Partners. The Final Evaluation process is conducted in line with the ILO guidelines for evaluation and the FE report is structured as follows:

- Section 2 (this section) sets out the background context, some summary information about the project, the evaluation background, and methodology;
- Section 3 sets out the Main Findings Gender Issues Assessment, Tripartite Issues Assessment, International Labour Standards Assessment;
- Section 4 sets out the Conclusions;
- Section 5 sets out the Lessons Learned and Emerging Good Practices;
- Section 6 sets out the Recommendations;
- Section 7 sets out the Report Annexes.

2.2 Project Background

ILO has multiple actions in the field of International labour standards (ILS) and offers technical assistance to countries seeking to overcome difficulties in the application of ILO Conventions. ILO's actions include technical advice and training on the application of ILS in target countries. Many of these actions allow countries to carry out activities focusing on reducing the gap with respect to the ILO Conventions they have ratified. Beneficiary countries receive ILO's technical advice and training with the objective of improving their reporting practices and building their reporting capacity in both quantitative and qualitative terms. ILO is characterized by being a trusted partner for this assistance.

Technical cooperation and assistance are a commitment of ILO with countries, when ILO's supervisory bodies note continuous or serious failures to effectively apply and report compliance on ILS. The technical cooperation is anchored in the legal obligations undertaken under ratified Conventions and is guided by the comments of the supervisory bodies. ILO has adopted 8 Fundamental Conventions that are aligned with the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and have become a reference point for social development.

Technical cooperation and assistance are a commitment of ILO with countries when ILO's supervisory bodies note continuous or serious failures to effectively apply and report compliance on ILS. Actions allow countries to carry out activities focusing on reducing the gap with respect to the ILO Conventions they have ratified. Beneficiary countries receive ILO's technical advice and training with the objective of improving their reporting practices and building their reporting capacity in both quantitative and qualitative terms.

In this context, the project “Sustaining Strengthened National Capacities to Improve International Labour Standards (ILS) Compliance and Reporting in Relevant European Union Trading Partners” was created. The project seeks to improve the application of the 8 Fundamental ILO Conventions in beneficiary countries of the GSP scheme (Mongolia and Pakistan) and the implementation of ILO fundamental conventions in the Trade for Sustainable Development Chapter of the EU Central America Association Agreement (El Salvador and Guatemala). Funded by the European Commission (DG TRADE) and with a budget of USD: USD 1,000,109, the project ran for a period of 28 months, from April 2018 to July 2020, following a no-cost extension of 6 months. The project focuses on the Sustainable Development Goal 8, implementing improved labour relations and working conditions in countries. ILO provided the target countries assistance in the application of the 8 fundamental ILO Conventions and meeting their obligations on standards, in particular, assistance was provided on the critical issues raised by the ILO supervisory bodies. Target countries were also assisted to fulfil their reporting obligations under these Conventions.

The selected countries are provided technical assistance to resolve critical issues raised by the ILO supervisory bodies and reflected under the EU GSP+/EU CAAA monitoring. The strategy was to act on several fronts to improve implementation of International Labour Standards (ILS), especially the Fundamental Conventions, and compliance with reporting obligations to the supervisory bodies within ILO. The EU special incentive arrangement for sustainable development and good governance arrangement (**GSP+**) provides advantageous tariff preferences (removal of tariffs on over 66% of tariff lines) to vulnerable developing countries that commit to ratify and effectively implement 27 core international conventions on human and labour rights, environment protection and good governance, including the eight fundamental ILO Conventions.

The main outcomes of the project are the following: 1) **Outcome 1:** The selected countries increase their compliance with their reporting obligations with respect to the ILO's Fundamental Conventions through the development of administrative/institutional capacity; 2) **Outcome 2:** The output of the reporting process at country level is improved through the increased and effective participation of the tripartite partners; 3) **Outcome 3:** Tripartite constituents are enabled to increase their institutional capacity through training on ILS and their supervisory mechanisms, which they can adapt and replicate; 4) **Outcome 4:** National curricula on ILS are available and taught at national training institutions; and 5) **Outcome 5:** Application of fundamental ILS is strengthened through initiatives and action by tripartite constituents, parliamentarians and judges (at central and local level). In this respect the project's activities involve 6 Components, as set out in Table 1 below.

Table 2.1 - Overview Project Activities by Component

Component	Core Activity
Component 1	Awareness-raising and training on issues related to the content of selected fundamental ILS.
Component 2	Capacity building of national organizations on application of selected fundamental ILS.
Component 3	Research to generate information on the status of implementation of ILS, including legislative gap analyses, advice on elements that will enable tripartite constituents to take the relevant decisions aimed at full implementation.

Component	Core Activity
Component 4	Strengthening of data collection and reporting capacity of the tripartite constituents including the capacity of using the systemic approach to managing ILS constitutional obligations.
Component 5	Development/publication of curricula or thematic materials on ILS (publications, studies, translation, conferences, etc.)
Component 6	Development of participatory processes and cross institutional action for implementation.

2.3 Evaluation Objectives, Scope and Approach

As per the evaluation guidelines for evaluation of ILO projects, this Final Evaluation includes generating an assessment of the up-to-date relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and progress toward results of project activities in relation to the stated objective. More specifically, the Final Evaluation is to assess the following five categories of project progress – i) Relevance and Validity of Design, ii) Coherence/Strategic fit, iii) Project results and effectiveness, iv) Efficiency of resource use, and v) Progress towards impact.

The purpose of the independent evaluation is to give an assessment of the effectiveness and the sustainability of the project across: i) Major outcomes; ii) Assessing performance as per the foreseen targets and indicators of achievement at output and outcome levels; iii) Strategies and implementation modalities chosen; iv) Partnership arrangements; v) Constraints and opportunities, and vi) Lessons to improve performance and delivery of future project results.

Regarding **project stakeholders and governance and ownership arrangements**, the evaluation was carried out by an independent evaluation team under the general supervision of the Evaluation Manager and ILO EVAL Office. Under the first phase, the evaluation approach was developed and a first review of the project documentation was carried out, as well as a launch conference call with the ILO Evaluation Office and an interview with the project management. The evaluation approach was based upon the questions set out below, which have been designed according to the evaluation category/parameter under which they belong, as well as learning/lessons learned and COVID-19.

The second phase of the evaluation work programme, the **stakeholder interview programme**, involved interviews with ILO project management and ILO Headquarters staff, EC Headquarters Staff (DG Trade) and EU Delegations, Project Management Board members and executing partners, Government authorities, external experts, trade union and employer representatives. All interviews were carried out remotely, due to COVID-19 restrictions, and taking account of the ILO guidelines for virtual evaluations, and particular importance was placed on keeping the list of issues simpler rather than unduly complex, and where possible shorter, as well as placing significant emphasis on flexibility to react to different perspectives and depths of knowledge and views amongst stakeholders. This did mean that it was at times difficult to administer all of the evaluation questions, but did have the advantage of focussing on the most important issues, and adapting the interview to the informant's role and experience/involvement with the project. In total, more than 40 stakeholders were consulted during this phase. The third and final phase was the analysis, synthesis and report development phase, during which this draft evaluation report has been developed.

Regarding **evaluation constraints**, the biggest constraint was carrying out the evaluation in what was a very condensed timeframe, and the relative complexity of the project in terms of number of countries involved (and related country contexts) and breadth of stakeholders. The logistics of managing the interview

programme within this timeframe was mitigated through a second evaluator being added to the evaluation team following discussion with the ILO Evaluation Office, and in particular the excellent support from ILO HQ and the project country co-ordinators in setting up the interviews.

The intended users and clients of the evaluation are the Project management Department (NORMES), ILO Country Offices in Beijing, Islamabad and San Jose, EVAL, European Commission (DG TRADE, DG DEVCO) EU Delegations in Islamabad, San Jose and Ulan Bator.

2.4 Project Background Context in Beneficiary Countries

2.4.1 El Salvador

In spite of the country's strategic location for trading with neighbouring markets, El Salvador has been recording a low economic growth over the past decades, with a GDP growth exceeding 3% only two times since 2000, which has translated into high poverty levels across the country and an increase in urban poverty. In 2016, it was reported that informal work was increasing while the national average unemployment rate stood at 7%, and 14.2% for the youngsters aged 16 to 24 years old. The general insecurity predominant in the country from recurrent natural disasters such as volcanic eruptions and floods and historic high rates of crimes and street violence have also contributed to a massive brain drain, with 1.5 million of Salvadorians living abroad, while 6.4 million remain in the country, hindering its capacity for a more exponential economic growth¹.

El Salvador is a member of the EU Central-America Association Agreement and has ratified the ILO's 8 Fundamental Conventions. It has not ratified the Protocol to Convention No. 29. The CEACR has pinpointed numerous gaps in the application of the ratified fundamental Conventions, including in the framework of the follow up to recommendations made by the Committee on Freedom of Association. The latter has examined several complaints for non-compliance with freedom of association rights and principles in El Salvador and has referred the follow up on the legislative aspects to the CEACR. The Conference Committee on the Application of Standards, which is a standing committee of the International Labour Conference, has also held discussions on the application by El Salvador of ILO Convention No. 144 on tripartite consultations, pinpointing gaps in the implementation of this instrument which is a governance Convention closely linked to freedom of association.² Hence, after further evaluation, the project has focused on strengthening the national tripartite institutions in improving the application of the Fundamental Conventions relevant to freedom association and collective bargaining, notably by strengthening protection against anti-union discrimination. These country-specific outcomes are reflected in the project action plan for El Salvador.

2.4.2 Guatemala

While Guatemala has one of the steadiest economic growth rates in Central America, fuelled by its predominant agricultural sector, it is ranked the 5th poorest country in Latin America, experiencing high inequalities and counting more than half of its population under the poverty line, including 13% living in extreme poverty. As a matter of fact, it is reported that only 40% of Guatemalan families enjoy food security³. The indigenous representing 40% of the population are more hard-hit by these social inequalities, with 73%

¹ World Bank. (n.d.). *El Salvador Country Profile*.

<https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/elsalvador/overview#:~:text=GDP%20growth%20in%20El%20Salvador,2.3%20percent%20in%20recent%20years>.

² https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100_COMMENT_ID:4000052

³ World Bank. (n.d.-b). *Guatemala Country Profile*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/guatemala/overview>

living under the poverty line and 22% in extreme poverty. Low government revenues hinder the country's public investments and the resulting lack of infrastructure and development of skills hamper foreign investment. In addition to this, the political instability of the country has historically resulted in high turnover in institutions and weak institutional capacities to overcome the prevailing national issues. Overall, the lack of working opportunities, political instability and recurrent natural disasters led to a massive movement of persons towards Northern America.

Guatemala is a member of the EU Central-America Association Agreement and has ratified ILO's 8 Fundamental Conventions. It has not ratified the Protocol to Convention No. 29. Following the recommendations and observations of the ILO supervisory bodies inviting the Government to improve and strengthen social dialogue processes with ILO technical assistance, the government of Guatemala was eligible to receive assistance from the ILO. Numerous supervisory body comments are pending on Guatemala along with complaints before the CFA while an article 26 complaint for non-conformity with Conventions Nos. 87 and 98 was made by delegates to the 101st Session (2012) of the International Labour Conference under article 26 of the ILO Constitution. The procedure relative to the complaint was closed in 2019 by the Governing Body which holds recurrent discussions of the measures taken to implement the roadmap agreed among the country's tripartite constituents in this regard.⁴ The project has aimed for the implementation of the conventions on elimination of child labour, prevention and elimination of forced labour, end of discrimination at work, respect of the freedom of association, in addition to strengthening of social dialogue at national level and training for reaching compliance with ILS reporting obligations. These country-specific outcomes are reflected in the project action plan for Guatemala.

2.4.3 Mongolia

Mongolia has been transitioning to a democratic market economy since the 1990s. Since then, it has recorded an exponential GDP growth coupled with a more educated population, and the availability of its many resources suggest that the country will continue to thrive in the future. The Government came up with a 2016-2020 action plan in order to increase the productivity in its manufacturing and agricultural sectors on one hand and maximize trade opportunities on the other. As a recently transitioned country, Mongolia faces a number of compliance gaps with ratified ILS due to a predominant informal economy and lack of awareness on human rights related practices at work.

Mongolia is a member of the GSP+ countries of the EU and has ratified the ILO's 8 Fundamental Conventions. It has not ratified the Protocol to Convention No. 29. To support Mongolia's economic transition and implementation of the Conventions, the country adopted a Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) which was implemented with ILO assistance and in collaboration with the country's tripartite constituents, between 2006 and 2010, and 2017 and 2021. Prior to the launching of the DWCP, the CEACR had emphasized the immediate need to assist the country in fighting against child labour, forced labour and human trafficking. It also observed the lack of awareness of the meaning of forced labour by employers in small and medium enterprises. Hence, the Mongolian project will be tackled with a perspective of elimination of child labour, forced labour and human trafficking, by strengthening the institutional capacities to support implementation of fundamental principles and rights at work, and by providing legal assistance to design national policies relevant with the achievement of these outcomes. These country-specific outcomes have been reflected in the project action plan for Mongolia.

⁴ https://www.ilo.org/gb/GBSessions/GB340/ins/WCMS_758124/lang--en/index.htm

2.4.4 Pakistan

With 200 million inhabitants, Pakistan is the 6th most populated country in the world, and the 9th provider in terms of workforce. Being a predominantly rural country, more than 45% of its population is working in the agricultural sector which is excluded from the scope of labour laws. Out of the remaining 55% of the population, 70% operate in the informal economy. Within the informal segment of the economy, the constitution of tripartite agreements and normative implementation of ILS become a challenge. In fact, lack of general awareness and labour regulations might induce a higher risk for non-respect of fundamental rights in the world of work such as child labour, forced labour and discrimination of vulnerable groups such as women, and constitute a more difficult area for monitoring from labour inspection. The 4 provinces of Pakistan as holders of their own legislative power in labour matters are responsible for building the regulatory framework necessary for the implementation of ILS. At the national level, Pakistan is planning to develop its garment and textile sector in the horizon of 2025 through investment and training of the workforce, to pave the way in providing the most vulnerable groups with steady jobs, thereby reducing poverty and boosting the country's economy.

