



International  
Labour  
Organization

► Evaluation Office



i-eval Discovery



## Final Independent Evaluation of ILO ROAF RBSA Interventions on Just Transition in Namibia and Madagascar

**ILO DC/SYMBOL:** MDG/23/01/RBS and NAM/23/01/RBS

**Type of Evaluation:** RBSA-funded activity

**Evaluation timing:** Final

**Evaluation nature:** Independent

**Project countries:** Madagascar, Namibia

**P&B Outcome(s):** Madagascar: 2.1, 2.2, 4.3, 3.2 and 8.3; Namibia: 3.1, 3.2 and 8.3

**SDG(s):** Madagascar: 5, 8, 14; Namibia: 4, 8, 13

**Date when the evaluation was completed by the evaluator:** 30 July 2025

**Date when evaluation was approved by EVAL:** 06 August 2025

**ILO Administrative Office:** CO Antananarivo, CO Harare

**ILO Technical Office(s):** TRANSITION A/P

**Joint evaluation agencies:** NA

**Project duration:** 24 Months (February 1, 2023 - February 28, 2025)

**Donor and budget:** RBSA, 700,165 USD

**Name of consultant(s):** Dwight Ordóñez, PhD

**Name of Evaluation Manager:** Abderrahim El Moulat, REO

**Evaluation Office oversight:** Ricardo Furman

**Evaluation budget:** 24, 924 USD

**Key Words:** Just Transition, Employment Policy, Supply Chains, Social Dialogue, Capacity Building, Skills, Gender Equality

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.



## Contents

|                                                                    |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Accronyms .....                                                    | 4  |
| Executive Summary .....                                            | 6  |
| 1. Background of the Interventions and their Rationale.....        | 13 |
| 1.1. Madagascar .....                                              | 13 |
| 1.2. Namibia .....                                                 | 14 |
| 2. Purpose, scope, and clients of evaluation .....                 | 15 |
| 2.1. Final Evaluation's Purpose and Overall Objective .....        | 15 |
| 2.2. Scope .....                                                   | 15 |
| 2.3. Users .....                                                   | 16 |
| 3. Methodology.....                                                | 17 |
| 3.1. Evaluation Framework .....                                    | 17 |
| 3.2. Methods and Techniques .....                                  | 19 |
| 3.3. Limitations.....                                              | 21 |
| 4. Findings .....                                                  | 21 |
| 4.1. Madagascar: Performance Analysis per Evaluation Criteria..... | 21 |
| 4.1.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit .....                            | 21 |
| 4.1.2 Coherence .....                                              | 22 |
| 4.1.3 Effectiveness .....                                          | 22 |
| 4.1.4 Efficiency.....                                              | 26 |
| 4.1.5 Impact.....                                                  | 27 |
| 4.1.6 Sustainability .....                                         | 27 |
| 4.1.7 Cross-cutting Issues .....                                   | 29 |
| 4.2. Namibia: Performance Analysis per Evaluation Criteria.....    | 29 |
| 4.2.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit .....                            | 29 |
| 4.2.2 Coherence .....                                              | 30 |
| 4.2.3 Effectiveness .....                                          | 30 |
| 4.2.4 Efficiency .....                                             | 34 |
| 4.2.5 Impact.....                                                  | 34 |
| 4.2.6 Sustainability .....                                         | 35 |
| 4.2.7 Cross-cutting Issues .....                                   | 36 |
| 5. Conclusions .....                                               | 37 |



## Final Evaluation of ILO ROAF RBSA Interventions on Just Transition in Namibia and Madagascar

|                                                                            |                                |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----|
| 5.1.                                                                       | Overall.....                   | 37 |
| 5.2.                                                                       | Madagascar.....                | 37 |
| 5.3.                                                                       | Namibia.....                   | 38 |
| 6.                                                                         | Recommendations.....           | 39 |
| 6.1.                                                                       | Overall.....                   | 39 |
| 6.2.                                                                       | Madagascar.....                | 39 |
| 6.3.                                                                       | Namibia.....                   | 40 |
| 7.                                                                         | Lessons Learned .....          | 41 |
| 8.                                                                         | Potential Good Practices ..... | 41 |
| ANNEX 1: Terms of Reference .....                                          |                                | 42 |
| ANNEX 2: Evaluation Matrix .....                                           |                                | 56 |
| ANNEX 3: Documents and Other Information Reviewed (provisional list) ..... |                                | 64 |
| ANNEX 4: List of Participants in Key Informant Interviews and FGD.....     |                                | 68 |
| ANNEX 5: EVAL Template 4.1 - Lessons Learned.....                          |                                | 70 |
| ANNEX 6: EVAL Template 4.2 – Good Practices.....                           |                                | 72 |
| ANNEX 7: Interview Guides.....                                             |                                | 76 |



## Accronyms

|             |                                                                             |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| APGL        | Locally managed fishing areas                                               |
| CNAP        | Caisse Nationale de Prévoyance (social security)                            |
| CO          | ILO Country Office                                                          |
| COOP        | Start.Coop (ILO program in support of cooperatives' organization)           |
| CPO         | Country Programme Outcome                                                   |
| CTM         | Conférence des Travailleurs de Madagascar                                   |
| DWCP        | Decent Work Country Plan                                                    |
| DWT         | Decent Work Team                                                            |
| EBMO        | Employer and Business Membership Organizations                              |
| EmplA       | Employment Impact Assessment                                                |
| EU          | European Union                                                              |
| EVAL        | ILO Evaluation Unit                                                         |
| FGD         | Focus Group Discussion                                                      |
| GEM         | Association of Employers of Madagascar                                      |
| GERME       | Gérez Mieux votre Entreprise (ILO Start and Improve Your Business program)  |
| GiZ         | German government international cooperation agency                          |
| GLM         | Lobster-Fishing Association of Madagascar                                   |
| GOM         | Government of Madagascar                                                    |
| GON         | Government of Namibia                                                       |
| HPP         | Harambee Prosperity Plan                                                    |
| ILO         | International Labour Organization                                           |
| ITC         | ILO International Training Centre at Turin                                  |
| KII         | Key Informant Interview                                                     |
| MJLR        | Ministry of Justice and Labour Relations (Namibia)                          |
| MLIREC      | Ministry of Labour, Industrial Relations and Employment Creation (Namibia)  |
| MTEFoP      | Ministère du Travail, de l'Emploi et de la Fonction Publique (Madagascar)   |
| NEP         | National Employment Policy                                                  |
| NIPDB       | Namibia Investment Promotion Development Board                              |
| NO          | National Officer                                                            |
| NPC         | National Planning Commission (Namibia)                                      |
| NSA         | Namibian Statistics Agency                                                  |
| OECD/DAC    | Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development Assistance Criteria  |
| OMA         | Offices, Ministries and Agencies (Namibia)                                  |
| OSH         | Occupational Safety and Health                                              |
| OSIET       | Organisation Sanitaire Inter Entreprise de Taolagnaro                       |
| P&B         | Programme and Budget                                                        |
| RBSA        | Regular Budget Supplementary Account                                        |
| REO         | Regional Evaluation Officer                                                 |
| ROAF        | ILO Regional Office Africa                                                  |
| SCORE       | ILO Sustaining Competitive and Responsible Enterprises program (for SME)    |
| SDG         | Sustainable Development Goals                                               |
| SEKRIMA     | Christian Confederation of Malagasy Unions                                  |
| SME         | Small and Medium-size Enterprises                                           |
| STED        | ILO programme on Skills for Trade and Economic Diversification              |
| STRENGTHEN2 | Employment Impact Assessment to Maximize Job-creation in Sub-Saharan Africa |
| SUSTAINILO  | programme on Sustainable Trade and Investment in Southern Africa            |
| TOR         | Terms of reference                                                          |
| TOT         | Training of trainers                                                        |
| TVET        | Technical Vocational and Education Training                                 |
| UNEG        | United Nations Evaluation Group                                             |
| UNEP        | United Nations Environment Programme                                        |
| UNPAF       | United Nations Partnership Framework                                        |





## Executive Summary

### Background of the Evaluation and Rationale

ILO's work on decent work in global supply chains emphasizes the importance of fair labor practices. A just transition means greening the economy in a way that is as fair and inclusive as possible, maximizing the social and economic opportunities of climate action, while minimizing and carefully managing any challenges to fundamental principles and rights at work.

ILO's support to Madagascar and Namibia aims to develop specific interventions that put in practice the ILO *Guidelines for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all* (2015) and thus contribute to the development of this process in both countries. Specific sectors and tools have been chosen as areas to pioneer this purpose: The lobster-catching sector in Madagascar, and the national employment policy and clean energy generation in Namibia.

### Final Evaluation's Purpose and Overall Objective

The final evaluation's purpose is to assure accountability and learning to the ILO constituents and key stakeholders. Knowledge and information obtained from this evaluation will contribute inputs to the design of future interventions and expanding and adapting ILO's work on Just Transition in the African region.

The overall objective of the final evaluation is to provide an assessment, following OECD-DAC evaluation criterion, of the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the contribution of the ILO interventions, strategies, and approaches to a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies in Madagascar and Namibia. ILO's cross-cutting policy drivers on Decent Work, including the promotion of equality between men and women and non-discrimination, and social dialogue, were taken in account when evaluating the project.

### Final Evaluation's Scope and Users

The evaluation scope covers all interventions-related activities implemented at national, regional and local levels in Madagascar and at national level in Namibia between March 2023 and February 2025.