Pakistan is a member of the GSP+ countries of the EU and has ratified the 8 Fundamental Conventions. It has not ratified the Protocol to Convention No. 29. To support Pakistan in its efforts to implement the Conventions in the context of its broad informal economy, the ILO implemented a Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) between 2016 and 2020. In addition to this initiative, the ILO carried out an EU-funded project that focused on providing assistance for evidence-based data collection to support Pakistan's reporting obligations and strengthening its institutional capacities to enforce labour laws, guarantee fundamental rights at work and enhance social dialogue. Particular focus was placed on application by the Province of Baluchistan. These country-specific outcomes have been reflected in the project action plan for Pakistan.

3 EVALUATION FINDINGS



Section Guide

This section sets out the principal review findings with regard to:

- *Relevance and Validity of Design (Section 3.1)*
- *Coherence/ Strategic fit (Section 3.2)*
- *Project results and effectiveness (Section 3.3)*
- *Efficiency of resource use (Section 3.4)*
- *Progress Towards Impact (Section 3.5)*
- *Sustainability (Section 3.6)*
- *Gender Issues Assessment (Section 3.7)*
- *Tripartite Issues Assessment (Section 3.8)*
- *International Labour Standards Assessment (Section 3.9)*

3.1 Relevance and Validity of Design

Overall, the **project's objectives and design took into account the needs, policies, and priorities of beneficiaries and stakeholders (global, country, and partner/institutions)**. Regarding the **quality/appropriateness of project design**, the project was well-designed and set up to contribute to Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8 through improved labour relations and working conditions in the focus countries, consistent with the focus countries' ILO commitments. More specifically, it was aligned to improving the application of the 8 fundamental ILO conventions among the four beneficiary countries of the EU preferential GSP Scheme. The interventions were therefore limited to building administrative capacity in implementing the ILS and focusing on institutional development. As labour standards tend to be embedded in trade agreements, there is a leeway to expand the design so as to accommodate the opportunity of leveraging trade on ILO's core international labour standards, with such an expanded design for example possibly including high-level engagement with relevant government officials on strengthening cooperation. There is also likely scope to further improve the project design in terms of making it more gender-sensitive and inclusive, in particular in the area of strengthening social dialogue and tripartism. A deliberate mechanism to include at least inequality issues of women and other vulnerable groups would not only improve the design of the project but also its impact.

It should be noted that the selected countries are provided technical assistance to resolve critical issues raised by the ILO supervisory bodies and reflected under the EU GSP+/EU CAAA monitoring. The strategy was to act on several fronts to improve implementation of International Labour Standards (ILS), especially the Fundamental Conventions, and compliance with reporting obligations to the supervisory bodies within ILO. The EU special incentive arrangement for sustainable development and good governance arrangement (**GSP+**) provides advantageous tariff preferences (removal of tariffs on over 66% of tariff lines) to vulnerable developing countries that commit to ratify and effectively implement 27 core international conventions on human and labour rights, environment protection and good governance, including the eight fundamental ILO Conventions. The project therefore serves the economic interest of the four countries as it is very much linked to trade.

Regarding **Mongolia**, for example, the project took into account government's priorities, including when these priorities did evolve or change, which sometimes meant changing the project work priorities and actions, or unforeseen delays – a case in point was when the government decided to prioritize the adoption of the draft revised Labour Law over P29 ratification. Project Management had to adjust its subsequent strategies. Other needs and priorities of stakeholders were also taken into account. In **Guatemala and El Salvador**, freedom of association was not considered a priority for both countries' governments, as can be seen in complaints brought to ILO regarding anti-union discrimination (and hence the project focus on strengthening the national tripartite institutions in improving the application of the Fundamental Conventions relevant to freedom of association and collective bargaining, notably by strengthening protection against anti-union discrimination). Otherwise, the activities that are reflected in the project design have been carried out.

In **Pakistan**, while the policies and priorities of most beneficiaries and stakeholders were taken into account for the most part, some stakeholders considered that there was room for improvement. Being a GSP+ beneficiary country since January, 2014, Pakistan stands to benefit on the continuity and sustenance of this trade for development facility to improve the country's compliance and reporting on twenty-seven international standards, including the eight Fundamental Conventions. However, some stakeholders such as the Ministry of Overseas Pakistanis and Human Resource Development (MOPHRD) considered that the project design would have been enhanced had other specific stakeholders been considered. In the latter case, stakeholder feedback received showed no recall of the Ministry being consulted during the design of this project. Furthermore, while EU-Trade in Pakistan was consulted on the design, some feedback indicated that more engagement should have taken place during the implementation of the project. This resonates with the feedback from MOPHRD.

According to the EU-Trade Representative, there are difficulties in attaining overall objectives because the Project started with one province. One alternative strategy would have been to include all of the four (4) provinces from the start. With proper situation analysis and needs assessment of each province, the project could have packaged small interventions for each province, as well as planning for active involvement of civil society in the relevant elements of the project, such as gender issues, labour rights, discrimination, capacity issues. While it was acknowledged that this can be a long and extensive process, it was considered to be helpful in terms of strengthening the project's sustainability prospects. It is important to point out that some of the above points where stakeholders' needs or priorities were considered not to have been taken sufficiently into account, need to be interpreted with care and are as likely to be a consequence of trying to formulate a multi-country global ILS project within a short period of time. In these circumstances, the project design can probably not realistically hope to accommodate every single priority or need, partly due to the range and number of stakeholders who would need to be consulted. Similarly, in some cases consultation with some stakeholders might demonstrate a context of very weak stakeholder capacity where it is difficult to articulate needs, or where the communication and relationship with other stakeholders is weak and/or difficult.

3.2 Coherence/ Strategic Fit

Overall, the project shows **good alignment with national priorities and with other ongoing ILO and wider UN initiatives on labour rights and ILS in the participating countries**. Moreover, the project has also worked hard to *adapt to changing government priorities*, notwithstanding the cost to the project in terms of additional effort or delays or having to rebuild momentum, as seen for example in its adapting to the Mongolian government's prioritizing the adoption of the draft revised Labour Law over P29 ratification. The

Project is also aligned to ILO Country Program Priorities (2017 to 2021) to develop, along with its constituents, improvements in labour market governance and institutions. In Pakistan, for example, the project is aligned with national priorities and complemented other on-going ILO and wider UN initiatives on labour rights and ILS.

Regarding the project's **alignment with other ongoing ILO and wider UN initiatives on labour rights and ILS in the participating countries**, this can for example be seen in its alignment with ILO's work priorities in Mongolia related to i) employment promotion strategies to address issues of sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation in the formal and informal economy and ii) strengthening tripartism to support social and economic policy development and implementation. The project is also complementary to ILO work in the country to ensure (iii) better application of rights and security for targeted groups focusing on child labour, disabled persons and forced labour.

In **Guatemala**, the project is very much aligned to achieving SDG 8, and to achieving the objectives of the ILO Office for Central America, Haiti, Panama and the Dominican Republic, which in turn are aligned with government programs and with the United Nations cooperation framework in the country. In fact, in 2019, the Project provided support to constituents in view of their participation in the United Nations working groups for the formulation of the new 2020-2025 Development framework.

In **El Salvador**, The project contributes directly towards realising SDG 8 in El Salvador, and is also aligned to the objectives of the ILO Office for Central America, Haiti, Panama and the Dominican Republic, which in turn is aligned with government programmes and with the United Nations cooperation framework in the country. It should also be noted that the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards, which is a standing committee of the International Labour Conference, has also held discussions on the application by El Salvador of ILO Convention No. 144 in tripartite consultations, pinpointing gaps in the implementation of this instrument which is a governance Convention closely linked to freedom of association. This is precisely the reason as to why the Project was designed to focus on strengthening the national tripartite institutions in improving the application of the Fundamental Conventions relevant to freedom of association and collective bargaining, notably by strengthening protection against anti-union discrimination. While there may have been concurrence by the previous government to pursue this, the new Administration does not have interest on the implementation of the project.

The **project's alignment with national needs** was further strengthened through assessment work carried out during the project inception phase, where the capacity of ministries of labour, social partners and other stakeholders to fulfil their mandate to lead national efforts and demand accountability for implementation of the ILO Fundamental conventions was deemed weak. This included weak institutional capacities in *El Salvador* (weak national capacities on ILS, reporting capacity); in *Guatemala* (similar challenges); in *Mongolia* (weak national capacities on ILS, particularly forced labour and labour exploitation); weak coordination and capacity of constituents in *Pakistan*. In response to these assessment findings, the Project provided training and capacity development support to enhanced capacity in terms of better understanding of ILS and enhanced coordination and consultation among social partners, as well as satisfying the ILS reporting requirements.

3.3 Project Results and Effectiveness

Overall, the project successfully achieved most of its objectives and correspondingly implemented the planned activities in each of the four countries. In particular, the project successfully supported social dialogue by providing training and orientation, supporting establishment of structures and building trust

among constituents, all of which significantly improved capacity and commitment to social dialogue. In view of its focus on institutional development, the Project carried out relevant training activities, targeting social partners and government institutions thereby improving the knowledge and understanding on ILS in all four countries. The training successfully built capacity in enhancing ILS reporting in terms of quality, better participation, improved coordination with other line ministries and conformance to overall reporting requirements.

In addition to the above, training materials have been produced and circulated which will be valuable beyond the completion of the project. In some countries, the COVID-19 pandemic propelled some stakeholders to adapt training into online formats allowing for broader dissemination. In fact, such training has been integrated in their respective institutions for delivery using their own budget beyond the life span of the project.

Any assessment of effectiveness has to take account of the challenges in delivering ambitious work programmes with relatively limited budgets in four countries in two subcontinents, and in particular in the level of influence of external factors and implementation challenges over which the project has limited to no control. As mentioned earlier, in Pakistan, the 2018 election caused significant project implementation delays, as it did also in **El Salvador** and **Guatemala**, and in **Mongolia** the project had to adapt to the government's prioritizing the adoption of the draft revised Labour Law over P29 ratification.

In **Guatemala**, challenges encountered included loss of interest of some stakeholders in view of the decision taken by the ILO Governing Body in November 2018 to close the complaint filed against the State of Guatemala under Article 26 for breach of ILO Convention 87, and the change of administration. Notwithstanding those impediments, the Project still carried out activities focussed on strengthening the capacities of workers and employers in the context of social dialogue as reflected in its commitments in the 2013 Priority Road Map for the country and the new government. In **El Salvador**, a similar challenge was encountered with the change of government and a new administration that was much less interested in the implementation of the project. To adapt, the Project focused on conducting training on the most relevant topics, orienting new government staff on ILS and the FPRW agenda. The initial support during the transition process was effective in dealing with this impediment but social dialogue during the first half of the project decreased significantly, although over the project cycle the project did succeed in improving social dialogue and in achieving a significant strengthening of the institutional structures for social dialogue, such as the re-activation of the Tripartite Labour Council.

Key constraints on the achievement of the project's expected results include the COVID-19 pandemic and national elections. The COVID-19 pandemic, not surprisingly, led to some delays. For example, in some instances national counterparts had to postpone or cancel altogether some capacity building activities due to Covid19 restrictions. With the pandemic restricting the movement of people, efforts were diverted to production of online materials containing information on the preparation of reports to the ILO. National counterparts had to generate information in electronic format not just as a work tool but also in the conduct of meetings and training. COVID-19 thus affected the output delivery commitments of national counterparts due to very restricted movement of people in the country. It should be noted that inputs from ILO specialists based in San Jose were needed for the necessary interventions. The Project consequently focused on the production of materials that would help in the preparation of reports to the ILO and also in the conduct of virtual meetings and trainings.

Regarding the impact of national elections, these more often than not led to turnover of senior and middle-management staff in government departments, as well as the generally below-par capacity levels of these institutions. However, through adaptive management, the projects in four countries reoriented their

strategies to overcome those changes and challenges by orienting and training new staff to ensure momentum and continuity. In some instances, COVID19 led to innovation in the delivery of training.

In **Mongolia**, stakeholders have emphasized the fact that some activities, such as the development and enactment of legislation, take time to be realised, as is the case with the ratification of P29 and its subsequent enforcement. While significant progress has been made for prospective Mongolian legislation to be compliant with ILS, the challenge lies in its full implementation, such as in the level of forced labour believed to exist in the informal sector of the economy. Regarding implementation constraints in **Mongolia**, one challenge has been staff changes within government agencies, especially regarding staff who have received capacity development from the project. COVID-19 did constrain to some extent the project's capacity to achieve its objectives to the fullest extent. While project staff adapted quickly to convert face-to-face capacity development to online training, enrolment was low and showed a need to further promote online training. As mentioned earlier, another challenge was when the government decided to prioritize labour legislation instead of simultaneously holding deliberations on P29.

Stakeholder feedback in **Pakistan** showed that achievement of project objectives is deemed to be moderately satisfactory, as some outputs and results have been delayed due to factors outside of the control of the project, and have been carried into post-project work efforts. Results include the i) draft implementation strategy being endorsed by the PTCC in Baluchistan, where the project liaised with the ILES project⁵, which is providing TA to the Ministry of Overseas Pakistanis and Human Resource Development (MoOP&HRD) in developing the National Labour Protection Framework (NLPF); ii) the needs assessment of the labour judiciary in view of their role and responsibilities in enforcement of ILS-compliant labour legislation, although no clear evidence was identified of the follow-up of capacity development plan; and iii) Qualitative research undertaken to identify sectors and areas that face significant risks of forced labour, as well as the population groups most vulnerable to entering situations of forced labour and Important indicators and variables regarding FPRW identified for consideration of future LFS. A draft summary report was prepared for tripartite consultation to promote possible ratification of P29 by the Government of Pakistan, while the full report on the GAP analysis will be finalised under the Trade for Decent Work project based on the report. Regarding the iv) development of the analysis on the Child Labour survey, the datasets were not available at the end of the project, and the support to data analysis has been rolled over into another (DFID-funded) project.