The Clients/ Users of the evaluation are the Government of Madagascar's relevant ministries and agencies (particularly, the Ministry of Labor, Employment and Public Function -MTEFoP, the Ministry of Fishing and Blue Economy, and the Regional Directorate of Social Security at Anosy - *Caisse Nationale de Prévoyance Sociale*); the Government of Namibia's relevant ministries and agencies (particularly the Ministry of Justice and Labour Relations -MJLR, and the Namibia Investment Promotion Development Board (NIPDB); employers' organizations and sectoral associations in both countries; trade unions in Madagascar and Namibia; and the ILO CO in Madagascar, the ILO CO for Zimbabwe and Namibia, the ILO ROAF and other relevant ILO policy departments, branches and programmes working in matters related to Just Transition.

### Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation used a mix of evaluation approaches to ensure triangulation of information, basically: A results-based approach to examine the project's outcome achievements; mixed methods to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings; and a participatory approach.

Data collection methods included an exhaustive review of documents; key informant interviews (KII) and focus group discussions (FGD). The evaluation data collection work was performed at Fort Dauphin and Mokala in Madagascar, and at Windhoek in Namibia. Remote meetings with ILO Specialists and national staff were organized virtually.

## Main Findings and Conclusions

### Overall Conclusion/ Overview of Interventions' Results in both Countries:

The ILO ROAF RBSA interventions on Just Transition in Madagascar and Namibia attained diverse degrees of achievement of their expected outcomes: While in Madagascar the *Ecolangouste Sud* project contributed to a relevant attainment of its four Results, in Namibia, RBSA-based interventions contributed in a limited way to mainstreaming Just Transition policy measures in ongoing strategic policy processes and frameworks (Result 1), but had no effect in increasing capacities on mainstreaming just transition in the green hydrogen investments and ongoing policy processes for tripartite partners.

The ILO ROAF RBSA interventions on Just Transition in Madagascar and Namibia carried out most of its planned activities and were successful in achieving most of their expected outputs (e.g., formulation of policies, assessments, interprofessional frameworks, services for constituents).

However, due to the limited implementation time (24 months) and limited available budget, as well as to the existence of administrative, technical and institutional weaknesses among the stakeholders in both countries (see below), the impact and sustainability of the assets generated by the project is limited and would require additional support from the ILO in order to address these factors and consolidate the interventions' achievement.

#### 1. Findings in Madagascar

##### a. Relevance and Strategic Fit:

ILO Just Transition-related interventions contributed to SDGs 5, 8 and 14, and were aligned with the UNSDCF 2021-2023 strategic priorities #3 and #4. The interventions contributed to ILO's Country Program Outcomes (CPO) MDG 801, MDG 802 and MDG 103, and to the ILO P&B output achievement indicators 1.1.2, 1.2.1, 3.3.1, 4.2.1, and 5.5.1. Specifically, the interventions contributed to outcome 1.3 of the Madagascar DWCP 2021-2023. The interventions are consistent with and relevant to four of the five axes of the Madagascar's National Blue Economy Strategy as well as to the strategic priorities and needs of social partners. Regarding its **Strategic Fit**, the *Ecolangouste Sud* project reflected a logical approach towards achieving its results, by linking the strengthening of capacities of key tripartite actors with the implementation of effective management mechanisms and formalization of fishmongers and fishermen. However, the project did not allocate a sufficient and realistic amount of time (it was implemented in just two years), to accompany its beneficiaries, consolidate its results and strengthen its sustainability.

##### b. Coherence:

ILO's interventions generated a close coordination of efforts and joint action by various stakeholders in the lobster sector, including public institutions (MTEFoP, MPEB, CNAPS) and public-private institutions (OSIET), social partners (GEM, GLM, CTM), and local NGOs (CARA, Aquatic Service), as well as with the GiZ Prada project for the implementation of APGLs. Within the ILO, the *Ecolangouste Sud* project generated successful cooperation with other ILO initiatives, such as the Vision Zero Fund (SST) and the ProAgro Youth Project (on youth training) and it also received support ILO initiatives in Madagascar on employment creation in the spiruline value chain and on the restauration of reef eco systems.

##### c. Effectiveness:

The *Ecolangouste Sud* project contributed to the overall objectives of greening practices and improving the productivity of businesses in the lobster value chain, as well as transforming the work environment with a view to a just transition. At outcome level, project implementation met a relevant attainment of its four expected Results. The project carried out most of its planned activities and achieved most of its expected outputs. ILO interventions in support of the

promotion of a Just Transition in the lobster- catching sector were mostly successful, the implementers managing to reach or surpass their set targets. Only a limited number of originally expected outputs could not be achieved (please see the body of the report). ILO interventions strengthened, through training and awareness raising activities, the capacity of the Association of Employers of Madagascar (GEM)/ Group of Lobster-Exporters and Processors of Madagascar (GLM) to implement sustainable mechanisms in the lobster industry with a view to a Just Transition. ILO interventions also strengthened the capacity of the Madagascar Conference of Workers (CTM), and particularly that of fishmongers and fishermen through training in sustainable management of coastal ecosystems and fisheries resources, collective bargaining and association management, and through the affiliation of 266 lobster sector workers to cooperatives and workers associations. The affiliation via the GLM effectively allows cooperative members to benefit from medical services by OSIET in Fort-Dauphin, pending the Ministry of Labor's approval of the extension of the scheme to villages. Although, this benefit is only granted if delivery quotas to the factory are met.

The interventions have also helped the Malagasy government, in collaboration with employer and worker organizations, to promote sustainable management practices in the lobster value chain, such as the pilot implementation of a Local Governance Protected Area (APGL), the implementation of a mobile, early warning, market information, and advisory system to anticipate climate risks and market failures, the training of fishmongers in reducing post-harvest lobster losses and the implementation of economic diversification activities for fishermen, among other. Finally, through the creation of fishmongers' cooperatives and fishermen associations, establishing contracts for the operationalization of an interprofessional organization in the lobster value chain, establishing workers access to social security and occupational safety and health services, and establishing a strategic labor inspection, among other activities, ILO sponsored interventions contributed to improve the productivity and resilience to climate shocks of the lobster value chain through Sustainable Entrepreneurship, Skills Development, Gender Equality, and Formalization (a detailed list of activities and number of beneficiaries may be found in the body of the report).

8

#### **d. Efficiency**

The implementers spent 98% of the available funds and managed to obtain additional support from other ILO projects and other cooperation sources. They managed to carry out a sizable number of activities and reach their targets with limited funding and staffing. However, the timeframe allocated for implementation and follow-up of activities' results (24 months) appears to be insufficient. ILO staff did thorough and adequate monitoring and documentation of the interventions' achievements.

#### **e. Impact**

ILO interventions in Madagascar had a relevant impact on strengthening social dialogue in the lobster-catching sector. Likewise, the implementation team succeeded in developing a promising model for inter professionalization in value chains and for the formalization of workers. However, the impact of the interventions is still nascent and limited. More time is needed to assess the interventions' impact on the productivity and resilience of the lobster fishing sector. Similarly, by the end of project life, the impact on the formalization of stakeholders and on their access to social protection and OHS risks being affected by contextual and institutional factors that hinder their achievement (please see body of the report).

#### **f. Sustainability**

While the project lacked an exit strategy, the participatory approach implemented by the project allowed it to attain relevant ownership of its achievements by all stakeholders in the lobster industry. (e.g. structuring of an interprofessional framework). However, the sustainability of the results delivered by the project is limited and fragile due to several negative factors, such as

adverse weather conditions leading cooperatives to not meet the quota agreed upon with the lobster companies, which in turn leads the latter to not make their contribution to social security and occupational safety and health institutions (the latter are two quarters in arrears) and for workers to lose access to these services; the administrative and technical weaknesses of fishmonger cooperatives and fishing associations to operate effectively; the fact that for the past two quarters (by May 2025) they have not made contributions to the local union; unfair competition from Chinese commercial enterprises; and the opposition of the MTEFoP in Antananarivo to authorize the OSIET (provider of OSH services) in Fort Dauphin to extend the geographic coverage of its services beyond 30km. All these factors pose the risk that the functioning of the interprofessional framework set by the project may be severely affected and become inoperative if corrective action is not taken soon.

#### **g. Cross-cutting issues**

The *Ecolangouste Sud* project had a clear gender approach. It was implemented on the basis of a tripartite framework, in which on-going social dialogue was the means and path through which most project activities were implemented.

### **2. Findings in Namibia**

#### **a. Relevance and Strategic Fit:**

ILO-sponsored intervention contributes to UNSDG 4, 8 and 13, and are aligned with the United Nations Partnership Framework (UNPAF) 2019-2024 and with the Namibia DWCP 2019-2023. They contribute to ILO CPO NAM126, as well as to ILO P&B Outputs 3.1, 3.3 and 5.1. ILO RBSA-funded interventions are relevant to constituents' priorities and needs. Regarding its **Strategic Fit**, the RBSA-funded proposal comprises a series of interventions in different areas/ sectors to be developed in a more or less separate way with diverse institutional actors, and which, although grouped under a same project title and under the general subheadings of "policy advice" and "capacity development", do not present in many cases a clear logical and hierarchical between outputs and expected results.

#### **b. Coherence**

The intervention is aligned with the Harambee Prosperity Plan 2, and the National Development Policy 6. The ILO maintains a collaboration relationship with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and other UN agencies such as UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA in Namibia.

#### **c. Effectiveness:**

RBSA-based intervention contributed in a limited way to mainstreaming Just Transition policy measures in ongoing strategic policy processes and frameworks (Result 1) but had no effect in increasing capacities on mainstreaming just transition in the green hydrogen investments and ongoing policy processes for tripartite partners, as the originally expected "employment promotion social dialogue mechanism to advise on the green hydrogen project, employment policies, and other key programs including the Global Accelerator", was not established.

Most interventions in Namibia have been completed or are in the process of attaining their foreseen outputs. After completing an evaluation of the second national employment policy (NEP2) and a situational analysis for the third national employment policy (NEP3), there is a draft of a National Employment Policy 3 (NEP3) available, and the Ministry of Justice and Labor Relations has scheduled regional consultative workshops to discuss the draft and obtain inputs from a wider group, before it is validated at national level. The allocation of responsibilities and identification of institutional capacities for the implementation of the NEP3 are yet to be developed. Regarding the establishment of gender responsive and pro-employment budgeting processes, while a training curriculum was developed and implemented, and a gender responsive and pro-employment budgeting toolkit was developed, the Implementation process

of the toolkit/ budgeting methodology stalled due to opposition from the Ministry of Finance, which did not prioritize this issue.

Regarding capacity building of government agencies towards a Just Transition, a Social Accounting Model (SAM) was developed by the Namibian Statistic Agency (NSA) with the support from the ILO, and a SAM matrix was completed to support conducting an Employment Impact Assessment. An employment impact assessment (EIA) of an investment in the green hydrogen sector (Hyphen) was conducted, but the report is yet to be finalized. A Just Transition workshop for constituents in Namibia was developed with RBSA project support on late 2024, but a Just Transition tripartite roadmap for promoting Decent Work in the green hydrogen sector was **not** developed, as originally planned in the RBSA-funded proposal. Regarding the application of the SKILLS for Trade and Economic Diversification (STED) methodology, a skills background study for the energy sector (addressing 4 subsectors: green hydrogen, biomass and biofuels, renewables and oil & gas) was completed by the Namibia Investment Promotion Development Board, and the recommendations of this report informed the energy sector skills strategy. Relevant capacities have been developed in the NIPDB to apply sectoral approaches (STED) to conduct similar skills anticipation studies. The NIPDB has identified various sectors in which it will carry out STED analysis in the future.

#### **d. Efficiency**

The project spent its funds adequately, mainly in funding the position of a National Officer to coordinate RBSA funding-related activities in Windhoek. The RBSA-related interventions were implemented in an efficient way, which allowed for the completion of several of its expected outputs at a relatively low cost. Technical and financial support from other ILO projects (STRENGTHEN 2) and offices (HQ, ITC-ILO, Pretoria DWT) contributed to the attainment of interventions' objectives. The RBSA-funded interventions on Just Transition in Madagascar lacked an M&E system. There is no evidence that RBSA-funded interventions followed a timeline, with specific quarterly or annual targets.

10

#### **e. Impact**

RBSA funded interventions, such as the continued tripartite discussion for the elaboration of the National Employment Policy, contributed to the goal of strengthening social dialogue in Namibia. However, the impact of the RBSA funded interventions is yet incipient and limited. While a NEP 3 draft has been completed, there is a need to support the process of final consultations that will lead to the final approval of the same. While the results regarding gender-responsive budgeting and the promotion of Decent Work in the green hydrogen sector were limited, the capacities developed at the NIPDB to apply sectoral approaches and to develop skills assessments is a promising feature that may become a sustainable institutional asset.

#### **f. Sustainability**

The RBSA-funded interventions in Namibia lacked an exit strategy, as well as a follow-up mechanism to accompany their continued implementation after end of the interventions' implementation period. The sustainability of the outputs delivered in Namibia through ILO's RBSA-related interventions is limited due to several structural factors that affect policy implementation, such as: A lack of recent reliable information on labour issues, a lack of sufficient budgetary resources to implement policies, reduced coordination culture among public institutions on the application of policies, the fact that the country is lacking a stable, employment promotion social dialogue mechanism, and an unstable participation/ membership of sectoral representatives in technical working groups (TWG) in charge of policy design/ implementation. Likewise, the recent merger of the ministries of Justice and Labor into one sole entity pose the need to clarify the issue of prioritization of employment creation within the new, combined Ministry of Justice and Labour Relations.

#### h. Cross-cutting issues

RBSA-based interventions in Namibia had a clear gender equality approach. For example, the NEP3 assumes Gender Equality as one of its guiding principles. Likewise, ILO RBSA-based interventions promoted the establishment of gender responsive and pro-employment budgeting processes. The project was implemented on the basis of a tripartite framework, the elaboration of the National Employment Policy 3 supported by the project being a clear outcome of its efforts to promote social dialogue.

#### Lessons Learned

1. Achieving long-lasting results in interventions promoting a Just Transition towards environmentally sustainable economies requires longer periods of implementation and investment than the ones allocated to the RBSA-funded interventions in Namibia and Madagascar.
2. While projects may be successful in achieving their expected short-term outputs, the provision of technical assistance after the implementation period is a factor that may enhance the impact and ensure the sustainability of interventions.

#### Good Practices

1. **Madagascar:** A participatory approach allowing for the integration of a wide range of stakeholders (tripartite, CSO, NGO, communities) as implementers and beneficiaries of interventions, creating a framework for synergies and coordination.
2. **Madagascar:** Promoting the formalization of workers and labor relations through inter professionalization frameworks is a promising model that may become replicable in other sectors.
3. **Madagascar:** Local governance of fishing areas (APGL) empowers local stakeholders and promotes the ownership of activities.
4. **Madagascar and Namibia:** Involving other government agencies beyond the Ministry of Labor to carry out specific interventions is a good way to promote cross-cutting ownership and sustainability.

11

#### Recommendations

##### 1.1. Addressed to ILO ROAF

**Recommendation #1:** Establish a longer implementation timeframe for RBSA-funded interventions, to ensure adequate consolidation and follow-up of results (*addressed to: ILO ROAF; priority: High; time implication: Medium term; resource implication: High*)

**Recommendation #2:** Include a sustainability plan in the design of all RBSA-funded projects/interventions (*addressed to: ILO ROAF; priority: High; time implication: Medium term; resource implication: Low*)

##### 1.2 Addressed to CO Antananarivo

**Recommendation #3:** Consolidate the results of the Eco langouste project by providing administrative and technical support to stakeholders in the sector during an additional two-year period (*addressed to: ILO CO Antananarivo, with support of ILO ROAF; priority: High; time implication: Short term; resource implication: High*)

**Recommendation #4:** Carry-out high-level discussion with the MTEFoP to overcome its opposition to the geographical expansion of OSIET's services (*addressed to: ILO CO Antananarivo; priority: High; time implication: Short term, resource implication: Low*)



### 1.3 Addressed to CO Harare

**Recommendation #5:** Provide technical assistance to the MJLR to address key institutional weaknesses that affect the sustainability and ownership of employment policies (*addressed to: ILO CO Harare, with support of ILO ROAF; priority: High; time implication: Short term; resource implication: Medium*)

### 1.4 Addressed to the Ministry of Justice and Labor Relations – Namibia

**Recommendation #6:** The Ministry of Justice and Labor Relations should focus its efforts in the following 24 months in addressing key structural issues affecting the viability of the NEP3 implementation (*addressed to: MLJR Namibia; priority: High; time implication: Short term; resource implication: Medium*)

## 1. Background of the Interventions and their Rationale

---

The ILO's work on decent work in global supply chains emphasizes the importance of fair labour practices. A just transition means greening the economy in a way that is as fair and inclusive as possible, maximizing the social and economic opportunities of climate action, while minimizing and carefully managing any challenges – including through effective social dialogue among all impacted groups, and respect for fundamental labour principles and rights.

ILO's support to Madagascar and Namibia aims to develop specific interventions that put in practice the ILO *Guidelines for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all* (2015) and thus contribute to the development of this process in both countries. Specific sectors and tools (e.g. lobster-catching in Madagascar; national employment policy, clean energy generation in Namibia) have been chosen as areas to pioneer this purpose.

### 1.1. Madagascar

Madagascar is considered one of the three most vulnerable countries in the world to the effects of climate change, because of natural disasters, poverty, reliance on natural resources and a lack of capacity to adapt to these factors.

**Lobster-fishing** activities in Madagascar represent a substantial part of the economic activities of fishing communities located in the South-East of the country. In the remote south-eastern Anosy region, where ILO Just Transition interventions are located, over 80% of the population live below the global poverty line of \$1.25/day. Rapid population growth of 2.8% per year is rendering traditional income generation through subsistence agriculture and fishing increasingly unsustainable in the face of diminishing natural resources.

Fishermen, families, and communities working in this activity and region face multiple factors affecting their income, labour rights, security, and the sustainability of their work. For example, climate change has resulted in erratic weather conditions and rough seas, catch averages have been declining steeply in the past decade, and lack of sustainable fisheries management practices has led to depletion of resources. Fishers lack decent work conditions, both regarding their income (which is often reduced by intermediary agents/*collecteurs* who own the canoes they use and pay little for their catch), and the absence of access to occupational safety and health (OSH) and social security. Of particular concern is the situation of women (*rabatteurs*), who act as representatives of intermediary agents at landing beaches, and who are paid small amounts as “commission” for what they collect from fishermen.

In response to the issues above, ILO's Just Transition intervention in Anosy, organized under the project Ecolangouste-Sud, identified the following expected results, under a “bottom-up” strategy:

- **Result 1:** The capacity of the Association of Employers of Madagascar (GEM) to effectively implement sustainable management mechanisms on coastal and marine eco systems is strengthened, under the framework of a Just Transition in the lobster-catching value chain.

- **Result 2:** The capacity of the Madagascar Conference of Workers (CTM) to effectively implement sustainable management mechanisms on coastal and marine eco systems is strengthened, under the framework of a Just Transition in the lobster-catching value chain.
- **Result 3:** The Government of Madagascar (GOM), in collaboration with employers' and workers' organizations, implements sustainable management mechanisms in the lobster-catching value chain, through a Just Transition and digitalization.
- **Result 4:** Lobster-catching value chain's productivity and resilience from climate shocks are improved through sustainable entrepreneurship, skills development, gender equality and formalization.