As with other countries, the project's contribution to improving social dialogue across the project countries stands out in **El Salvador and Guatemala**. This has required significant patience and investment from ILO, nurturing a culture of social dialogue and tripartism around ILS. This work has started from a very challenging standpoint in both countries where trust levels were low, capacities were very weak and dialogue either near absent or non-existent. Furthermore, in some cases, such as in the trade union moment, additional challenges included a plethora of small and under-resourced bodies with limited capacity and a lack of a history of effective collaboration.

Collaboration/Co-ordination with other on-going ILO, UN and/or Other Partners' Programmes /Initiatives

The project has also been relatively effective in **co-ordinating and collaborating with other on-going ILO, UN and/or other partners' programmes/projects/initiatives**. In **Mongolia**, for example, the Project has collaborated with other ongoing ILO programmes, although not so much with other UN initiatives and other partners' initiatives where the nature of coordination tends to be limited to information-sharing. Government stakeholders and national partners have praised the collaboration with ILO, considering it of

⁵ The ILES project has been providing the TA to the Ministry of Overseas Pakistanis and Human Resource Development (MoOP&HRD) in developing the National Labour Protection Framework (NLPF).

high quality, and underlining that shortcomings have been on their side. ILO were considered to have provided clear guidelines in carrying out the gap analysis and in the design and delivery of training activities, as well as a high quality of capacity development support in general. In **Pakistan**, the project has collaborated with a range of international actors and projects, including UNICEF, the International Labour and Environmental Standards (ILES) Project, the Labour Standards in Global Supply Chains (LSGSC), DFID, the Italy-funded project “Promotion of Decent Work Opportunities for the economic empowerment of vulnerable segments of society”, the EU-funded and ILO-implemented Trade for Decent Work project, and the EU-funded Bridging Project.

Influence of Internal and External Factors on Project Capacity to Reach its Objectives

There have also been some important **internal and external factors that have influenced and/or hindered the project’s capacity to reach its objectives**. For at least some of these factors, ILO has had little to no control, such as for example changing Government priorities, policies, national elections, etc. In El Salvador, Guatemala, and Pakistan, these factors have not been taken into account as risks and uncertainties that could have affected project implementation. However, in Mongolia, it was explicitly mentioned that progress to meet its ILS obligations and use of ILS capabilities to open up trade opportunities will depend on government commitment and its ability to foster sustained institutional capacity development and policy continuity within the government structure at all levels. In the case of **Pakistan**, for example, the Election in 2018 partly delayed certain activities of the project as senior government officials had to be replaced. Beyond the impact of elections in project countries, and the delays or postponement in activities that elections have generated, this has created a wider problem of staff turnover, which has created knock-on problems of losing experienced staff and sometimes having to start over and resume engagement and capacity building work from scratch. The time and momentum-building loss linked to elections has also impacted adversely in El Salvador, Guatemala and Pakistan, with Mongolia being the sole country where national elections did not create delays for the project. Co-ordination with sub-national administrative levels and logistical issues have also played a part, such as in Baluchistan, where distance/difficulty of access and security issues created additional challenges for project implementation. Moreover, the High Court decision prohibiting Trade Unions caused further implementation challenges. Other factors, of a more internal nature, did constraint implementation, such as the departure of the International Labour Specialist covering Pakistan⁶.

In **Mongolia**, beyond the impact of elections in project countries, and the delays or postponement in activities that elections have generated, an important challenge has been staff turnover within government ministries and agencies, which has created knock-on problems of losing experienced staff and sometimes having to start over and resume engagement and capacity building work from scratch. The COVID-19 pandemic also created some challenges in the latter stages of the project implementation, although the project team was quick to convert face-to-face training to on-line training format. Due to low enrolment in online training, there is however still a need to promote online training vs. traditional face-to-face training. Other challenges have been the government’s prioritizing of labour legislation instead of simultaneously deliberating P29, requiring project strategy and work plan adaptation.

As mentioned above, national elections caused delays in both **El Salvador** and **Guatemala**, as well as further disruption and loss of momentum through staff turnover in government ministries, including in key counterpart ministries. Furthermore, the project had to also deal with delays and momentum loss before national elections, as in **El Salvador**, where a drop in political will was observed in the months leading up to

⁶ ILO had an ILS specialist covering Pakistan, but not as part of the team as she was based in Delhi, and who departed Delhi to take on another assignment.

the election. In **Guatemala**, ILO's closing of the complaint filed against Guatemala for breach of ILO C87 also created concerns that some stakeholders' interest and political commitment would be adversely affected.

Going forward, in the preparation of any future ILS support project document, any risks and uncertainties that might affect the implementation of the project would have to be identified. Moreover, development of a more robust theory of change in the project documents would equally enable a more robust results framework. Such a theory of change would have further contributed to establishing valuable pathways to anticipate changes in government and thereby proactively manage adaptation strategies and necessary collaboration in the engagement of government stakeholders.

3.4 Efficiency of Resource Use

It is important to underline that any analysis of efficiency of project implementation and project management needs to take account of the specific context of this project. Firstly, the project has had to maintain a focus and deliver an (ambitious) work programme in 4 countries (and 4 challenging country contexts) across two sub-continent, requiring co-ordination with 4 national and sub-national strata of actors in these countries, relevant EU Delegations, ILO HQ (including NORMES and other actors, ITC Turin and ILO Brussels) and the EC in Brussels. Furthermore, the project work programme in each country is heavily influenced by external factors, over which ILO has little control, in particular changing Government priorities, policies, national elections, etc. In the case of Pakistan, for example, the Election in 2018 partly delayed certain activities of the project as senior government officials had to be replaced. Beyond the impact of elections in project countries, and the delays or postponement in activities that elections have generated, this has created a wider problem of staff turnover, which has created knock-on problems of losing experienced staff and sometimes having to start over and resume engagement and capacity building work from scratch.

Overall, **project management** has been for the most part adequate, although there is scope for improvement. It should however be emphasised that the project did present some challenges in terms of the geographical coverage of the project, and the relative ambition, which has meant that at times ILO struggled to deliver the targeted results within the available country-level and overall budgets. In this respect, the project has had an important cost-efficiency value in that it has been able to start and/or build on ILO past work and reputation in the project countries, and this is an important value for money dimension to ILO's wider value proposition as a partner to the EU that should not be ignored.

From a wider project management perspective (i.e., both at overall and country-level management), the project has done reasonably well in adapting to changes on the ground. In Pakistan, for example, when the government changed its priorities to focus on the adoption of the draft revised Labour law over P29 ratification, the project management team adjusted its own implementation strategy to take this into account. In fact, the MoOPHRD requested TA from ILO for developing a model law on forced labour elimination. In Mongolia, project management was also considered to have been adaptive in that while government wanted to prioritise labour legislation, fundamental steps for P29 ratification were anchored on capacity development strategy for journalists, among other important stakeholders. With COVID-19, stakeholders such as MBA were quick to adopt online learning.

Regarding communication, the project has for the most part been effective towards core stakeholder groups and constituents, while it has also registered a number of innovations. Of particular note has been the volume and increased reach of online communication and dissemination, which has had significant outreach, such as the video on ILS in a COVID-19 crisis period, as well as infographics on COVID-19 mitigation and prevention in the workplace. Regarding **project communication** between ILO and the EU at the country level, this has

been somewhat uneven, although it is important to acknowledge that some country-level communication between ILO and the EU has been ongoing in the project countries, an example being the ILO's Mongolia Country Director periodically engaging with, and updating, the EU Delegation on the project's work and progress. Overall, however, there has been too much focus on ILO-EU communication flowing from ILO country teams via ILO HQ and onto the EC HQ (DG Trade) and then to relevant EU Delegations and other interested parties (e.g., DG DEVCO). This has also at times created unnecessary work for ILO HQ and the DG Trade staff, who had to relay the communication to counterparts in the EU Delegations etc., with the disadvantage that they are relaying information second-hand. Going forward, there is a need to significantly increase the communication between ILO country staff and counterpart EU Delegations in the project focus countries.

Project reporting has in terms of content for the most part being adequate, although a greater focus could be placed on extracting learning and wider points for reflection. However, the delivery of timely reporting has proven a challenge at times, with reports arriving late and sometimes lacking sufficient internal quality control, due in part to time pressure to pull together the various country and other inputs. This has also created challenges for the EC, not just in terms of unnecessary time on quality control but also pressure to approve project reports within internal EC deadlines and an excessive focus on report verification rather than more substantive discussion between ILO and the EC on project progress, findings and learning.

Regarding **efficiency of resource use**, the project has achieved significant savings vis-à-vis budget due to synergies established with other ILO projects along with benefits gained through use of regular ILO funds meant for single strategy across several projects. Stakeholder feedback has also shown that the project is perceived as having been efficiently managed and implemented by ILO. In **Mongolia**, for example, the Project showed strong efficiencies in the management of its resources, in fact achieving significant savings in terms of its budget thanks to being part of the overall ILO programme in Mongolia and some smart spending. Some normative work in particular the advice on labour law revisions benefited significantly from the ILO regular budget. The project also generated savings from travel costs due to the COVID-19 pandemic though it also had to face some difficulties in delivering some outputs. Stakeholders considered that the efficiency in the management of resources also emanated from the fact that work packages were distributed to stakeholders whose share of the work within the Project was well aligned with their needs, policies, and priorities. An example is the Mongolia Bar Association (MBA), which carried out a series of training sessions for Mongolian judges, prosecutors, lawyers, as well as documenting the trainings and dissemination through webinars. MBA also integrated the ILS related training into the curriculum for the required continuing education of lawyers in Mongolia. The painstaking identification of these stakeholders by the Project creates an inherent accountability among these stakeholders that extends beyond the life of the Project. This in turn was considered to generate strong ownership of project outputs among national players, allowing project outputs to be used beyond the project period and revitalising national and local discourse and conversation about labour rights and social and economic development. In El Salvador and Guatemala, stakeholders generally considered that the project had been efficiently managed and implemented by ILO, with the main efficiency constraints being budget resources and the relatively short project duration.

In **El Salvador** and **Guatemala**, the project was considered to have been efficiently implemented, with some efficiencies gained through implementation in parallel to existing ILO interventions around employment, labour inspection and migration. Another efficiency gain was realised through the use of one national co-ordinator for both El Salvador and Guatemala, while other efficiency gains were realised through ILO's programmatic approach, accelerating and facilitating access to ILO technical specialists for specific questions.

In **Pakistan**, the original financial allocation of USD 231,049 was reduced to USD 212,617.69 due to exchange rate losses. The Project financed the activities as planned and budget shortfall was managed through effective coordination with the office and sister projects while maintaining the quality of outputs. International consultants engaged for the Project happened to be in the country, thereby leading to savings on air-travel and accommodation costs. For approximately USD 200,000 Technical Assistance (TA) per country, the Project generated significant results which can be attributed to ILO's project management efficiency. Regarding adequacy of budget resources, some stakeholders considered more could have been done, had greater budget envelopes been available. In Pakistan, for example, resources for the technical support for ILS and labour law reform work were considered generally sufficient for the technical work, consultations and workshops, but more resources⁷ would have made it possible to involve more stakeholders and host larger workshops. Resource efficiencies were also achieved with the increased transition to online delivery and promotion due to COVID-19, and the (often) increased reach that online promotion achieved.

The total execution of the project considered for El Salvador and Guatemala as a whole, represented a little more than 98% of execution, with the amount not disbursed (10,000 euros) assigned to technical assistance in training. Further efficiency and value for money is created by the significant reservoir of country knowledge, trust/relationships, and in-country office and expertise that ILO brings to the project work in each country, compared with alternative implementation scenarios such as implementation by a consultancy provider following a tendering procedure, where these assets/advantages would for the most part not exist. This is a core part of the distinct value proposition of ILO to this kind of project, not just to the EU but also to other development actors and donors and/or partners for other potential projects, that can be further explored in the future.

The project has also **adapted relatively efficiently to the COVID-19 pandemic**, moving planned capacity building work online. For example, in **Mongolia**, the planned capacity building work for journalists around P29 was delivered online instead of in person. More, generally, stakeholder consultation emphasised the speed at which training was moved online, and going forward there is interest in further promoting online learning delivery. The Project was efficient in delivering the desired results notwithstanding the COVID-19 pandemic. It is particularly noteworthy that stakeholders immediately converted face-to-face training to on-line learning format. Moving forward, the intention among stakeholders is to further promote this mode of learning. From the point of view of the stakeholders, the pandemic only affected them to the extent of the implementation on the latter part of the project and they had to "make do" with the situation within their available means.

3.5 Progress Towards Impact

Regarding impacts generated by the project, one such impact is the institutionalization of tripartite committees to discuss reporting matters and look into the comments of the ILO supervisory bodies pertaining to implementation of ratified Conventions. Through the tripartite committees, the ILO is able to provide further technical assistance and support through other projects and programs within ILO and/or with other related initiatives by other UN agencies and development partners.

Another important impact has been an improved understanding and knowledge on ILS among government staff, policy makers and social partners leading to overall improvement in national capacity to apply ILS in

⁷ It was noted by Project Management that the presence of a dedicated administration and finance assistant would, for example, have helped in the administration efficiency of the project.

law reform, judicial processes and other relevant fields. The various training and orientation activities ensured sustained momentum even when there was a change of Administration or government. A further impact is improved reporting on ILS both in terms of the quality of reporting and in terms of the systems and processes within ministries of labour to coordinate and consult with social partners and with other line ministries. Improved quality of reporting emanates from the project's support to improved capacity and social dialogue.

In **Pakistan**, a key impact of the Project has been the improved understanding and awareness of ILS and good practices in comparative labour law in different provinces and among government, employers and trade unions. Moreover, there was a noticeably improved social dialogue and technical capacities on issues of freedom of association and collective bargaining and improved measurement of fundamental principles and rights at work, particularly concerning child labour and forced labour.