### 1.2. Namibia

An estimated 70% of the population in Namibia does not have access to electricity, which, together with widespread poverty, characterizes the Namibia as being one of the most unequal societies in the world.

The Ministry of Labour, Industrial Relations and Employment Creation and the National Planning Commission have requested ILO's assistance to ensure that private and public investment leads to social impacts and results in employment and skills development opportunities for Namibians. Under its Just Transition intervention, the ILO is providing technical advice on green jobs and capacity development for evidence-based advocacy and policy dialogue to ensure that the investment leads to broader social impacts through skills development and job opportunities for Namibians. This builds on the ongoing support to formulate the 3rd National Employment Policy (NEP3); the establishment of a framework for employment impact assessment (EmPIAs) and development of pro-employment and gender responsive budgeting toolkits.

Likewise, in 2021 Hyphen Hydrogen Energy, a Namibian company, was selected by the Namibian government to develop, construct and operate green hydrogen production facilities in the Tsau/Khaeb national park for international, regional and domestic markets. The Hyphen's project is expected to create around 15,000 jobs during its construction period and once fully developed, it will employ approximately 3,000 people. As part of its assistance to **capacity building on Just Transition within the GON**, the ILO supported the development of a social accounting matrix on this green hydrogen investment and piloting an Employment Impact Assessment on the Hydrogen sector.

In response to the issues above, the ILO identified the following expected results for its interventions in Namibia:

**Result 1:** The Government in consultation with social partners and through social dialogue mainstreams Just Transition Policy Measures in ongoing strategic policy processes and frameworks.

**Key result 2:** Constituents, especially workers and employers' organisations have increased capacities on mainstreaming just transition in the green hydrogen investments and ongoing policy processes for tripartite partners.

## 2. Purpose, scope, and clients of evaluation

---

### 2.1. Final Evaluation's Purpose and Overall Objective

The final evaluation's purpose is to assure accountability and learning to the ILO constituents and key stakeholders. Knowledge and information obtained from this evaluation will contribute inputs to the design of future interventions and expanding and adapting ILO's work on Just Transition in the African region. The evaluation will also contribute to strengthening local governance and building accountability of the governments of Madagascar and Namibia and ILO constituents in these countries.

The overall objective of the final evaluation is to assess the contribution of the ILO interventions, strategies, and approaches to a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies in Madagascar and Namibia.

The **specific objectives** of the final evaluation are:

- a. To assess the relevance of the interventions' design and implementation strategies in relation to the relevant ILO, UN and national development frameworks (i.e. SDGs and UNSDCF) of countries covered and final beneficiaries' needs.
- b. To review and substantiate emerging evidence related to the achievements of the interventions' goals and their contribution to the advancement of just transition efforts in the respective countries and across the continent.
- c. To assess the extent to which the interventions have achieved their stated objectives and expected results, while identifying the supporting factors and constraints that have led to them, including strategies and implementation modalities chosen, partnership and coordination arrangements.
- d. To identify unexpected positive and negative results of the RBSA interventions.
- e. To assess the level of implementation efficiency of the interventions.
- f. To assess the extent to which the interventions' outcomes and observed impacts will be sustainable in the respective countries.
- g. To identify lessons learned and emerging good practices for the key stakeholders, including ILO in Africa, to guide its efforts in supporting just transitions.
- h. To provide strategic recommendations for the different key stakeholders to promote sustainability and support further development, as well as to inform the design of future similar interventions of the ILO in support to just transition.

15

### 2.2. Scope

This evaluation addresses all interventions-related activities implemented at national, regional and local levels in Madagascar and at national level in Namibia between March 2023 and February 2025. The geographical coverage of the evaluation includes all geographical locations where the interventions were implemented: The Anosy Region (Taolagnaro District and city of Fort Dauphin), and the national level for Namibia (mainly carried out at the capital city of Winhoek). The period evaluated encompasses the entire project period from design to implementation. Meetings were held at Fort Dauphin and

Mokala in Madagascar, and at Windhoek in Namibia. Remote meetings with ILO Specialists and national staff were organized virtually.

Integrating gender equality and social dialogue as cross-cutting concerns was part of data collection, analysis, and reporting. To the extent available, the evaluator reviewed secondary data and information disaggregated by sex and age. The evaluator also assessed the relevance and effectiveness of the interventions' strategy related to gender equality.

This report gleans information from a diverse range of stakeholders who participated in and were intended to benefit from interventions in both countries (please refer to Annex4 for a detailed list of institutions and beneficiaries addressed by the evaluation).

### 2.3. Users

The users of this final evaluation are:

#### **Madagascar :**

- Public and semi-public institutions: The Ministry of Labor, Employment and Public Function (MTEFoP)– Regional Directorate at Anosy, the Ministry of Fishing and Blue Economy (MPEB) – Regional Directorate at Anosy, and the Regional Directorate of Social Security at Anosy -*Caisse Nationale de Prévoyance Sociale (CNAPS)*; l'Organisation Sanitaire Inter Entreprise de Taolagnaro (OSIET);
- Employers' organizations: Groupement des Entreprises de Madagascar (GEM), Groupement des Langoustiers de Madagascar (GLM) ;
- Workers' Organizations : Conférence des Travailleurs de Madagascar (CTM), Confédération Chrétienne des Syndicats Malgaches (SEKRIMA).

16

#### **Namibia:**

- The Ministry of Justice and Labour Relations (MJLR, previously known as Ministry of Labour, Industrial Relations and Employment Creation -MLIREC); the National Planning Commission (NPC); the Namibia Investment Promotion Development Board (NIPDB); the Ombudsman Office;
- Employers' organizations: The Namibia Employers' Federation;
- Workers' organizations: The Trade Union Congress of Namibia; the Namibia National Labour Organization; the National Union of Namibian Workers.

#### **ILO:**

- The ILO Country Office (CO) in Madagascar
- The ILO Country Office for Zimbabwe and Namibia
- The ILO Regional Office for Africa in Abidjan (ROAF)
- Other relevant ILO policy departments, branches and programmes working in matters related to Just Transition.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1. Evaluation Framework

The evaluation followed the ILO's evaluation policy which adheres to international standards and best practices, articulated in the OECD/DAC Principles and the Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the United Nations System approved by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

The evaluation used a mix of evaluation approaches and ensured triangulation of information. It used a results-based approach to examine the interventions' achievements; mixed methods to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings; and a participatory approach in that, to the extent possible, the evaluation involved ILO key stakeholders such as beneficiaries, ILO Tripartite Constituents, ILO staff and strategic partners.

Data collection work was performed through both face-to-face interviews and meetings in each country, and through virtual interviews, as needed (e.g. for ILO staff in Geneva and Antananarivo). The evaluator carried out field work in Namibia (Windhoek) on May 12 -15, and in Madagascar (Fort Dauphin and Mokala) on May 19-23.

The Evaluation used as evaluation criteria the standard OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria for evaluating development assistance: Relevance and strategic fit; coherence; effectiveness; efficiency; impact orientation; and sustainability.<sup>1</sup>

ILO's cross-cutting policy drivers on Decent Work, including the promotion of equality between men and women and non-discrimination, and social dialogue, were taken in account when evaluating the project.

As per the evaluation TOR (please see Annex 1), a list of 34 key questions was formulated to guide the gathering, analysis, conclusions and recommendations, as well as lessons learned and good practices. The specific evaluation questions were the following:

**Table 1. Evaluation Criteria and Questions**

| Evaluation Criteria                | Evaluation Questions to be addressed                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Relevance and Strategic Fit</b> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To what extent are the RBSA interventions on just transition aligned to the needs and priorities of tripartite stakeholders and beneficiaries identified in the project documents and during implementation?</li> <li>2. How well do the RBSA interventions on just transition support national development commitments, regional priorities, and relevant SDGs?</li> <li>3. To what extent are the interventions' objectives aligned with the socioeconomic realities and specific challenges of each target country (Madagascar and Namibia)?</li> <li>4. Did the projects' design reflect a logical, realistic, and purposeful approach toward achieving their objectives in different national contexts?</li> </ol> |
| <b>Coherence</b>                   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. How well do the interventions complement and align with other ongoing ILO programmes and projects in the respective countries and across the region?</li> <li>6. Are there any overlaps, synergies, or potential duplications with other donor-supported projects or national programs?</li> </ol>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |

<sup>1</sup> See [ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation \(2020\)](#)

|                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                           | <p>7. To what extent have the interventions been designed to maximize systemic and sustainable changes at national and regional levels?</p> <p>8. How well are the interventions aligned with national policy frameworks, regional priorities, and international commitments, including the Sustainable Development Goals and ILO frameworks and guidelines?</p> <p>9. How effectively do the interventions collaborate with other donors, partners, and stakeholders across two countries to ensure coherence?</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| <b>Effectiveness</b>      | <p>10. To what extent are the interventions likely to achieve their intended objectives by the end of the implementation period?</p> <p>11. Have the interventions been effective in improving just transition and decent work across the two countries?</p> <p>12. What are the key success factors and challenges encountered in achieving the expected outcomes?</p> <p>13. Have the interventions followed their Theory of Change, and have the assumptions and development hypotheses been validated by performance data?</p> <p>14. Have the interventions achieved their targeted outputs and outcomes equitably across geographic areas and for intended beneficiaries (e.g., women, youth, informal workers)?</p> <p>15. What unexpected results, both positive and negative, have emerged from the interventions?</p>                     |
| <b>Efficiency</b>         | <p>16. How effective was the technical support and backstopping provided by ILO's Decent Work Teams (DWTs) and headquarters?</p> <p>17. How efficiently have the financial, human, and technical resources been allocated and utilized across the interventions to achieve their objectives?</p> <p>18. Have project funds and interventions been delivered in a timely manner, and what were the key bottlenecks encountered in implementation?</p> <p>19. Could similar results have been achieved with fewer resources or through alternative approaches?</p> <p>20. Have the interventions adequately incorporated gender and inclusion objectives within their budgeting and planning processes?</p> <p>21. Has an effective risk management, monitoring, and evaluation system been established and implemented across the interventions?</p> |
| <b>Impact Orientation</b> | <p>22. How have the interventions contributed to long-term improvements in the lives of beneficiaries, particularly women and youth?</p> <p>23. What tangible changes have the interventions brought at the policy and practice levels in terms of governance, technical capacity on just transition, and access to decent work?</p> <p>24. To what extent have the interventions contributed to broader national, regional and global development goals?</p> <p>25. What evidence exists of the interventions' contributions to strengthening local institutions, social partners, and governance systems?</p> <p>26. What lessons can be drawn from the impact of the interventions to inform ILO future just transition projects and interventions?</p>                                                                                          |
| <b>Sustainability</b>     | <p>27. Are the interventions' results structured to ensure long-term sustainability beyond their lifecycle?</p> <p>28. How effectively have the interventions built local ownership, institutional capacity, and stakeholder commitment to sustain their outcomes and impacts?</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |

|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                      | 29. What are the main risks to the sustainability of the interventions' achievements, and how have these risks been mitigated?<br>30. To what extent are national institutions and implementing partners prepared to sustain the outcomes without continued ILO support?<br>31. Have realistic and effective exit strategies been developed and implemented to ensure ongoing benefits for beneficiaries and partners?<br>32. Will the interventions' beneficiaries, such as women and informal workers, continue to experience improved access to just transition support after the end of ILO support? |
| Cross-cutting Issues | 33. To what extent did the interventions mainstream gender equality and non-discrimination principles into their design and implementation?<br>34. How effectively did the interventions promote strong and independent worker and employer organizations and facilitate constructive social dialogues?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |

### 3.2. Methods and Techniques

Evaluation methods and techniques address the collection of primary and secondary data. Primary data is information that the evaluator collected directly from stakeholders about their first-hand experience with the interventions. This data was collected through face-to-face and remote individual interviews and focus group discussions.

Secondary data is documentary evidence that has direct relevance for the purposes of the evaluation and that has been produced by the ILO, the GOM and GON authorities, and other individuals or agencies for purposes other than those of the evaluation.

19

Evaluation methods and techniques included:

#### a. Document Review

The evaluator reviewed a variety of documents related in each country to the current evaluation. Examples include the project document, annual reports on projects' results, activity reports, policy documents, specific assessments, training programs, and other documents, as relevant. The list of documents reviewed can be found in Annex 3.

#### b. Key Informant Interviews and Focus Groups

The evaluator carried out face-to-face and remote key informant interviews (KII) and focus group discussions (FGD) with relevant stakeholders, as per the agenda per country attached as Annex 4. Ten (10) face-to-face KII were conducted in Namibia (of which 30% of interviewees were women), and 10 in Madagascar (20% of interviewees were women). An additional 2 remote KII were carried out with ILO Geneva staff<sup>2</sup> (addressing the Namibia interventions) and 4 remote KII in Madagascar (75% male interviewees).

**In the case of Madagascar, one focus group discussion (FGD)** with 2 female and 22 male fishmongers and fishermen, which benefitted directly from ILO interventions, was organized at the fishing community of Mokala; likewise, two FGD with institutional staff that were trained as trainers in ILO's COOP (2 people) and GERME (4 people) methodologies were conducted in Fort Dauphin. Please refer to Annex 4 for a tentative list of participants in these meetings. While the FGD in Mokala was based on the

<sup>2</sup> ILO-HQ Staff interviewed: Chief Technical Advisor – Employment impact assessments and targeting and Senior Employment Intensive Specialist.

spontaneous participation of villagers present in the community at the moment of the visit, intentional sampling was used to select participants in the other two FGD.

The following table summarizes the number of participants in KII and FGD, per country, type of organization, sex and modality of interview (face-to-face, remote). In total, 20% of participants were women.

Table 2. Number of Participants in KII and FGD per Country/ modality

| Type of Org<br>Country/modality                       | Gov<br>Org | Employers'<br>Org | Workers'<br>Org | CSOs | Int<br>Org<br>(incl<br>ILO) | Total<br>Male | Total<br>Female | Grand<br>Total |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------------|-----------------|------|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| F-to-F Windhoek<br>Namibia                            | 3          | 1                 | 3               | 1    | 2                           | 8             | 2               | 10             |
| Remote Namibia                                        | -          | -                 | -               | -    | 2                           | 2             | -               | 02             |
| F-to-F Fort<br>Dauphin<br>Madagascar                  | 5          | -                 | 1               | 2    | 2                           | 7             | 3               | 10             |
| Remote<br>Madagascar                                  |            | 1                 | 1               | -    | 2                           | 3             | 1               | 04             |
| FGD with COOP<br>trainers                             | 1          | -                 | -               | 1    | -                           | 1             | 1               | 02             |
| FGD with Germe<br>Trainers                            | 1          | -                 | -               | 3    | -                           | 2             | 2               | 04             |
| FGD with<br>fishmongers and<br>fishermen at<br>Mokala | -          | -                 | -               | 24   | -                           | 22            | 2               | 24             |
| Total                                                 | 10         | 2                 | 5               | 31   | 8                           | 45            | 11              | 56             |

20

The intersection of qualitative data -from interviews- and quantitative data - basically obtained through analysis of monitoring information, annual project reports, and interventions' records in each country- allowed for an external validation of the different subjective perceptions. The **KII and FGD guidelines used in the evaluation** are presented in Annex 5.

### **c. Workshop to Review and Validate Preliminary Findings in Each Country**

At the end of the field work in each country the evaluator presented the preliminary findings to the key stakeholders in a presential workshop in Windhoek on May 15 and a remote/online workshop on May 23, 2025. This allowed to discuss, validate and refine the findings of the evaluation and fill information gaps.

#### ***d. The evaluation matrix***

The evaluation matrix presented in Annex 2 served as the main framework for organizing and clarifying the focus of data collection efforts. It consists of a double-entry table in which sources of relevant information are identified for each evaluation category and question. This allows to capture and systematise all relevant information within a single document. In addition to clarifying and focusing data collection, the matrix facilitated the subsequent data analysis and reporting phases.

### **3.3. Limitations**

Given the fact that participants in group meetings were selected through intentional sampling, there may be some bias in participants responses. However, during group meetings, the evaluator prompted for additional information as needed to reduce this risk.

The evaluation findings are based on information collected from background documents, the interventions' monitoring and evaluation systems, and key informant interviews. The accuracy of the evaluation findings is predicated on the integrity of information provided to the evaluator from these sources. All efforts were made to triangulate this information and mitigate any information bias.

## **4. Findings**

---

### **4.1. Madagascar: Performance Analysis per Evaluation Criteria**

21

#### **4.1.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit**

ILO RBSA Just Transition-related interventions in Madagascar are relevant and consistent with the needs and priorities of a variety of stakeholders.

From the side of the Government of Madagascar and the Employers' Organisations, the interventions responded to an explicit request from the Groupement des Langoustiers de Madagascar (GLM) and the Ministry of Fishing and Blue Economy (MPEB) aiming at improving the socio-economic viability of the lobster-catching value chain in the Anosy region, by providing an opportunity to put in practice the lobster-catching technical framework agreed in 2021 by GLM, local fishing communities and the MPEB. The interventions aim also to support the implementation of an annual ban on fishing activities, legal minimum size of authorized catch, and a ban on catching egg-laden females. At the same time, several interventions responded to the need to improve and diversify the livelihoods of fishing families and communities and provide them with alternative means to compensate temporary reduction of income. The interventions contribute to SDGs 5 (gender equality), 8 (decent work), and 14 (sustainable management of marine resources). They are aligned with the UNSDCF 2021-2023 strategic priorities #3 (Boost labor productivity and productive job creation for decent incomes and a competitive economy) and #4 (Strengthen sustainable, resilient, and inclusive environmental management).

ILO interventions in Madagascar contribute to ILO's Country Programme Outcomes (CPO) MDG 801, MDG 802 and MDG 103. They contribute to the ILO P&B output achievement indicators 1.1.2, 1.2.1, 3.3.1, 4.2.1, and 5.5.1.

Specifically, ILO interventions in Madagascar contribute to outcome 1.3 of the Madagascar DWCP 2021-2023 (More investments in productive and manufacturing systems, including the blue and green economy and digitalization, are promoted for inclusive, sustainable, and inclusive growth).

They are relevant to four of the five axes of the Madagascar's National Blue Economy Strategy<sup>3</sup>, aimed at developing an integrated planning process and implement a framework to unify the social, ecological, and economic benefits and impacts of activities in blue sectors. The interventions sponsored by the ILO, such as the operationalization of the interprofessional organization in the lobster value chain, have allowed to pilot this comprehensive framework.

Regarding the **Strategic Fit** of the interventions, the Ecolangouste project reflected a logical approach towards achieving its results, by linking the strengthening of capacities of key actors (MPEB, GLM, CTM) with the implementation of effective management mechanisms (e.g., inter professional organization of the lobster value chain, digital alert and market information system, strengthening of labour inspection), and formalization of fishmongers' cooperatives and fishers' associations. While the project reflected a purposeful approach, it did not allocate a sufficient and realistic amount of time (it was implemented in just two years), to accompany its beneficiaries, consolidate its results and strengthen its sustainability.