In **Mongolia**, one unintended impact has been that labour rights and child labour and forced labour issues which used to be conversation taboos have now become topics for conversations, and there is a perceived interest in these topics across different sectors as well as among the general public. Another unintended impact of the Project was when 3 NGOs on their own initiative delivered training in schools and training to teachers, integrating the training (on the topics of child rights, child labour, and human trafficking) in civics classes. Although no draft operational protocol has been prepared on P29, many of its intended provisions have been incorporated in the proposed labour legislation and in the customized training tools for journalists, child protection officers, labour inspectors, youth and family development officers. However, creating sustained impact and change will require not only robust legislation but also a strong enforcement regime, while to-date there have been no prosecutions related to child labour or forced labour infringements precisely because these outcomes take time. It should be noted however that a significant milestone has been achieved when gaps were identified and recommendations on gap-filling measures made so that strong legislation on the implementation of P29 will hopefully be adopted following its eventual ratification. It is also likely that some follow-on impact will manifest itself over time from the work of ILO in building a strong women's committee within the national trade union and making it visible, such that this can pave the way for the generation of ideas that can be picked up by local institutions. Using that same model, other vulnerable groups could also be possibly represented in the national trade union provided they are identified, engaged and organized.

3.6 Sustainability

Regarding the extent to which the planned results of the project are likely to be sustained and/or scaled-up and replicated by stakeholders, ILO is an important sustainability anchor of the project as it continues to pursue its normative and tripartite mandate in these countries, while the ILO supervisory bodies continue to function and supervise application of ratified Conventions. For instance, some of the related components of this project can be carried over to its work under the Trade for Decent Work Umbrella, among others to ensure that they will be sustained beyond the life span of the project. It also collaborates with other UN agencies and development partners who may have initiatives related to the project. More importantly, ILO continues to work with the government and social partners on issues of compliance and sustained participation in tripartite institutions.

Thus, alignment of the project with ILO's general work priorities in the project countries should also contribute to strengthening sustainability prospects. For example, in **Mongolia**, the Project is aligned to ILO's DWCPs and CPOs more specifically on work priorities in the country related to i) employment promotion strategies to address issues of sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation in the formal and informal

economy and ii) strengthening tripartism to support social and economic policy development and implementation. The project is also complementary to ILO work in the country to ensure iii) better application of rights and security for targeted groups focusing on child labour, disabled persons and forced labour. In view of such alignment, ILO Mongolia is very much an anchor for the project's implementation and sustainability.

The increased development of online training resources will also contribute to sustained impact, as they will be available for use by stakeholders in the post-project period. Similarly, the capacities developed and support actions to ILO partners (e.g., strengthening the capacity of the Women's Committee in the Trade Union in Mongolia by supporting a nation-wide campaign for violence and harassment-free workplaces) and to nurturing social dialogue and the related institutional support, will continue, even if it is difficult to predict at this point how much momentum will be sustained and how much further support would be required from ILO. Going forward, it is however worth reflecting on whether there is scope for a more strategic and systemic view of the desired change and future situation in a country, coupled with a new and/more systematic approach to change and to sustainability, that could contribute to strengthening sustainability prospects.

3.7 Gender Issues Assessment

The project has made some important contributions to supporting the creation of gender-sensitive representative voices, such as for example ILO's work with its partners and stakeholders in Mongolia in strengthening the capacity of the women's committee within the Trade Union. This helps ensure that relevant women's issues are therefore included in TU discussions, and this might be worth replicating in other countries. The project reporting for El Salvador, Guatemala and Mongolia have gender-disaggregated data in their reporting of participation in project events and capacity building activities, although this was not observed in the case of reporting for Pakistan. Another positive element was the prominence of women in the leadership of some ILO country teams and government stakeholders interviewed, such as in the case of Mongolia, where it was observed that all were women.

However, the project design does not seem to include a clear and consistent gender dimension, and it is not clear that the project design included a specific review from a gender-sensitive lens with a view to ensuring that the project adequately addressed gender issues in its design. The evaluation has also not seen evidence that the gap analyses carried out pertaining to P29 (Protocol of 2014 to the Forced Labour Convention, 1930) provided for gender-disaggregated data and/or data affecting other vulnerable groups such as workers with disabilities, indigenous peoples, migrant workers, and workers in the informal economy. Going forward, there is likely scope for the project to further consider how it can strengthen its gender dimension, at all levels of the project, as well as in post-project follow-up actions and initiatives.

4 LESSONS LEARNED, GOOD PRACTICES AND GOING FORWARD



Section Guide

This section sets out the findings with regard to:

- *Lessons learned and (emerging) good practices, which are summarised by not repeated en bloc. (Section 4.1)*
- *Learning regarding the complementarity, synergies and value of the EU-ILO Partnership (Section 4.2)*
- *Reflection Questions for ILO on generating increased impact and its value proposition (Section 4.3)*

4.1 Lessons Learned and Good Practices

The evaluation has identified a number of lessons learned and good practices, which are presented in the Executive Summary and the following Chapter on Conclusions, Learning and Recommendations. Lessons Learned are referred to below as LLs (e.g., LL1, etc.) and Good Practices are referred to as GPs (e.g., GP1, etc.)

- 1. LL1 - Inclusion of equality issues of women and vulnerable groups in Social Dialogues and within Trade Unions:** Women and vulnerable groups need to be included in the focus on ILS, or at least their issues have to be represented in social dialogues and within Trade Unions. While the project experience has shown that identifying, engaging and organising these groups can be challenging given that many tend to be part of the informal economy, this also presents an opportunity to engage relevant CSOs which can play a crucial role especially in countries where the informal sector thrives. In Mongolia, for example, ILO and its partners have strengthened the women's committee within the Trade Union, with the result that relevant women's issues were included in the discussions. An emerging good practice in this area has been the project's support for the Authority for Family, Child and Youth Development (AFCYD) in adapting and rolling-out of the 3-R Training Kit for families, youth and children. Gender issues and equality at work, in the family and in society were mainstreamed into this kit, which is now being used by AFCYD and CSOs for training of vulnerable groups as part of their regular programmes. This practice could be replicated by also including other vulnerable groups not just in Mongolia but also in other countries.
- 2. LL2 - Value of periodic engagement with (local) EU Delegation and Government Stakeholders:** Periodic engagement with EU-Delegation and government stakeholders is a good strategy to leverage on trade vis-a-vis core international labour standards. Without periodic engagement, consultations and collaboration with EU-Delegations in the country and government stakeholders from the design and even during M&E, the Project could miss out important insights that could have significantly added value in terms of project implementation, expected results and outcomes. Moreover, it should be noted that ILO can leverage on GSP3 not just to engage the government but also to strengthen its cooperation. Relevant government agencies should be aware of the project and the responsibility of the government to retain

its GSP3 status so they can influence the executive and legislative branches of the national government. The idea is to gain top support and full ownership of the GSP+3 project.

3. **LL3 - Promotion of social dialogue and tripartism amidst the COVID-10 pandemic.** According to stakeholders, COVID-19 did not affect much the implementation of the project but moving forward, the COVID-19 pandemic with its far reaching socio-economic consequences calls for effective tripartite social dialogue. All parties in social dialogue cannot afford to ignore the socio-economic consequences of COVID-19 not just for the workers but also for the business owners. And if social dialogue and tripartism can constructively capture these issues and solutions, its promotion and development become more compelling in the country as they can be utilized as drivers not just for economic and social resilience but also for inclusive growth and development of a country.
4. **GP1 - Training of journalists to report on forced labour.** The training of journalists, as demonstrated in Mongolia, helps raise awareness beyond the circle of stakeholders. The causes of child labour in many developing countries are complex and understanding these causes is vital to finding solutions. The media can influence public perceptions and opinions on forced labour and the news that they report can bring the issue into the mainstream by engaging the public and generating support to advocate for relevant policy changes. With the influence of media on public clamour for better labour legislation, Government may improve and align its national legislative framework on the prevention and elimination of forced labour and eventually ratify P29 not only in Mongolia but in other countries.
5. **GP2 - Institutionalization of training by stakeholders in their respective organizations.** Proper identification and engagement of stakeholders and making them aligned to the goals of the project, facilitating the institutionalisation of ILO training. Rights-based education and awareness create demand for better legislation and helps build the sustainability of the project. For example, the institutionalisation of training on child labour issues can help eliminate child labour through raising awareness and enhancing knowledge of stakeholders combatting child labour. Some stakeholders have already institutionalized the relevant training in their respective organizations, mainly because this training is considered to be very well-aligned with their objectives and priorities, and demonstrating the advance engagement work by ILO project staff. It is also noteworthy how NGOs have been tapped to expand the geographic coverage of the training through different channels, as shown in the example of AFCYD in Mongolia where the latter promoted public officers' training in collaboration with its local offices and NGOs.
6. **GP3 - Building strong Women's Committees within Trade Unions.** In Mongolia, ILO, through its stakeholders, has strengthened the capacity of women's committee within the national trade union. Relevant women's issues are therefore included in discussions, allowing women's voices to be heard. By bringing these issues to the fore, ILO can provide technical assistance to build capacity of tripartite bodies on equality issues. With this arrangement in place, social dialogue and tripartism can become more gender-sensitive and make an increased contribution as mechanisms for inclusive development.

4.2 Some Points for Reflection on the EU-ILO Partnership and Added Value Proposition in the Context of the Project

The evaluation has highlighted the strong complementarity and synergies in the EU-ILO Partnership. Like many effective partnerships, it has evolved organically. Based on the evidence of this project and its related learning, such as the need for the strengthened ILO-EU communication flows, some input to further reflections on the EU-ILO partnership is provided below. It is important to underline that these points have been distilled from the evaluation team's consideration of the learning from this specific project, insofar as

the EU-ILO partnership is concerned, and thus may miss, or not be informed by, other wider dimensions to this partnership. In this respect, they should therefore only be taken up by ILO and the EU insofar as they are considered as useful input. At the same time, they seek to offer practical (i.e., not abstract) reflection steps or tools that could be put in place to help strengthen a promising partnership, in the same way for example as two private sector companies might put specific management practices in tool to better capture and harvest the potential in their partnership, as well as measuring and learning from same.

4.2.1 Improved EU-ILO communication, in particular at the country-level

Firstly, as seen already, there have been some communication and reporting weaknesses, and strengthening the overall communication, and in particular at the country level – as well as making it more value-focussed and results focussed – can strengthen the EU-ILO country-level dimension of the partnership. Part of this means being clear on what is valuable for the other partner to have, what the other partner could bring at different points in the project or activity cycle in terms of knowledge or advice, and possible creating an online (or even MS Word) dashboard that could allow for more effective country-level and global-level communication around progress.

4.2.2 A conceptual framework to capture the full spectrum of potential EU-ILO complementarity, synergy and value

The current value and complementarity of the EU-ILO partnership is likely being constrained from realizing its full potential by a number of factors.

1. **Conceptual Clarity – a clear Partnership Mapping Framework:** Firstly, for both ILO and EU, there is a need to map the value proposition more rigorously on paper and within a clear conceptual framework. The most effective partnerships in the world do not happen by accident and involve reflection on, and monitoring, of value. For the EU, this could include greater specificities of the EU Trade Agenda value for DG Trade, as distinct from wider EU values, and also consideration/mapping of complementarities by the DG (and possibly Sector). In the shorter-term EU Development cooperation could be included more widely, engaging with DG DEVCO. While difficult to predict, this could lead to enhanced alignment around the EU's Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) Agenda, and coherence in important communications to key external stakeholders, such as the European Parliament.
2. **Operational Mechanisms:** The current partnership as manifested in this project, has been somewhat constrained by operating processes/constraints on both sides.
 - **EU:** On the EC side, DG Trade is constrained typically by internal budgeting on an annualised basis, while the development of this project has helped allow a multi-annual window to some extent. The move to an increased 'programmatic' dimension with some increased internal flexibility in budget allocation is in this context very positive and can facilitate the development of the partnership.
 - **ILO:** On the ILO side, there is likely to be potential to improve the value of the partnership by a greater strategic view on what can be achieved during a project-based intervention, and what would need to happen outside of that. In particular, **more focus on a project "exit" strategy with a focus on maximising sustainability would bring further value to the partnership**, and likely increase the dialogue and mutual ILO-EU value at the country level. To some extent, this is happening in terms of ILO Country Offices finding other funding sources to continue with actions that were not fully completed during this project's time frame or need continued support.

4.3 Reflection and Looking to the Future (Reflection Questions)

4.3.1 Why Reflection Questions (RQs)?

Beyond the above reflection points, additional issues or questions have come up in the evaluation team’s analysis and discussion on the evaluation findings from the project under evaluation. Some of these go beyond the project, and may also not be informed by a full grasp of what ILO is doing across the globe. Thus, they are put below as reflection questions, and are intended – where deemed pertinent – to act as a basis for further discussion and refinement.

It should also be emphasised that i) most, **if not all, of these questions are inter-linked**; and ii) addressing each of these questions will **likely deliver further value increase to ILO’s side the EU-ILO Partnership**.

Reflection Points and Questions (RQs)

The reflection questions (RQs) are summarised below:

Table 4.1 – Overview Reflection Questions

RQ1	Can ILO do more – and achieve more – with increased use of technology, including e-learning and e-guidance?
RQ2	Should ILO look anew at its approach to partnering, with a view to developing a partnership strategy and support that can amplify its impact?
RQ3	Can ILO do more in terms of increasing sustained impact in partner countries over the medium-term?
RQ4	COVID-19 Recovery - Can ILO strengthen linkages between its work around ILS and effort to support COVID-19 recovery and building back better?

4.3.2 Scope to increase ILO impact through increased use of technology?

RQ1	Can ILO do more – and achieve more – with increased use of technology, including e-learning and e-guidance?
-----	---

Why this question? While COVID-19 has presented significant challenges in a short period of the project, its influence has however been limited to the tail-end of the project. However, during this period the impact has been pronounced in terms of changing working and co-ordination and communication practices. Increased use of online training (as well as increased online dissemination) has allowed the project to reach greater numbers of stakeholders, with some of the online reach of the project’s communication representing success stories in their own right. These changes and the significant increase in the use of technology and remote collaboration have triggered formal reflection within ILO, as well as by ILO country actors and partners, and this is extremely positive.