#### 4.1.2 Coherence

An important factor of the *Ecolangouste* project's success in achieving its multiple goals was the ILO's team capacity to establish fruitful cooperation links among diverse local actors. Thus, the project involved close coordination of efforts and joint action by various stakeholders in the lobster sector, including public institutions (MTEFOP, MPEB, CNAPS) and public-private institutions (OSIET), social partners (GEM, GLM, CTM), and local NGOs (CARA, Aquatic Service). The project established cooperation links with the GiZ Prada project for the implementation of APGLs.

Within the ILO, the *Ecolangouste* project generated successful cooperation with other ILO initiatives, such as the Vision Zero Fund (SST) and the ProAgro Youth Project (youth training). ILO actions in the lobster-catching sector also received support from two ILO initiatives in place in Madagascar: A project on *“Contribution à l'amélioration de la sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle, et la création d'emplois décentés dans le domaine de l'économie bleue à travers le développement de la chaîne de valeur spiruline”*, and a project on *«Restauration des écosystèmes récifaux pour renforcer la résilience des écosystèmes marins dans le sud-ouest de Madagascar»* (MDG/22/03/UNP). These projects contributed funds, respectively, to support activities related to improving 100 women/youth livelihood means and to develop locally managed fishing areas.

#### 4.1.3 Effectiveness

While the pilot interventions of this two-year project contributed to relevant progress in each of its expected results, several factors hamper the eventual impact of Results 1, 2 and 4 (see section 4.1.6: Sustainability).

---

<sup>3</sup> Stratégie Nationale de l'Économie Bleue (MPEB, 2022). Please see the project's contribution to the implementation of this strategy in section 4.1.3 (Effectiveness), Result 3.

The project carried out most of its planned activities and achieved most of its expected outputs. ILO interventions in support of the promotion of a Just Transition in the lobster-catching sector were mostly successful, the implementers managing to reach or surpass their set targets. By May 2025 most interventions had been completed or were in the process of achieving their expected outputs. Only a limited number of originally expected outputs could not be achieved (please see further at the end of this section).

**Result 1: Strengthened capacity of the Association of Employers of Madagascar (GEM)/ Lobster-Fishing Association of Madagascar (GLM) to implement sustainable mechanisms in the lobster industry with a view to a Just Transition**

At outcome level, Employers, represented by GLM, are fully aware of the need to implement sustainable management mechanisms that ensure the preservation of fishing resources (minimum size of resources, annual ban period), and at the same time, to ensure acceptable working conditions for fishermen and fishmongers. GLM accepted and promoted the agreement with fishmongers' cooperatives and fishermen associations on a stable price per fishing quota and has actively coordinated with CNAPS and OSIET to implement a social security and OSH network for fishermen (the President of the GLM is also the president of the Conseil d'Administration of OSIET). GLM has actively engaged in trying to address the recent opposition from MTEFoP to allow OSIET to extend the coverage of its services beyond 30 Km, to attend onsite the preventive and health needs of fishing communities. As MTEFoP maintains its opposition to such extension, this problem remains unsolved. The ILO Director in Madagascar has sent a letter to MTEFFoP on this matter.

23

The following outputs were achieved by the project:

- a) 50 people trained in Just Transition, social dialogue, greening of corporate practices, and green entrepreneurship.
- b) 50 people trained in occupational safety and health.
- c) 25 lobster collectors and staff from processing plants made aware on better distribution of income generated by the industry, with particular attention to the situation of women working as rabatteurs.
- d) 50 women trained in techniques and practices for sustainable collection and management of lobster fishing products.
- e) A Just Transition advocacy framework document for the GEM/ GLM is available.

**Result 2: Strengthened capacity of the Madagascar Conference of Workers (CTM) for the sustainable management of coastal ecosystems and fisheries resources with a view to a Just Transition**

At the outcome level, fishmongers and fishermen in 7 communities are articulated for a first time in workers' organizations (e.g., cooperatives and associations) and affiliated to a regional union. Likewise, the capacity of the national workers' organization CTM, through its local representative union SEKRIMA was strengthened, allowing it to become knowledgeable of the issues affecting workers in the blue sector and the need for a just transition. In this way, SEKRIMA, which was mainly composed of mining-sector workers, was able to increase and diversify its membership. Likewise, fishmongers and fishermen have acquired knowledge and put into practice measures for the conservation of fishing

resources, reduction of loss and respect of minimum size of produce. Fishmongers and fishermen are also knowledgeable of their recently acquired rights to social security and OSH services. Notwithstanding the above, the fact that the fishermen and fishmongers received reduced income during the annual fishing ban and are currently affected by reduced periods of fishing activity each month due to adverse climate conditions, have impeded them to comply with their contributions to SEKRIMA for two quarters since their affiliation in October 2024. Given that the project ended in April 2025, ILO staff have not been able to implement mitigation measures regarding these issues.

The following outputs were achieved by the project:

- a) 266 lobster fishing stakeholders (including 63 fishmongers and 203 fishermen) joined the Christian Confederation of Malagasy Unions (SEKRIMA)
- b) 50 women "rabatteurs" trained in association management, collective bargaining, and techniques and practices for the sustainable collection and management of lobster fishing products
- c) 25 people trained in advocacy for better distribution of income generated by the sector, with particular attention to the situation of women rabatteurs
- d) A membership strategy and an action plan to increase CTM representation is available
- e) A gender-sensitive guidance note for CTM, for promoting Just Transition was validated

24

**Result 3: Implementation by the Malagasy government, in collaboration with employer and worker organizations, of sustainable management practices in the lobster value chain, through Just Transition and Digitalization.**

As an outcome of its interventions, the Ecolangouste Sud Project contributed to advance Madagascar's Stratégie Nationale de l'Économie Bleue (SNEB, 2023-2025), by: a. Creating awareness of the national regulatory framework among key stakeholders (contributing to axe 1 of the SNEB); b. Improving governance in the aquaculture sector through the **pilot implementation** of an inter professionalization framework (axe 2 of the SNEB); c. Improving fishing agreements (axe 3 of the SNEB); and d. Implementing a spatial planning approach involving all stakeholders and managing resources to improve the environment and human wellbeing (axe 4 of the SNEB).

The following outputs were achieved by the project:

- a. Implementation (pilot implementation in a village) of a Local Governance Protected Area (APGL), including the establishment of social dialogue mechanisms (tripartite committee, communal committee) and enforcement mechanisms (control and monitoring committee), validated management rules, and a gender-sensitive management plan, achieving an increase in lobster weight after one month of fishing ban period.
- b. 63 fishmongers (including 17 women) trained in reducing post-harvest lobster losses, with actual losses reduced from 8% to 4%.
- c. A mobile early warning, market information, and advisory system to anticipate climate risks and market failures was implemented.

- d. Livelihoods and income sources for lobster industry stakeholders were improved through the implementation of economic diversification activities for 63 families in the fishing sector and the training of another 199 fishermen in alternative fishing techniques.

These achievements did not face major challenges, and the systems established remained functional by the end of the project. Both the local representatives of the MoLEFP and the MPEB expressed their satisfaction with regards to the support received from the project.

**Result 4: The productivity and resilience to climate shocks of the lobster value chain have been improved through Sustainable Entrepreneurship, Skills Development, Gender Equality, and Formalization.**

Both fishmongers and fishermen activities were **formalized** respectively in cooperatives and associations, a mechanism which in turn would allow them to access, for the first time, social security and OSH services. The project contributed to increasing families' resilience to climate shocks through training in entrepreneurship and helping expand livelihood means, including the provision of bovines, chicken and seeds. Trainers trained in the GERME and COOP methodologies were able to replicate training courses with workers in the lobster-catching communities, and in the case of GERME in other sectors.

Notwithstanding the above, the trainers interviewed reported that due to the short lifespan of the project they were not able to do a follow-up of the application of training contents by the beneficiaries. Given the limited literacy level of beneficiaries, personalized support would be needed.

25

Likewise, limited management skills of fishmongers and fishermen, together with other factors (reduced income during annual fishing ban, reduced monthly periods for fishing activity due to adverse climate conditions, lack of prevision culture) have impeded them to achieve the expected quotas, putting them in arrears for two quarters with regards to payments to CNAPS and SEKRIMA. This limits their effective access to social security and OSH services for them and their family members. During his visit to one of the beneficiary communities, the evaluator observed that it lacked a unified monthly register on catch and delivery to buyers (companies), each fishmonger having one of its own, not shared with others. In the absence of a unified and collective register on catch and delivery to buyers, how to ascertain if the quotas were completed and the companies pay workers' benefits? Given that the project ended in April, ILO staff have not been able to implement mitigation measures regarding these issues.

Another challenge, both for project implementation and for the workers in the value chain, is the scattered and distant location of fishing communities, as well as the difficult access to them by road. For example, additional to the issues mentioned above, fishmongers and fishers interviewed at the Mokala community raised to the evaluator's attention their need to have a motorboat to speed up the delivery of their produce to Fort Dauphin. The road is in bad shape (a 25km. distance is covered in 1:30 hours using a 4WD). It takes them 4 hours on foot going by the coastline. This is the closest community to Fort Dauphin (some communities are up to 100 km away from the port).

Finally, while the Directorate of Labor and Employment in the Anosy region now has in place and is following a strategic labor inspection plan, it has only 3 labor inspectors and

two assistant labor inspectors, a number of staff that may be insufficient to cover altogether the mining, agriculture and fishing industries and sizable territory.

The following outputs were achieved by the project:

- a. Seven cooperatives and seven associations were created in seven intervention villages, bringing together 63 fishmongers and 203 fishermen, respectively.
- b. Sixty-three *rabatteurs* were professionalized as fishmongers, including 17 women.
- c. Four collaboration contracts have been signed for the operationalization of the interprofessional organization in the lobster value chain.
- d. 17 people were certified as ILO GERME trainers, who in turn trained approximately 2,000 end beneficiaries.
- e. 26 people from 16 government and private institutions completed the ILO Think COOP and Start COOP training courses.
- f. Access to social security (CNAPS) and occupational health (OSIET) was facilitated for the 63 fishmongers and 203 fishermen through their respective affiliation with cooperatives and associations.
- g. A strategic labor inspection plan was developed and made available.
- h. A green skills anticipation report using GREENING TVET was produced.

Notwithstanding the relevant achievements above, a limited number of outputs, originally foreseen in the intervention design, could not be completed due to the limited budget available and/ or the time needed to follow through their implementation. These included:

- a. Training of trainers on the ILO SCORE tool.
- b. The implementation of a mutual savings and credit model for fishermen (this would have required a longer period for implementation than a mere 2 years).
- c. The implementation of a training program for SMEs and cooperatives in value chain, based on the recommendations of the lobster fishing technical framework and on the ILO tool for greening technical and vocational training systems.

#### 4.1.4 Efficiency

The interventions in Madagascar spent 98% of the available funds and managed to obtain additional support from other ILO projects and other cooperation sources. The results of these efforts are impressive in the sense that the implementers managed to carry out a sizable number of activities and reach their targets with limited funding and staffing (2 persons).

Internally, the *Ecolangouste* project received technical support from the **Vision Zero Fund** in developing a workshop for employers' and workers' associations on OSH and on evaluation of hazards in the lobster value chain; from the **ProAgro Youth project** in co-financing training in the GERME and COOP methodologies for youth, and funding from

**project MDG/22/03/UNP<sup>4</sup>** to develop locally managed fishing areas (APGL). Externally, **GizPrada** contributed staff and its own resources for the joint implementation of APGL activities.

While the distribution of expenses among the various outputs appears to be adequate, the implementation period and the amount of funds allocated for monitoring/consolidating results appear insufficient, even if the ILO obtained a two-month non-cost extension to complete certain activities.

This may have a negative final effect on the related impact and sustainability of the interventions if action is not taken with regards to extending the follow up of the interventions' outcome. More time and additional action are needed for accompanying the beneficiaries, helping strengthen their organizations and consolidating the interventions' results.

During the implementation period, ILO staff did thorough and adequate monitoring and documentation of the interventions' achievements, systematically collecting data, as reflected in the lists of participants, disaggregated by sex, on training and other capacity-building activities. Consolidation of data per output/activity was done on a quarterly basis, using an Excel template, comparing targets with actual results per indicator. There were no outcome indicators/ targets. Reporting results was done on an annual basis.

#### 4.1.5 Impact

ILO interventions in Madagascar had a relevant impact on strengthening social dialogue in the lobster-catching sector. A cooperation framework is in place and social dialogue at local/ regional level are fluid among the two concerned ministries (MTEFoP and MPEB), GLM, SEKRIMA, OSIET, CNAPs and local CSO involved in the project. In this sense, the implementation team succeeded in developing a promising model for inter professionalization in value chains and for the formalization of workers.

However, the impact of the interventions is still nascent and limited. After the initial implementation period of 24 months, at least an additional two-year follow-up period is needed to assess the interventions' impact on the productivity and resilience of the lobster fishing sector. There is no current system in place to document and track these impacts.

Similarly, the project's impact on the formalization of stakeholders and on their access to social protection and OHS risks is being affected by contextual and institutional factors that hinder their achievement (see below: Factors Affecting the Sustainability of Project Deliverables).

Immediate actions are needed to consolidate and monitor the achievements of the interventions to ensure their continuity.

#### 4.1.6 Sustainability

The project had a short lifespan, given its ambitious objectives, and it lacked an exit strategy that may have allowed it to follow up and consolidate its results.

---

<sup>4</sup> *Restauration des écosystèmes récifaux pour renforcer la résilience des écosystèmes marins dans le sud-ouest de Madagascar*

The participatory approach implemented by the project allowed it to attain relevant ownership of its achievements by all stakeholders in the lobster industry. (e.g. structuring of an interprofessional framework). This shall help promote the continuity of the actions supported by the ILO.

While government agencies and related bodies (MoLEFP, MPEB<sup>5</sup>, CNAPS, OSIET) and the private sector (GLM, fishing companies) have the mandate and capacity to continue contributing to the continuation of project activities, workers in the lobster value chain lack the capacity to sustain some of the project achievements in absence of ILO's continued support. The sustainability of the results delivered by the project is limited and fragile due to the following factors negatively affecting them:

- Weather conditions and the annual ban on fishing activities at the end of the year affected lobster capture and collection. As a result, the cooperatives did not meet the quota agreed upon with the lobster companies. Consequently, as of May 2025, contributions to the Social Security System (CNAPS) could not be made at all. Therefore, fishermen in the seven target villages where the project worked are two quarters in arrears in their payments to the CNAPS. Given this situation, without effective contributions to the CNAPS, benefits cannot be provided by the latter.
- Similarly, SEKRIMA has not received any contributions from any cooperative or association during the last two quarters. If the lack of contributions to CNAPS and SEKRIMA continues for further quarters, there is a risk that the functioning of the interprofessional framework will be severely affected.
- The effective organization of fishmonger cooperatives and fishing associations is still weak. For example, in the village visited by the evaluator, fishmongers lacked a collective, daily register of collected produce. Cooperatives and associations need more sustained administrative and technical support from the project to operate effectively.
- In November 2024, the MTEFoP in Antananarivo rejected to authorize the OSIET in Fort Dauphin to extend the geographic coverage of its services beyond 30 km. As a result, OSIET cannot provide decentralized services near the villages (which are mostly isolated and very far from Fort Dauphin). This could further hamper the ability of the social security and OSH systems to provide effective healthcare to workers in the lobster value chain.
- The beneficiaries of the Ecolangouste Sud project in the seven targeted villages represent approximately 10% of the total fishermen in these areas. Unfair competition from Chinese companies operating in the area, which pay additional premiums to wholesalers, risks affecting the functioning of the interprofessional framework promoted by the ILO. According to fishermen in a village visited by the evaluator, 50% of the lobster resources are purchased by these Chinese companies. Thus, further action is needed to ensure that the interprofessional framework remains attractive and a competitive option for the workers. Further

---

<sup>5</sup> While MoLEFP has three labor inspectors and two assistant inspectors for the whole of the Anosy region, the MPEB has only two fishing inspectors, of which only one is active (the other one retired recently). This staff may seem insufficient for backing up all needed activities, but addressing this issue is within both ministries' resources and competences.

work is needed to promote and consolidate a culture of prevision among workers in the lobster industry value chain.

#### 4.1.7 Cross-cutting Issues

##### a. Gender

The project had a clear gender equality approach. The dimension of gender was considered as part of the advocacy frameworks formulated for the lobster industry value chain. The project included all female fishmongers within its training and formalization activities (female rabatteurs in the 7 targeted communities represented 27% of beneficiaries -17 women out of 63 people). It also included women as direct beneficiaries in project trainings and livelihoods support activities at community level. Additionally, the project promoted equitable participation of men and women in Trainers of Trainers (TOT) Trainings. For example, the number of male and female participation in GERME and COOP trainings was similar. All female and male members in cooperatives and associations were sensitized with regards to OSH issues; however, given that the majority of fishermen are male, the majority of attendants to OSH activities were male.

##### b. Tripartism

The project was implemented on the basis of a tripartite framework, involving government agencies, an employers' association (GLM), a workers' union (SEKRIMA), and various cooperatives and associations organized with project support.

29

##### c. Social Dialogue

On-going social dialogue was the means and path through which most project activities were implemented. The inter professionalization framework established by the project is a clear outcome of social dialogue efforts.

#### 4.2. Namibia: Performance Analysis per Evaluation Criteria

##### 4.2.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit

ILO RBSA-funded intervention regarding Just Transition in Namibia contributes to UNSDG 4 (skills for young people), 8 (job creation) and 13 (integrate climate change into planning), and are aligned with the United Nations Partnership Framework (UNPAF) 2019-2024 and with the ILO DWCP 2019-2023.

ILO interventions in Namibia contribute to ILO CPO NAM126, as well as to ILO P&B Outputs 3.1 (national employment policies), 3.3 (just transition) and 5.1 (skills mismatch and anticipation of skills needs). ILO RBSA-funded intervention is relevant to constituents' priorities and needs. The former Ministry of Labor, Industrial Relations and Employment Creation (MLIREC) and the National and the Planning Commission (NPC) explicitly requested the ILO to provide support to assess and develop a just transition strategy in the green hydrogen value chain; they also requested its support to develop a new national employment policy (NEP3). Likewise, they requested ILO's support for the establishment of an employment impact assessment system and of a

pro-employment gender responsive budgeting toolkit to mainstream jobs and gender equality in the formulation of national budgets, and develop a sectoral skills needs diagnostic report for the green hydrogen sector. The GON also requested to be part of the pathfinder countries on the UN Global Accelerator (GA) on Jobs and Social Protection for Just Transitions. All these were separate requests, most of which were “packed” by the ILO under the RBSA-funded proposal: “Promoting just transition and productive employment in Namibia.”

Regarding its Strategic Fit, the RBSA-funded proposal comprises a series of interventions in different areas/ sectors to be developed in a more or less separate way with diverse institutional actors, and which, although grouped under a same project title and under the general subheadings of “policy advice” and “capacity development”, do not present in many cases a clear logical and hierarchical between outputs and expected results.