This raises the question of whether ILO should consider an increased focus on use of technology to deliver online training. This is a multi-faced question, and it is important to first emphasise that this does not necessarily mean doing less capacity development work in traditional face-2-face settings in a post-COVID environment. However, the opportunity to reach a significant increased range of stakeholders is an enticing prospect, in particular where in a COVID-19 recovery context financial resources and finance providers will be looking to see how more can be done with less.

The evaluation would suggest that ILO could do more with a more systemic use of technology to support in-country work. Already, ILO has a significant ‘asset base’ through the online resources and learning and training provided by ILOITC. But in terms of supporting increased scale and reach of change/effort to support change, can ILO do more in terms of creating comprehensive online guidance systems for key partners and actors, with a focus on empowering these actors further by providing them with the knowledge, resources and tools to progress more autonomously and make a bigger contribution?

4.3.3 Scope to amplify medium-term impact through a more strategic and systemic partnership approach?

RQ2	Should ILO look anew at its approach to partnering, with a view to developing a partnership strategy and support that can amplify its impact?
------------	--

Why this question? To avoid confusion, it should first be clarified that ILO has already a profound and long-standing partnership approach in its Tripartite approach, and this is not in any way questioned. The potential to engage more with the EU at country level is just one example of why we wonder if ILO can further develop its partnership strategy, and whether it can bring a more strategic and systemic approach to some of its partnering. During the evaluation interviews, the evaluation team saw instances of organisations that were interested in exploring greater/systemic collaboration with ILO, one example being the Mongolian Bar Association, another being the University of Central America.

The wider point is that there are organisations ‘out there’ that have an interest in, or can benefit, from working with ILO and its country partners to supporting the ILS agenda in the engagement of countries. Sometimes, these partnerships will likely only cost ILO some engagement time and support, and not require direct financial support, allowing ILO to create additional leverage to generate in-country impact. As a highly (theoretical) example to illustrate the point, could systemic collaboration with universities such as UCA be harnessed to deliver not only education to students (and future leaders in society) but also extend to providing some with capacity development and toolkits, and through university work placement or post-graduate TVET provide support to under-capacitated and under-resources trade union organisations to support ILO capacity development work.

4.3.4 More impact through increased focus on creating and supporting systemic change?

RQ3	Can ILO do more in terms of increasing sustained impact in partner countries over the medium-term?
------------	---

Why this question? The evaluation findings have shown that part of the value proposition that ILO brings to its work, and its partnership with the EU, is the significant knowledge of the beneficiary countries, its technical staff, and existing relationships, reputation and country presence.

Given the reputation and general goodwill that ILO enjoys in these countries, it may be worth asking if it could be doing more. Its core work around ILS and tripartism requires a long-term willingness to engage with patience to secure change where possible, and to be prepared for setbacks and factors outside one’s control. While its technical expertise is without question, is there scope to bring a greater dimension of change management and systemic change into its work? Given the reputation and goodwill of ILO, we wondered at times if this ‘asset’ is being leveraged to its full potential. Furthermore, we wonder if ILO’s approach needs

to include a greater focus on skills (and lens) such as change management and creating systemic change, and a greater focus on medium-term results, to balance the existing focus activities and technical ILS expertise.

Thinking about this could also involve looking for all levers that can help open new 'entry points', advancing change, and of course working with a clear medium-term results framework that includes ILO and all relevant country actors. **Partnerships and partnering strategy are one such source of leverage (see RQ 2).** But as seen for example in the evaluation findings with regard to leveraging the country-level partnership with the EU, there is more, and possibly much more that can be done.

4.3.5 Scope to strengthen nexus between ILS and COVID-19 recovery?

RQ4

Covid 19 Recovery - Can ILO strengthen linkages between its work around ILS and effort to support Covid 19 recovery and building back better?

Why this question? The pandemic caused lockdowns, closure of workplaces, income losses and more unemployment, while the medium-long term consequences are likely to be severe to very severe, and with increased risk of significant unemployment growth, deteriorating social cohesion, deepening social inequalities. Moreover, most existing research shows that COVID-19 is having a disproportionately adverse effect on more vulnerable workers and groups that are either marginalized such as indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities, migrant and informal economy workers.

It is noted for instance that in many sectors, women and young people are the most hard-hit by the pandemic on the world of work.⁸ The impact of the COVID-19 crisis calls for the implementation of sustainable policies to address the social issues arising from income loss, and sustainable public investments and programmes to encourage the development of responsible industries and technologies and creation of decent work opportunities for the most vulnerable groups. It is important in this framework to avoid regressing in the compliance with voluntarily undertaken international obligations, notably in relation to the 8 ILO fundamental Conventions. In the context of the crisis response to the COVID-19 outbreak, these standards provide a tried-and-trusted foundation for policy responses that focus on a recovery that is sustainable and equitable.⁹

ILO is actively reflecting on how to support recovery, and is active in pursuing its own interventions to contribute to this global effort. Regarding the linkage to this work around ILS, can ILO make its own distinct contribution by developing interventions that can support local and sustainable recovery. For example, in progress on some of the points in these questions, it can create significant increased systemic capacity in Tripartite actors, but also other partnerships such as civil society, while an enhanced online resource base could also focus on **bringing (tested) intervention models** around women entrepreneurship, local economic development, sustainable energy communities, etc. – ILOITC has already numerous online resources and modules, for example in the area of sustainable local tourism. Some of these models might also be of interest to EU Delegations and Global EC (DEVCO/HQ) Funding Programmes (and of course other donors) and bring an added dimension to the ILO-EU partnership and mutual value proposition.

⁸ UN (2020). The world of work and the COVID-19.

⁹ https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/multimedia/video/institutional-videos/WCMS_740023/lang--en/index.htm; A note on ILS and COVID-19 is available at https://www.ilo.org/global/standards/WCMS_739937/lang--en/index.htm

5 EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS, LEARNING & RECOMMENDATIONS



Section Guide

This section provides an overview of the following:

- *Evaluation Conclusions (5.1)*
- *Lessons Learned and Good Practice (5.2)*
- *Evaluation Recommendations (5.3)*

5.1 Evaluation Conclusions

The final evaluation conclusions are set out below. Each conclusion (C) is numbered.

The table below summarises the final evaluation conclusions:

C1 - Relevance and Quality of Design: Overall, the project has been highly relevant to the needs, policies, and priorities of beneficiaries and stakeholders, at both the country-level and at the global level, and significant effort was invested in the project design to ensure it reflected these priorities and needs.

C2 - Progress against results: Overall, the project has achieved most of its objectives and correspondingly implemented the planned activities in each of the four countries. The project has successfully supported social dialogue through training provision, supported the establishment of structures and built trust among constituents, all of which significantly improved capacity and commitment to social dialogue. Within its focus on institutional development, the Project has improved knowledge and understanding on ILS through a wide range of training activities for government institutions and social partners that it has delivered, and this capacity development and knowledge transfer has led to improved ILS reporting in terms of quality, better participation, improved coordination with other line ministries and conformity to overall reporting requirements.

C3 - Implementation Challenges: The project's results and achievements also need to be interpreted in the context of challenging national implementation environments, a relatively short project timeframe for this kind of work, and the challenges faced such as national elections, changing government priorities, and turnover of key staff within government ministries. However, some of these risks and uncertainties could have been better identified in the project scoping. Going forward, there is scope for ILO to further invest in its future project scoping to account for any risks, uncertainties, and assumptions that might affect the implementation of ILS-related project interventions, including a comprehensive theory of change, with a view to strengthening project results frameworks. In particular, a theory of change would establish valuable pathways to anticipate changes in government and potential synergies with projects and initiatives of EU (country and regional) and other development partners.

C4 - Efficiency of use of resources: The Project has performed well for the most part in terms of efficient use of resources, managing to deliver a significant volume of activities and work within what were relatively small country-level project budgets. On a wider level, the project also offered significant efficiency gains by building on ILO technical experience and in-country presence, relationships and understanding, compared with at

least some other alternative implementation means, such as contracting private service providers via a tender procedure.

C5 - Project management: Project management has been efficient for the most part, notwithstanding the specific challenges of co-ordination of a project targeting four countries in 2 different sub-continent, and where this kind of activity was relatively new to the ILO Department managing the project. However, project reporting can be improved in terms of quality and timely delivery.

C6 - Country-level Project Communication Flow: Communication between the different project stakeholders has at times not been sufficiently strong (or defined) to ensure EU stakeholders are obtaining information on the countries' situation, progress and developments in a timely manner. To some extent, there has been excessive focus on formal reporting, and ILO country office communication via ILO Headquarters before information being transmitted to the EC at HQ and then at country level. This has sometimes meant that EU Delegations received information late or were not aware of specific developments in their respective countries. A strengthened communication flow between ILO country offices and EU Delegations would be one action that could go a long way to addressing this (see Recommendations).

C7 - EU-ILO Partnership: The EU-ILO partnership is a highly complementary one that brings mutual value added to both partners. Like many good partnerships, it has evolved organically in the years leading up to this project. **This project is not only valuable because of the results that it has achieved, but because of the learning and questions it raises about how and where the partnership might/could evolve.**

C8 - Progress towards Impacts: A key impact of the project has been the institutionalization of tripartite committees, to discuss reporting and look into the comments of the ILO supervisory bodies pertaining to implementation of ratified Conventions. A second key impact has been an improved understanding and knowledge on ILS among government staff, policy makers and social partners leading to overall improvement in national capacity to apply ILS in law reform, judicial processes and other relevant fields. A third impact of the project is improved reporting on ILS both in terms of quality and the systems and processes within ministries of labour to coordinate and consult with social partners and with other line ministries.

C9 - Sustainability: ILO is continuing to support some activities that were not completed during the project duration, either through other donor-funded projects or own country office efforts, and in this respect ILO itself is an important sustainability anchor for the project. In some areas, sustainability returns are higher than average from this project, for example through the training and capacity development work moved online, where these tools and resources continue to be available to country-based partners and stakeholders. Moreover, alignment of the project with ILO's general work priorities in the project countries should also contribute to strengthening sustainability prospects. Notwithstanding the above, it is possible that a more strategic and systemic view of the desired change and future situation in a country, coupled with new and/more systematic approach to change and to sustainability, could lead to strengthened sustainability prospects.

C10 - Learning: The project work, and wider implementation experience, has generated numerous **lessons learned** and **good practices**, including: i) **Lessons learned:** Inclusion of Equality Issues of Women and vulnerable groups in Social Dialogues and within Trade Unions (LL1); Value of Periodic engagement with EU-Delegation and Government Stakeholders (LL2); Promotion of social dialogue and tripartism amidst the COVID-19 pandemic (LL3); and ii) **Good/Emerging Good Practices:** Training of journalists to report on forced labour matters (GP1); GP2 - Institutionalization of training by stakeholders in their respective organizations (GP2); and Building Strong Women's Committees within Trade Unions (GP3).

C11 - Reflection for the Future: Emanating from the evaluation team’s analysis and discussion, the evaluation team have thought it useful to put forward some further reflection questions for ILO. It should be noted that while these questions emanate from the evaluation work on this project, they are rather wide-ranging in scope, extending beyond ILO’s work on ILS.

- ✓ **RQ1** -Can ILO do more – and achieve more – with increased use of technology, including e-learning and e-guidance?
- ✓ **RQ2** -Should ILO look anew at its approach to partnering, with a view to developing a partnership strategy and support that can amplify its impact?
- ✓ **RQ3** -Can ILO do more in terms of increasing sustained impact in partner countries over the medium–term?
- ✓ **RQ4** - COVID-19 Recovery - Can ILO strengthen linkages between its work around ILS and efforts to support COVID-19 recovery and building back better?

5.2 Lessons Learned and Emerging Good Practices

The table below summarises the final evaluation Lessons Learned and Good Practices:

Table 5.1 - Summary of the Lessons Learned and Good Practices

No.	Lesson Learned / Good Practice
LL1	<p>Inclusion of equality issues of women and vulnerable groups in Social Dialogue and within Trade Unions:</p> <p>Women and vulnerable groups need to be included in the focus on ILS, or at least their issues have to be represented in social dialogue and within Trade Unions. While the project experience has shown that identifying, engaging and organising these groups can be challenging given that many tend to be part of the informal economy, this also presents an opportunity to engage relevant CSOs which play a crucial role especially in countries where the informal sector thrives. The project work in Mongolia has for example provided learning and emerging good practice in this respect, where the project’s support for the Authority for Family, Child and Youth Development (AFCYD) in adapting and rolling-out of the 3-R Training Kit for families, youth and children mainstreamed gender issues and equality at work, in the family and in society, and is now being used by AFCYD and CSOs for training of vulnerable groups as part of their regular programmes.</p>
LL2	<p>Value of Periodic engagement with EU Delegations and Government Stakeholders</p> <p>Periodic engagement with government and EU stakeholders is important in leveraging trade vis-a-vis core international labour standards, without which the Project could miss out important insights that could add value in terms of project implementation, expected results and outcomes. Moreover, while it is good to focus on the project per se, it should be noted that ILO can leverage on GSP3 not just to engage the government but also to strengthen its cooperation. In fact, the engagement should not only be limited to the Labour ministry but also to national trade ministries and any relevant government agencies tasked with studying the impact of tariff policies and programs on national competitiveness and consumer welfare. These other government agencies should be made aware of the project and the responsibility of the government to retain its GSP3 status so they can influence the executive and legislative branches</p>

No.	Lesson Learned / Good Practice
	of the national government. The idea is to gain top support and full ownership of the GSP+3 project.
LL3	<p>Promotion of social dialogue and tripartism amidst the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>According to stakeholders, COVID-19 did not affect significantly the implementation of the project, coming as it did in the final few months of the project implementation period, but going forward, the COVID-19 pandemic will have significant socio-economic consequences and knock-on effects on tripartite social dialogue.</p> <p>All parties in social dialogue cannot afford to ignore the socio-economic consequences of COVID-19 not just for the workers but also for the business owners. And if social dialogue and tripartism can constructively capture these issues and solutions, its promotion and development becomes more compelling as they can be utilized as drivers not just for economic and social resilience but also for inclusive growth and development of a country.</p>
GP1	<p>Training of journalists to report on forced labour.</p> <p>This initiative has helped raise awareness beyond the circle of stakeholders, by the general public where topics that were considered taboo such as forced labour are openly discussed. The causes of forced labour are complex and understanding these causes is vital to finding solutions. Media can influence public perceptions and opinions about forced labour. The news that they report will bring the issue into the mainstream by engaging the public and generate support to advocate for relevant policy changes. Through this initiative, NHCRM is essentially creating demand for P29. Through public clamour for better labour legislation, Government may improve and align its national legislative framework on the prevention and elimination of forced labour and eventually ratify P29.</p>
GP2	<p>Institutionalization of training by stakeholders in their respective organizations.</p> <p>Some stakeholders have institutionalized the relevant training in their respective organizations mainly because such initiative is very well-aligned to their objectives and priorities. This means that ILO, through this Project has engaged well with these organizations and also provided the initial training. It's also noteworthy how it has tapped NGOs to expand the geographic coverage of the training through different channels. By way of example, the AFCYD has trained 3206 children and 170 public officers using different modules in 2020, in cooperation with its local offices and NGO. Further trainings will be delivered in children's camps and centres, institutional care centres, youth development centres and family support centres. Reaching out to NGOs has created a multiplier effect not only in terms of raising awareness but also in terms of training.</p>
GP3	<p>Building Strong Women's Committees within Trade Unions.</p> <p>In Mongolia, ILO through its stakeholders have strengthened the capacity of the women's committee within the Trade Union by supporting a nation-wide campaign for violence and harassment-free workplaces. Relevant Women's issues are therefore included in their discussions, thereby ensuring that women's voices are reinforced. By bringing them to the fore, ILO can provide technical assistance to build the capacity of tripartite bodies on equality issues,</p>

No.	Lesson Learned / Good Practice
	allowing social dialogue and tripartism to become more gender-sensitive and vital mechanisms for inclusive development.

5.3 Evaluation Recommendations

The table below summarises the final evaluation recommendations

Table 5.2 - Summary of the Final Evaluation Recommendations

No.	Recommendations
R1	<p>Develop communications material to help EU Staff understand the work of ILO, its specificities and challenges: ILO should develop some communication materials (e.g., PowerPoint Presentations) explaining the key features of its work, the linkages to trade, factors facilitating success and examples of specific achievements in the past. While direct EU project counterparts in DG Trade may understand some of the specificities and challenges involved in ILO's work, it does not necessarily follow that other EC staff will.</p> <p>Such material could be circulated to relevant EC DGs and EU Delegations around the world, given that easily accessible and understandable material will be needed for new EU staff taking up roles in the EC or EEAS that involve interaction or engagement with the project. Similarly, this material could explain the complementarity of the EU-ILO partnership, as well as sharing some of the achievements from this project.</p> <p>Priority: Medium</p> <p>Addressed to: ILO HQ (NORMES) – Development of communications material, dissemination within ILO and ILO networks; EC (DG Trade) – Review of material, dissemination within EC and to EEAS</p> <p>Timeframe: 1st Quarter of 2021</p> <p>Resource implications: Budget/staff time allocation for the preparation of relevant materials.</p>
R2	<p>Develop communications material to broadcast some of the Projects successes, and the complementarity of the EU-ILO partnership: ILO should develop some communication and dissemination materials (e.g., video, PowerPoint, web pages) that explain the complementarity and value of the partnership, as well as using some of the project's results and achievements to showcase same.</p> <p>Priority: High</p> <p>Addressed to: ILO HQ (NORMES) – Development of communications material, ILO dissemination EC (DG Trade) – Review of material, dissemination within EC, EEAS, etc.</p> <p>Timeframe: 1st Quarter of 2021</p> <p>Resource implications: Budget/staff time allocation for the preparation of relevant communication materials</p>

No.	Recommendations
R3	<p>Strengthen communication, dialogue and information flow between ILO country offices and EU Delegations: Part of the value of EC-ILO collaboration around ILS is that EU staff can access readily ILO expertise and knowledge on the situation and developments in the target countries. However, this value has not been fully leveraged due to excessive focus on formal reporting, and ILO country communication via ILO Headquarters before information being transmitted to the EC (HQ).</p> <p>It is recommended that ILO in particular make communication more value-focussed and results focussed, with a view to immediately strengthening the EU-ILO country-level dimension of the partnership (some ILO offices are already to some extent dialoguing with EU counterparts). This means being clear what is valuable for the other partner to have, what the other partner could bring at different points in the project or activity cycle in terms of knowledge or advice, and possibly creating an online (or even Microsoft Word) dashboard that could allow more effective country-level and global-level communication around progress.</p> <p>Priority: High Addressed to: ILO HQ (NORMES), with consultation with DG Trade. Timeframe: 1st Quarter of 2021 Resource implications: Budget/staff time allocation for communication process management, orientation of key people involved, and other materials</p>
R4	<p>Develop a stronger conceptual framework for the EU-ILO Partnership, as a first step to Strengthening the Value Proposition and Partnership</p> <p>The EU-ILO partnership is a highly complementary one that is bringing mutual value added to both partners. It is strongly recommended that a (rigorous) conceptual framework for the EU-ILO Partnership Is developed, as a first step to Strengthening the Value Proposition and Partnership.</p> <p>Priority: High Addressed to: ILO HQ (NORMES, other DGs) EU - EC (DG Trade, DG DEVCO), EU Delegations Timeframe: 1st Quarter of 2021 Resource implications: Allocation of budget/staff time/TA for this undertaking as a project.</p>
R5	<p>Explore how operational mechanisms can be adapted or developed to grow ILO's value (and that of the partnership with the EU)</p> <p>Potential most likely exists to improve the value of the partnership by a greater strategic view on what can be achieved during a project-based intervention, and what would need to happen outside of that. In particular, more focus on a project "exit" strategy with a focus on maximising sustainability would bring further value to the partnership. Looking at all states of the project/intervention cycle, in particular pre-project (strategic situation/Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats analysis), project timeframe (and what is possible or can be made possible) and the post-project sustainability strategy, will likely help strengthen operational</p>

No.	Recommendations
	<p>mechanisms, as well as being highly complementary with the Reflection Questions set out in this evaluation report.</p> <p>Priority: High Addressed to: ILO HQ (NORMES, other ILO Departments) Timeframe: Q1-Q2 of 2021 Resource implications: Allocation of budget for this as a project which can be integrated in other recommendations that pertain to the relationship between ILO and EU.</p>
R6	<p>Diplomatic Engagement and Strengthening of Cooperation. Continue the high-level engagement strengthening of cooperation with high-ranking government officials not just with the Labour Ministry but probably also with the Trade Ministry. ILO can collaborate closely with the EU-Delegation on this undertaking. The goal is to orient or re-orient high-ranking government officials on the benefits of GSP 3 and what has accomplished to date in the country as far as the GSP Project on ILS, social dialogue and tripartism.</p> <p>Priority: High Addressed to: ILO Country Director Timeframe: 1st Quarter of 2021 Resource implications: Allocation of time by ILO Country Directors.</p>
R7	<p>Operationalise within ILO Discussion and Reflection on the Reflection Questions</p> <p>It is recommended that ILO launch a structured reflection and discussion process on the questions below, as a contribution to its own ongoing organisational reflection and learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ RQ1 - Can ILO do more – and achieve more – with increased use of technology, including e-learning and e-guidance? ✓ RQ2 - Should ILO look anew at its approach to partnering, with a view to developing a partnership strategy and support that can amplify its impact? ✓ RQ3 - Can ILO do more in terms of increasing sustained impact in partner countries over the medium-term? ✓ RQ4 - COVID-19 Recovery - Can ILO strengthen linkages between its work around ILS and effort to support COVID-19 recover and building back better? <p>As can be seen, while these questions emanate from the evaluation work on this project, they are rather wide-ranging in scope, extending beyond ILO’s work on ILS. One option could be to do this with for example an Input Discussion Paper, supported by structured questions and an online or in situ discussion forum/fora. The questions could/should be adapted also to reflect existing internal reflection and policy development that is on-going within ILO, or could be broadened or fine-tuned, for example, implicit in some questions is also the question whether is a need to provide more systematic capacity development along with TA support?</p> <p>Priority: High Addressed to: ILO Senior Management, NORMES, ILO EVAL Timeframe: 1st Quarter of 2021 Resource implications: Allocation of time for such discussions to be included in relevant executive meetings within ILO.</p>

6 ANNEXES

6.1 Annex I: Final Evaluation Bibliography

1. ILO Policy Guidelines for Evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations
2. Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO: Practical tips on adapting to the situation
3. Protocol on collecting evaluative evidence on the ILO's COVID-19 response measures through project and programme evaluations: ILO policy framework for tackling the economic and social impact of the COVID-19 crisis
4. Final Evaluation: Terms of Reference
5. Inception Report for the Final Evaluation
6. ILO Resource Kit, Checklist 5: Preparing the Evaluation Report
7. ILO Resource Kit, Checklist 10: Documents for Project Evaluators
8. ILO Resource Kit, Guidance Note: Evaluation Lessons Learned and Emerging Good Practices
9. ILO Template for Lessons Learned
10. ILO Template for Good practices
11. Stakeholders contact list by country for Final Evaluation interviews
12. Stakeholders Interview Report
13. ILO General conditions and Annexes related to the project
14. Mid-Term Project Progress Report related to the project
15. Final Project Progress Report related to the project
16. Decent Work Country Programme Report for Mongolia (2006-2010)
17. Decent Work Country Programme Report for Mongolia (2012-2016)
18. Decent Work Country Programme Report for Pakistan (2016-2020)
19. ILO Website
20. Website Pages of Trade for Decent Work and EU Bridging Projects.

6.2 Annex II: List of Stakeholders Consulted

No	Name/s	Stakeholder Description	Organisation/ Department
I.	Global/Europe		
1	Audrey Le Guével	Programme and Operations Officer	ILO HQ
2	Maura Miraglio	Senior Programme Officer for ILS	ITC Turin
3	Rikard Nordeman	Project Officer	European Commission (DG Trade)
4	Indre Vaicekauskaite	Project Officer	European Commission (DG Trade)
5	Sara Gondy	Former Project Officer	European Commission (DG Trade)
6	Karen Curtis	Deputy Director	NORMES (ILO HQ)
7	Chittarath Phouangsavath	Senior Legal Specialist	NORMES (ILO HQ)
II.	Pakistan		
8	Husnain Ashraf	Development Advisor	EU Trade and Communication, Delegation in Pakistan
9	Abid Niaz Khan	National Project Coordinator	ILO Country Office
10	Ingrid Christensen	Director Country Office	ILO Country Office
11	Saad Gilani	Senior Programme Officer	ILO Country Office
12	Miranda Fajerman	ILS Specialist (in another position since June 2019)	ILO Country Office
13	Yaan Cres	Relevant officer	UNDP
14	Atifa Raffat	Joint Secretary	Ministry of Overseas Pakistanis and Human Resource Development (MOPHRD)
15	Zahoor Awan	General Secretary and GB Member	Pakistan Workers' Federation
16	Fasihul Karim Siddiqi	General Secretary	Employers' Federation of Pakistan (EFP)
17	Saeed Ahmed Sarpara	DG Labour Welfare	Province of Baluchistan
18	Gulfam Nabi Memon	Ex Joint Director of Labour	Province of Sindh
19	Dr. Ahmed Javed Qazi	Secretary of Labour and Human Resources	Province of Punjab
20	Irfan Ullah	Director of Labour	Province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
III.	Mongolia		
21	Claire Courteille-Mulder	Director of CO-Beijing	ILO Country Office
22	Parissara Liewkeat	ICO-Beijing, Programme Analyst	ILO Country Office
23	Lkhagvademberel Amgalan	ILO-Mongolia, National Project Manager	ILO Country Office

No	Name/s	Stakeholder Description	Organisation/ Department
24	Otgontungalag Tsevel	Director of Labour monitoring and legal policy department	Confederation of Mongolian Trade Unions (CMTU)
25	Maya Sholtoi	Senior Analyst of Labour Relations Policy Implementation Coordination Department	Ministry of Labour and Social Protection (MLSP)
26	Tungalag Jargalsaikhan	Senior Officer of Foreign Cooperation Division	Ministry of Labour and Social Protection (MLSP)
27	Baasanjav Navagchamba	Head of Sub-committee on Labour law	Mongolian Bar Association (MBA)
28	Azjargal Jantsandorj	Senior Specialist for Child protection	Authority for Family, Child and Youth Development (AFCYD)
29	Bolortsetseg Sosorbaram	Director of Training, Research and Information Centre	Authority for Family, Child and Youth Development (AFCYD)
30	Unurjargal Zagdaa	Senior Officer	National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia (NHRCM)
IV	Guatemala & El Salvador		
31	Carmen Moreno	Director	ILO San José Office
32	Carlos Linares	National Project Coordinator	ILO San José Office
33	Sergio Paixão	Senior ILS Specialist	ILO San José Office
34	Fernando Garcia	Labour Law and Social Dialogue Specialist	ILO San José Office
35	Oscar Valverde	ACTRAV Specialist	ILO San José Office
36	Randall Arias	ACTEMP Specialist	ILO San José Office
37	Ena Nuñez	Consultant for El Salvador	ILO San José Office
38	Francisco Martínez	Consultant for El Salvador	ILO San José Office
39	Jorge Camilo Trigueros	Director	International Labour Affairs
40	Sarahi Molina	Secretary General	Movimiento Sindical y Gremial de El Salvador (MUSYGES)
41	Cristina Gonzalez	National Officer	ILO Country Office
42	Luz de María Morales	Director of Planification	Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare

6.3 Annex III: Evaluation Questions and Approach

As per the evaluation guidelines for ILO projects, the evaluation investigates the project Relevance and strategic fit of the intervention, Validity of intervention design, Intervention progress and effectiveness, Efficiency of resource usage, Effectiveness of management arrangements and Impact orientation and sustainability of the intervention. The evaluation approach also takes account of ILO Guidance with regard to the COVID 19 pandemic, with all foreseen field interviews carried out remotely to ensure no risk to project stakeholders, ILO personnel and the FE expert. The evaluation approach was based upon the questions set out below, which have been design according to the evaluation category/parameter under which they belong. The evaluation parameters, as mentioned in the previous section, are:

- **Relevance and Validity of Design**
- **Coherence/Strategic fit**
- **Project results and effectiveness**
- **Efficiency of resource use**
- **Progress towards impact**

Table 2.1: Overview Evaluation Questions

No.	Evaluation Question (and Evaluation Parameter)	Data Collection Methods
<i>Relevance and Validity of Design</i>		
1	To what extent were the needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders taken into account in project design?	Desk Research Stakeholder interviews
2	To which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change?	Desk research Stakeholder interviews Analysis and synthesis post-field interviews
3	Were the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground? Did they need to be adapted to specific national needs or conditions?	Desk research Stakeholder interviews Analysis and synthesis post-field interviews
4	Did the project design establish a clear strategy to solve the problems and needs detected?	Desk research Stakeholder interviews
<i>Coherence/Strategic fit</i>		
1	To what extent was the project aligned to national priorities and complemented other on-going ILO and wider UN initiatives on labour rights and ILS in the participating countries?	Desk research Stakeholder interviews

No.	Evaluation Question (and Evaluation Parameter)	Data Collection Methods
2	Are strategies and approach coherent with ILO policies, results framework, thematic/sectoral strategies, action plans and other relevant frameworks?	Desk research Stakeholder interviews
3	Is project coherent with the other elements of strategies and outcomes in relevant development cooperation projects?	Desk research Stakeholder interviews Analysis and synthesis post-field interviews
<i>Project results and effectiveness</i>		
1	To what extent did the project achieve planned objectives? Has the quantity and quality of the outputs produced been satisfactory?	Desk research Stakeholder interviews Analysis and synthesis post-field interviews
2	To what extent did the project coordinate and collaborate with other on-going ILO, UN and/or other partners' programmes/projects/initiatives to increase its effectiveness and impact?	Desk research (NB project reporting) Stakeholder interviews
3	What are the main factors –internal to the project and external- that have hindered the project capacity to reach the objectives? Are there alternative strategies that would have increased the perspectives of achieving the project objectives?	Desk research (including review of implementation guidance and advice) Stakeholder interviews
<i>Efficiency of resource use</i>		
1	To what extent have material, human, and institutional resources been sufficient and adequate to meet project objectives?	Desk research (including comparison delivery of activities and outcomes against planning) Stakeholder interviews
2	What have been the amount, quality, and opportunity of the products supplied?	Desk research Stakeholder interviews (primarily)
3	To what extent was the project efficient in delivering the desired/planned results? Are there other more efficient means of delivering more and better results (outputs and outcomes) with the available inputs?	Desk research (where reported in project reporting and tracking) Stakeholder interviews
4	Has the project received the necessary institutional, technical, and administrative guidance from different decision-making levels for successful execution?	Desk research (including comparison other initiatives) Stakeholder interviews
5	How efficient were the management and accountability structures of the project?	Desk research (where reported in project reporting and tracking) Stakeholder interviews
<i>Progress towards impact</i>		

No.	Evaluation Question (and Evaluation Parameter)	Data Collection Methods
1	To which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects?	Desk research (analysis of impacts and contributory and sustaining factors) Stakeholder interviews
2	How effectively is the Project building the necessary capacity of people and institutions?	Stakeholder interviews Overall analysis (post-field interviews)
3	To what extent are planned results of the project likely to be sustained and/or scaled-up and replicated by stakeholders?	Stakeholder interviews Overall analysis (post-field interviews)
4	What further concrete steps could be taken to increase the perspectives of the sustainability of the results?	Desk research (NB implementation-influencing factors, challenges etc.) Stakeholder interviews Overall analysis (post-field interviews)

6.4 Annex IV: Lessons Learned

ILO Lesson Learned Template	
<p>Project Title: <i>Final Independent Evaluation - Sustaining Strengthened National Capacities to Improve International Labour Standards Compliance and Reporting in Relevant European Union Trading Partners</i></p> <p>Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/17/29/EUR</p> <p>Name of Evaluator: Norman Tilos Date: 03/12/20</p> <p>The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation.</p>	
LL1:	Lesson Learned: Inclusion of Equality Issues of Women and Vulnerable Groups in Social Dialogue and within Trade Unions
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	Equality Issues of Women and vulnerable groups need to be included in social dialogues and within the Trade Union. To do this, vulnerable groups have to be identified, engaged, and organized. This is where Civil Society Organizations (CSO's) can play a crucial role especially in countries where informal sector seems to thrive.
Context and any related preconditions	In Mongolia, ILO through its stakeholders have strengthened the capacity of the women's committee within the Trade Union. Relevant Women's issues are therefore included in their discussions. This can be replicated by also including other vulnerable groups to the fore.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries are the vulnerable groups. NGOs will have to be engaged for this purpose. Trade Unions.
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	By including vulnerable groups in the trade union, their voices will be heard in important discussions. By bringing them to the fore, ILO can provide technical assistance to build capacity of tripartite bodies on equality issues faced by specific groups, such as women, workers with disabilities, indigenous peoples, migrant workers, and those that work in the so-called informal sector. With this arrangement in place, social dialogues and tripartism become vital instruments for inclusive development.
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	Evidence of Women and other vulnerable group being part of the Trade Union. Quantity of CBAs that reflect equality issues faced by women and vulnerable groups.
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Capacity Development resources allotted for this purpose.

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: *Final Independent Evaluation - Sustaining Strengthened National Capacities to Improve International Labour Standards Compliance and Reporting in Relevant European Union Trading Partners*
Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/17/29/EUR

Name of Evaluator: Norman Tilos

Date: 03/12/20

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation.

LL2:	Lesson Learned: Value of Periodic Engagement with EU Delegations and Government Stakeholders
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	Periodic engagement with EU-Delegation and government stakeholders is a good strategy to leverage on trade vis-a-vis core international labor standards. For instance, better collaboration around expectations would have helped if EU Delegation in the country was consulted (In Pakistan for example, for budget allocation to provinces for example with regards to different issues regarding labour, associations, etc.) Had there been consultations with EU-Trade in the country from design and even during M&E, value-adding insights could have been integrated from the beginning.
Context and any related preconditions	This applies to design and implementation of projects in general. What is particularly unique in this project is the fact that it is linked to trade. It therefore presents immense opportunity for ILO to leverage on GSP3 by also engaging the government both at the federal and provincial levels. This includes engaging relevant government agencies at the national level on the processes and procedures pertaining to compliance of GSP+3.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	This is for ILO Country Directors
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	Without periodic engagement, consultations and collaboration with EU-Delegation in the country and government stakeholders from the design and even during M&E, the Project would miss on important insights that could have significantly added value in terms of project implementation, expected results and outcomes. Moreover, while it is good to focus on the project per se, it should be noted that ILO can leverage on GSP3 not just to engage the government but also to strengthen its cooperation. In fact, the engagement should not only be limited to the Labour ministry but also to the trade ministry. The idea is to gain support and full ownership of GSP+3.
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	This lesson will impact the level of support from the government which affects the delivery of outputs and ultimately the expected outcomes of the project. EU-Delegation can provide additional insights that may be integrated in the project.
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Since this is high-level engagement, this lesson has potential replication for ILO Country Directors in general. This may also require collaboration with the EU-Delegation in the country.

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: *Final Independent Evaluation - Sustaining Strengthened National Capacities to Improve International Labour Standards Compliance and Reporting in Relevant European Union Trading Partners*

Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/17/29/EUR

Name of Evaluator: Norman Tilos

Date: 03/12/20

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

LL3:	Lesson Learned: Promotion of Social Dialogue and Tripartism Amidst the COVID-19 Pandemic
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	According to stakeholders, COVID19 did not affect much the implementation of the project but moving forward, the COVID-19 pandemic with its far reaching socio-economic consequences calls for effective tripartite social dialogue.
Context and any related preconditions	In Pakistan, the Pakistan Worker’s Federation (PWF) issued its stance last March 2020 on the outbreak of COVID-19 in view of the suffering of the working community in Pakistan in terms of job loss, inadequate social protection and insufficient rehabilitation measures. It also presented the initiatives of the present Government in managing the crisis. The paper also underscores the gaps in international standards and current legal framework in Pakistan to address this kind of issues while advocating the cause of affected workers and proposing steps and actionable suggestions required from various stakeholders not only to address the crises but a long-term strategy to address similar situations in future. While dealing with Covid19 pandemic may not be part of the project per se, it presents an opportunity for ILO to promote social dialogue and tripartism as drivers for economic and social resilience, inclusive growth and development.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	Tripartite constituents, Government stakeholders, ILO Country Directors
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	All parties to social dialogue cannot afford to ignore the socio-economic consequences of Covid19 not just for the workers but also for the business owners. And if social dialogue and tripartism can constructively capture these issues and solutions, its promotion and development become more compelling in the country as they can be utilized as drivers not just for economic and social resilience but also for inclusive growth and development of a country.
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	This has an impact on the extent of development of social dialogue and tripartism in a country.

ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Resource to engage experts on Social Dialogue and Tripartism
---	--

6.5 Annex V: Emerging Good Practices

This section sets out some of the emerging good practices using the ILO Good Practices Template

<p>Project Title: <i>Final Independent Evaluation - Sustaining Strengthened National Capacities to Improve International Labour Standards Compliance and Reporting in Relevant European Union Trading Partners</i></p> <p>Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/17/29/EUR</p> <p>Name of Evaluator: Norman Tilos Date: 03/12/20</p> <p>The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation.</p>	
<p>GP Element: Training of Journalists to Report on Forced Labour</p>	
<p>Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)</p>	<p>Institutionalization of training by stakeholders in their respective organizations</p> <p>In Mongolia, the project outputs have fostered demands for better legislation while building technical skills to ensure vulnerable workers receive protection. One good practice that is noted is how some stakeholders institutionalized training in their respective organizations. More specifically, following the consultation process in the preparation of P29 gap analysis, MLSP-AFCYD and NHRCM developed and implemented own plan of actions to improve the knowledge of rights monitors, labour inspectors and journalists on child labour, forced labour, fair recruitment and trafficking for labour exploitation</p> <p>For instance, in cooperation with its local offices and NGOs, the AFCYD has trained 3206 children and 170 public officers using different modules in 2020. Further trainings will be delivered through institutional care centres, youth development centres and family support centres. Reaching out to NGOs has created a multiplier effect not only in terms of raising awareness but also in terms of training.</p>
<p>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</p>	<p>These stakeholders have institutionalized the relevant training in their respective organizations mainly because such initiative is very well-aligned to their objectives and priorities. This means that ILO, through this Project has engaged well these organizations and also provided the initial training. It is also noteworthy how the project has tapped NGOs to expand the geographic coverage of the training through different channels.</p>

<p>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</p>	<p>Proper identification and engagement of stakeholders and making them aligned to the goals of the project, lead them to institutionalize the training that ILO or the Project it wishes to be carried out. It helps build the sustainability of the project. Rights-based education and awareness create demand for better legislation. The institutionalization of training on forced labour issues for instance, would help eliminate forced labour through raising awareness and enhancing knowledge for stakeholders who combat forced labour.</p>
<p>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</p>	<p>The number of people trained and the level of awareness on the subject matter.</p>
<p>Potential for replication and by whom</p>	<p>This can be replicated in other countries like Pakistan.</p>
<p>Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO’s Strategic Programme Framework)</p>	<p>Promotion of P29 (Forced Labour) and its ratification is one of ILO Mongolia’s thrusts.</p> <p>Also, as a member of the European Union’s (EU) enhanced Generalized Scheme of Preferences (GSP+), Mongolia benefits from trade incentives dependent on compliance with international Conventions, including forced labour. Increasing efforts to eliminate forced labour is therefore not only a human rights necessity, but also plays an important part in promoting decent work (i.e. alignment to ILO’s DWCP) and economic growth</p>
<p>Other documents or relevant comments</p>	<p>N/A</p>

ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

Project Title: *Final Independent Evaluation - Sustaining Strengthened National Capacities to Improve International Labour Standards Compliance and Reporting in Relevant European Union Trading Partners*

Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/17/29/EUR

Name of Evaluator: Norman A. Tilos

Date: 3/12/20

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation.

GP Element:	Training of Journalists to Report on Forced Labour
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	<p>NHRCM has integrated the training tool kit for journalists to report on forced labour in its e-campus. It has trained 30 journalists from various press and media institutions.</p> <p>This initiative has helped raise awareness beyond the circle of stakeholders by the general public. Topics that used to be considered taboo such as forced labour, are openly discussed. The causes of child labour/forced labour are complex and understanding these causes is vital to finding solutions for a future without it. Media can influence public perceptions and opinions about forced labour. The news that they report will bring the issue into the mainstream by engaging the public and generating support for relevant policy changes.</p>
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	<p>P29 has not been ratified yet in Mongolia and since the Government does not make it a priority without passing the labour legislation in the Parliament, the Project built capacity with NHCRM to train journalists. This good practice can expand not only in terms of acquiring skills on reporting forced labour in the context of Mongolia but also in terms of the network of journalists outside of Mongolia. By expanding their network, journalists can partner on news stories that go beyond their national boundaries which may include labour migration.</p>
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	<p>Through this initiative, NHCRM is essentially creating demand for P29. Through public clamor for better labor legislation, Government may improve and align its national legislative framework on the prevention and elimination of forced labour and eventually ratify P29.</p>
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	<p>Measurable impact would be the level of awareness of the public on forced labor issue in the country. While this has not been measured in the project, there are some anecdotal evidence that the media are writing and reporting about the issue and the public are talking about it.</p>
Potential for replication and by whom	<p>This can be replicated in other countries where journalists are not yet trained to cover these issues.</p>

Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	One DWCP objective is to promote decent work as a key component of national development strategies.
Other documents or relevant comments	None.

ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

Project Title: *Final Independent Evaluation - Sustaining Strengthened National Capacities to Improve International Labour Standards Compliance and Reporting in Relevant European Union Trading Partners*

Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/17/29/EUR

Name of Evaluator: Norman A. Tilos

Date: 3/12/20

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

GP Element: **Building Strong Women’s Committees within Trade Unions**

Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	In Mongolia, ILO through its stakeholders have strengthened the capacity of the women’s committee within the Trade Union. Relevant Women’s issues are therefore included in their discussions.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	<p>This practice as an entry point can be replicated throughout the country and also by other trade unions in other countries. CSOs on women can be engaged for this purpose.</p> <p>In the process, ILO can build capacity to make various social dialogue actors more responsive to gender equality and to women’s needs and interests.</p> <p>Trade unions have made efforts to ensure that women’s representation in decision-making reflects the range of jobs, skill areas and sectors in which women work.</p>
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	By having strong women’s committees, women’s voices are strengthened in important discussions. By bringing them to the fore, ILO can provide technical assistance to build capacity of tripartite bodies on equality issues, rendering social dialogue and tripartism more gender-sensitive and inclusive.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	Quantity of CBAs that reflect equality issues faced by women. Qualitative measure would include evidence of women’s committees within the Trade Union
Potential for replication and by whom	This can be replicated throughout the country through the Trade Unions and by ensuring that future projects have in-built gender elements especially those that involve building capacity for social dialogue and tripartism. Project designers in ILO play a crucial role in replicating this in other countries.

<p>Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO’s Strategic Programme Framework)</p>	<p>ILO aims to promote opportunities for women and men to get jobs in an environment of equity, security and human dignity. In view of ILO’s Action Plan 2018–21, effective and inclusive gender-responsive delivery of the Decent Work Agenda is supported by operationalizing the ILO Policy on Gender Equality and Mainstreaming. Through a mainstreaming strategy, the action plan is geared towards women’s equality and empowerment in the world of work. This good practice is considered to be aligned with the objective of the action plan especially in the context of ILO’s tripartite mandate.</p>
<p>Other documents or relevant comments</p>	<p>The Report on “The Women at Work Initiative: The push for equality” proposes that the ILO should make a new push for gender equality as it enters its second century. This good practice is an example of such an initiative within the trade unions.</p>

6.6 Annex VI: Final Evaluation Terms of Reference

Terms of References

PROJECT TITLE	SUSTAINING STRENGTHENED NATIONAL CAPACITIES TO IMPROVE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR STANDARDS COMPLIANCE AND REPORTING IN RELEVANT EUROPEAN UNION TRADING PARTNERS
DC PROJECT CODE	GLO/17/29/EUR
DONOR	EUROPEAN COMMISSION (DG TRADE)
TOTAL BUDGET APPROVED	USD 1,000,109
ILO ADM UNITS	ILO OFFICES IN BEIJING, ISLAMABAD and SAN JOSE
ILO TECHNICAL UNIT	INTERNATIONAL LABOUR STANDARDS DEPARTMENT (NORMES)
EVALUATION DATE	TBC
PROJECT MANAGER	CORINNE VARGHA, Director, International Labour Standards Department (NORMES)
EVALUATION MANAGER	MARIA BORSOS
TOR PREPARED	15 July 2020

Introduction and Rationale for the independent evaluation

The European Union Special Incentive Arrangement for Sustainable Development and Good Governance (Generalized Scheme of Preferences/GSP) grants full removal of certain tariff lines to vulnerable countries which make binding obligations to ratify and effectively implement 27 international Conventions on human and labour rights, environmental protection and good governance. Out of the 27 Conventions, 8 are core ILO Conventions¹⁰.

The Project, funded by the European Commission's DG TRADE, was developed to specifically contribute to improve the application of the 8 Fundamental ILO Conventions in beneficiary countries of the GSP scheme (Mongolia and Pakistan) and [identical obligations \(effective implementation of ILO fundamental conventions\) in the Trade for Sustainable Development Chapter of the EU Central America Association Agreement \(trade part\)](#). (El Salvador, Guatemala,) with a view to reducing and progressively eliminating discrimination, forced labour, child labour, and violations of freedom of association. In

¹⁰ The ILO's fundamental conventions are: *Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87)*; *Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98)*; *Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29)*; *Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105)*; *Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138)*; *Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182)*; *Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100)*; *Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111)*.

particular, the selected countries have been assisted on the critical issues raised by the ILO supervisory bodies and reflected under EU GSP+ monitoring, and better meet their standards-related obligations under the ILO Constitution.

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

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

As per ILO's evaluation policy, this Project is subject to a final independent evaluation. This final evaluation examines the overall progress, outputs delivered, and assess the impact of the Project. This term of reference (TOR) describes the scope of work and expected outputs from the evaluation, adhering to ILO's policies and procedures on evaluations¹¹. It will be conducted by an external independent evaluator and managed by an Evaluation Manager who is an ILO staff member with no prior involvement in this project. The ILO Independent Evaluation Office will oversee the evaluation.

Background of the Project and status

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

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

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

The main outcomes are the following:

¹¹ [ILO Evaluation policy guidelines](#)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Activities include:

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

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

Following a first phase of implementation from 1 October 2015 to 31 March 2018, the Project under review started on 1 April 2018 for an initial period of 24 months.

For the current project a mid-term report was submitted to the EC in May 2019. Subsequently, taking into account the impact of the protection measures taken as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic on the delivery of the activities foreseen during the first quarter of 2020, a request for a no-cost extension until 31 July 2020 was submitted to the EC in February 2020 and approved. The Project is closing on 31 July 2020, and the final progress report is officially due on 31 October 2020, as stipulated in the agreement.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation:

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

Below is the list of intended users and clients of the evaluation:

- Project management Department (NORMES),
- ILO Country Offices in Beijing, Islamabad and San Jose,
- EVAL,
- European Commission – DG TRADE
- EU Delegations in Islamabad, San Jose and Ulan Bator.

The ILO evaluation office will use the evaluation for reporting, input for organisational learning and other meta-evaluation purposes.

Methodology

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

- A desk review of relevant documents related to project performance and progress, including the initial project document, revised logframe, workplans, and the progress report.
- Interviews with project management staff, relevant staff in the ILO country office, EU Delegations and Decent Work Teams (Brussels, Bangkok, Beijing, Islamabad, Ulaanbaatar, and San Jose) and ILO HQ through Skype/videoconference.
- Relevant staff in Turin Centre who were involved in capacity building activities through Skype/call.
- Field interviews through Skype/videoconference with individuals and/or focused group discussions with relevant national stakeholders (i.e., Government, Public institutions, social partners, DG TRADE in Brussels, EU Delegations).

The methodology is suggested for the evaluation, which can be adjusted by the Evaluator if considered necessary, in accordance with the scope and purpose of the evaluation and in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, as overseen by EVAL as part of the process for management and implementation of independent evaluations. The methodology should consider any implications on evaluation of the Covid19 pandemic as outlined in the [relevant ILO Guidance](#)¹².

The evaluation should be carried out in adherence with the relevant parts of the ILO Evaluation Policy and ILO Policy Guidelines for Evaluation: Principles, Rationale, Planning and Managing for Evaluations (3rd ed. August 2017)¹³.

The following is the proposed methodology:

i. Inception Phase

¹² http://www.ilo.org/eval/WCMS_744068/lang--en/index.htm

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

The Evaluator will review the project document, work plans, project monitoring plans, progress reports, previous project reviews completed by ILO and/or donor, government documents, meeting minutes, workshop reports, ILO's programme policy frameworks and other relevant documents that were produced through the project or by relevant stakeholders. In addition, the Evaluator will conduct initial electronic or telephone interviews with key project informants (International Technical Specialist and National Project Coordinators) and an inception meeting with the Evaluation Manager, Project team and technical backstopping unit in ILO HQ (via Skype or face-to-face). The objective of the consultation is to reach a common understanding regarding the status of the project, the priority assessment questions, available data sources and data collection instruments and an outline of the final evaluation report. The following topics will be covered: status of logistical arrangements, project background and materials, key evaluation questions and priorities, outline of the inception and final report. Based on the scope and purpose of the evaluation, document review, briefings and initial interviews, the Evaluator will prepare an inception report with the final methodology.

ii. Data Collection Phase

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

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

iii. Report Writing Phase, including lessons learned, emerging good practices and recommendations

Based on the inputs from discussions and interviews with key stakeholders, the Evaluator will prepare the first of the evaluation report, including lessons learnt, emerging good practices and recommendations. The draft report will be sent to the Evaluation Manager, who will share the report with key stakeholders for their inputs/comments. The Evaluation Manager will consolidate all comments including methodological comments and will then share them with the Evaluator for consideration in finalizing the report. The Evaluator will finalize the report, taking into consideration the stakeholder comments and submit one complete document, with a file size not exceeding 3 megabytes. A debriefing will be held with the ILO and the donor, in-person or through conference call, following the submission of the final report.

Evaluation Criteria and Suggested questions

The Project will be evaluated against criteria such as its relevance and strategic fit, the validity of project design, project effectiveness, the efficiency of resource use, the effectiveness of management arrangement, and sustainability, as defined in the IO policy guidelines for evaluation (2017¹⁴). The Gender dimension will be

¹⁴ http://www.ilo.ch/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_571339.pdf

considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables, and final report of the evaluation. In terms of this evaluation, this implies involving both men and women in the consultations, evaluation analysis and evaluation reporting. Moreover, the evaluator should review data and information that is disaggregated by sex and gender and assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve the lives of women and men. The evaluator should also consider adapting evaluation methods to the ILO's normative and tripartite mandate by referring [Guidance Note 19 of the ILO Policy Evaluation Guidelines](#)¹⁵ :

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

Relevance and Validity of Design (*Is the intervention doing the right things?*)

- 1) *To what extent were the needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders taken into account in project design?*
- 2) *The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries'*, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change*
- 3) *Were the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground? Did they need to be adapted to specific national needs or conditions?*
- 4) *Did the project design establish a clear strategy to solve the problems and needs detected?*
- 5) *To what extent was the monitoring and evaluation framework appropriate and useful in assessing the project's progress?*

Coherence/Strategic fit (*How well does the intervention fit?*)

The extent to which other interventions support or undermine the intervention, and vice versa. This includes internal coherence and external coherence, in particular, synergies and fit with national initiatives and with other donor-supported projects and project visibility

- *To what extent was the project aligned to national priorities and complemented other on-going ILO and wider UN initiatives on labour rights and ILS in the participating countries?*
- *Are strategies and approach coherent with ILO policies, results framework, thematic/sectoral strategies, action plans and other relevant frameworks?*
- *Is project coherent with the other elements of strategies and outcomes in relevant development cooperation projects?*

Project results and effectiveness (*Is the intervention achieving its objectives?*)

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

Efficiency of resource use (*How well are resources being used?*)

¹⁵ http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_721381/lang--en/index.htm

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

Progress towards impact (WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES THE INTERVENTION MAKE?)

The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.

Note: Impact addresses the ultimate significance and potentially transformative effects of the intervention. It seeks to identify social, environmental and economic effects of the intervention that are longer term or broader in scope than those already captured under the effectiveness criterion. Beyond the immediate results, this criterion seeks to capture the indirect, secondary and potential consequences of the intervention. It does so by examining the holistic and enduring changes in systems or norms, and potential effects on people's well-being, human rights, gender equality, and the environment.

Sustainability (Will the benefits/changes last or be used for further changes?)

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

Evaluator's responsibilities and deliverables

1. Key responsibilities:

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

2. Key deliverables:

i. Deliverable 1: Inception report with methodology¹⁶

¹⁶ http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_165972.pdf

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

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

ii. Deliverable 2: Draft Evaluation Report

To be submitted to the Evaluation Manager in the format prescribed by the ILO checklist number 5¹⁷.

iii. Deliverable 3: Presentations of Draft Report

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

iv. Deliverable 4: Final Evaluation Report

To be submitted to the Evaluation Manager as per the proposed structure in the ILO Evaluation guidelines, checklist number 5, carefully edited and formatted¹⁸. The quality of the report will be determined based on quality standards defined by the ILO Evaluation office¹⁹ who will have final approval of the report. The report should also, as appropriate, include specific and detailed recommendations by the Evaluator based on the analysis of information obtained. All recommendations should be addressed specifically to the organization or institution responsible for implementing it, as indicated in the section specifying the clients of evaluation (pg 4-5) The report should also include a specific section on lessons learned and good practices²⁰ from that aspect of the project that the evaluation is focusing on, either that could be replicated or those that should be avoided.

v. Evaluation summary

A standalone summary of the evaluation in the template provided by EVAL for wider dissemination²¹.

Proposed workplan and timeframe

The evaluation is foreseen to be undertaken in the time period, 9 November to 26 November 2020 (TBC), with the aim to submit the final evaluation report to the donor no later than 11 December 2020. The total effort is expected to be 23 work days to complete the full assignment.

Phase	Tasks	Responsible Person	Timing	Days Proposed
-------	-------	--------------------	--------	---------------

¹⁷ http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_165967.pdf

¹⁸ http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166357/lang--en/index.htm

¹⁹ http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang--en/index.htm

²⁰ http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206158/lang--en/index.htm

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

²¹ http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166361/lang--en/index.htm

I	Inception phase: Desk review, initial briefing with Evaluation Manager, internal briefings with the IPS and Project Coordinators, development of a draft inception report and agenda for meetings	Evaluator	28 Oct- 5 November	5 working days
II	Circulate draft inception report to Project stakeholders, consolidate comments and send to Evaluator	Evaluation Manager	5-11 November	3 working days
III	Final Inception report and evaluation plan	Evaluator	By 12 November	1 working day
IV	Data collection phase: Meetings with key stakeholders, facilitate stakeholder meetings and interviews, debriefing with ILO Field Offices	Evaluator	9 - 26 November	7 working days
V	Report writing phase: Draft evaluation report based on desk review and consultations from field visits	Evaluator	By 27 November	5 working days
VI	Circulate draft evaluation report to Project stakeholders, consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to Evaluator	Evaluation Manager	27 Nov – 8 December	
VII	Finalize report including explanations on comments not included	Evaluator	By 11 December	2 working days
VIII	Approval of report by EVAL	EVAL		
IX	Official submission to PARDEV	Evaluation Manager		
Total				23 working days