#### 4.2.2 Coherence

The ILO does not have a country office in Namibia, its program being handled by the CO in Harare, but it maintains a collaboration relationship with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and other UN agencies such as UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA in Namibia.

ILO interventions are aligned with the Harambee Prosperity Plan 2 (addressing activities -e.g. “Investigate the feasibility of Green Hydrogen and Ammonia as a transformative strategic industry” - foreseen in Goal 3: “Developing Complementary Engines of Growth” of Pillar 2: “Economic Advancement”), and the National Development Plan 6 (addressing one of the latter’s overarching developmental objectives: Curbing the rising unemployment levels/creation of employment).

30

#### 4.2.3 Effectiveness

In this section we will discuss separately the contribution of the project to the attainment of the results enunciated in the proposal, and the achievement of specific outputs according to some areas of implementation.

Regarding the project’s contribution to specific key results:

**Result 1: The Government in consultation with social partners and through social dialogue mainstreams Just Transition Policy Measures in ongoing strategic policy processes and frameworks.**

Although some work has been advanced to study impact of green hydrogen investments towards achieving just transitions, **at outcome level no major contribution has yet been registered** with regards to the result above. The Employment impact assessment (EmPIA) on Green Jobs in the green hydrogen value chain was reduced to a study on the HYPHEN green hydrogen project and has not yet been validated; the originally expected policy gap analysis assessing the policy landscape towards effectively promoting just transitions and productive employment in Namibia was not conducted; and the originally expected tripartite just transition strategy/roadmap for Promoting Decent Work in the green hydrogen was not developed. The GON did not prioritize the implementation of these issues. It seems that the idea that the Green Hydrogen sector is to generate an important number of jobs is losing support, as the sector may be less employment-intensive than originally thought. Likewise, while gender responsive and

pro-employment budgeting processes were developed, these later stalled due to lack of prioritization from the Ministry of Finance.

**At outcome level**, with STED project's support, ILO helped develop the institutional capacity at the National Investment Promotion Development Board (NIPDB) to apply sectoral approaches and to develop skills assessments. The NIPDB has shown **ownership** of this methodology and after completing a study of the energy sector, it foresees carrying out skills analysis of other sectors (e.g. agriculture, manufacturing, tourism, automotive, transportation and the film and creative industry).

Substantive project efforts were concentrated in the development of the National Employment Policy 3 (NEP3), whose draft has been completed and is yet to be validated at national level before being implemented. Thus, no contribution can be ascertained yet at outcome level.

**Key result 2:** Constituents, especially workers and employers' organisations have increased capacities on mainstreaming just transition in the green hydrogen investments and ongoing policy processes for tripartite partners.

**At outcome level** no major contribution has been registered with regards to the result above, as the originally expected "employment promotion social dialogue mechanism to advise on the green hydrogen project, employment policies, and other key programs including the Global Accelerator", was not established. As social dialogue has been conducted among tripartite partners to formulate the draft of the NEP3, Namibia is still lacking a stable, employment promotion social dialogue mechanism to address labour related issues, including Just Transition-related issues.

31

**At output level**, most interventions have been completed or are in the process of being completed. The variety of outputs related to the RBSA-funded intervention contribute to the two main expected results for the country (development of policies, capacity building among constituents), but may be classified under four areas of intervention: Development the Third National Employment policy, promotion of gender-responsive and pro-employment budgeting, capacity building on Just Transition, and building the capacity of local institutions to apply sectoral analysis on skills development (STED).

### 1. Third National Employment Policy

- a. An evaluation of the second national employment policy (NEP2)<sup>6</sup> and a situational analysis for the third national employment policy (NEP3) were completed under the lead of Ministry of Labor, Industrial Relations and Employment Creation (MLIREC).
- b. Two MLIREC staff were trained in the development of employment policies by the ILO International Training Centre at Turin (ITC-Turin).

---

<sup>6</sup> The evaluation of the second National Employment Policy (NEP2) revealed significant misalignments with the National Development Plan (NDP4), particularly in ideological direction and labor standards, which hindered effective implementation. Key challenges included the absence of a coordinating authority, lack of funding, poor inter-ministerial collaboration, and failure to mainstream NEP2 across government strategies. Despite a comprehensive framework, there was no monitoring mechanism, and skills development remained inadequate. Recommendations emphasized aligning employment policy with national planning, setting measurable targets, establishing a central coordinating body, fostering institutional collaboration, and reforming social protection systems.

- c. Following several consultation meetings among tripartite stakeholders, there is a draft of a National Employment Policy 3 (NEP3) available. The Ministry has scheduled regional consultative workshops to discuss the draft and obtain inputs from a wider group, before it is validated at national level.
- d. The allocation of responsibilities and identification of institutional capacities for the implementation of the NEP3 are yet to be developed.

## **2. Gender responsive and pro-employment budgeting processes**

- a. A training curriculum was developed and implemented.
- b. A gender responsive and pro-employment budgeting toolkit was developed.
- c. The Implementation process of the toolkit/ budgeting methodology stalled due to opposition from the Ministry of Finance, which did not prioritize this issue.

## **3. Capacity building on Just Transition**

- a. An initial discussion between the Hyphen Consortium and the ILO in April 2023 as the RBSA-funded interventions were starting up.
- b. A Social Accounting Model (SAM) was developed by the Namibian Statistic Agency (NSA) with the support from the ILO. A SAM matrix was completed to support conducting an Employment Impact Assessment; however, the SAM is not focused in one investment or sector, but it is rather a snapshot of the whole economy. The SAM matrix was funded by ILO's STRENGTHEN 2 Project.
- c. An employment impact assessment (EIA) of an investment in the green hydrogen sector (Hyphen) was conducted, but the report is yet to be finalized due to ongoing substantive discussions with stakeholders about the methodology and findings. The EIA was also funded by the STRENGTHEN 2 Project<sup>7</sup>.
- d. A Just Transition workshop for constituents in Namibia was conducted with RBSA project support on late 2024. The workshop, led by the ILO's Senior Specialist on Sustainable Enterprises, aimed to raise awareness among Namibian constituents about the importance of Just Transition in the face of environmental and climate change. It sought to build understanding, strengthen policy development capacities, foster collaboration among stakeholders, and identify next steps toward establishing a national Just Transition framework for Namibia.
- e. A Just Transition tripartite roadmap for promoting Decent Work in the green hydrogen sector was **NOT** developed, as originally planned in the RBSA-funded proposal.
- f. The follow-up of activities on Just Transition in Namibia will be carried out in the future under the UN Global Accelerator Project, of which the country is one of the pathfinder members and the ILO a key stakeholder.

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.ilo.org/resource/news/strengthen2-employment-impact-assessment-maximize-job-creation-africa>

#### 4. SKILLS for Trade and Economic Diversification (STED)

- a. An inaugural Skills for Trade and Economic Diversification (STED) Workshop was carried out in November 2023. The consultative workshop was co-facilitated by two STED technical experts from the ILO and brought together approximately 90 participants from government ministries and agencies, heads of private sector, civil society, education and training institutions and unions. It aimed to achieve the following outcomes: a. Understanding STED and the methodology behind it; b. Appreciating why STED is important for the country; c. Understanding the roles of various stakeholders in supporting the process; d. Appreciating how STED has evolved in other countries; e. Obtaining buy-in and support of the stakeholders in driving this key process; f. Informing the establishment/ strengthening of National Sector Committees and associated governance structure; g. Prioritize economic sectors according to national development plans.
- b. A skills background study for the energy sector<sup>8</sup> (addressing 4 subsectors: green hydrogen, biomass and biofuels, renewables and oil & gas) was completed by the Namibia Investment Promotion Development Board in 2024, and validated in March 2025, through a STED foresight and policy workshop aimed at formulating a vision and recommend actions.
- c. The recommendations informed the energy sector skills strategy, which was validated and finalized for submission to the Government for approval process.
- d. Relevant capacities have been developed in the NIPDB to apply sectoral approaches (STED) to conduct similar skills anticipation studies.
- e. NIPDB has identified various sectors in which it will carry out STED analysis in the future (e.g. agriculture, manufacturing, tourism, automotive, transportation and the film and creative industry).
- f. NIPDB will do an annual report on skills supply and demand in Namibia.
- g. As the ILO is starting a new project in Namibia (e.g., Sustainable Trade and Investment in Southern Africa -SUSTAIN), the work carried out with RBSA funding on skills could be an entry point for work to be implemented under this new project.

---

<sup>8</sup> The study contains a series of specific findings and recommendations pertaining to the areas of economic and labor force analysis, business analysis, skills demand analysis, and skills supply analysis. The conclusions of the evaluation call for a. Maintaining stable energy prices, including electricity and fuel prices, which will play an important role in the energy sector's value chain development and promote a spillover effect on broader socio-economic development and industrialization; b. Addressing address challenges such as skills gaps, technological adoption and regulatory compliance that may hamper opportunities created by favorable policy and positive investment trends; c. Up-skilling and re-skilling the labor force through TVET programs and increasing STEM education at schools; d. Enhancing international cooperation and f. Strengthening evidence-based decision making.

#### 4.2.4 Efficiency

Limited funding was allocated for RSA activities in Namibia. The project spent its funds adequately, mainly in funding the position of a National Officer (NO) to coordinate RBSA funding-related activities in Windhoek. The NO received technical support from the Senior Programme Officer of the ILO CO for Zimbabwe and Namibia. This management arrangement was effective.

The RBSA-related intervention was implemented in an efficient way by various institutional actors, which allowed for the completion of several of its expected outputs at a relatively low cost. However, the RBSA-funded interventions on Just Transition in Madagascar lacked an M&E system.

The RBSA project received some relevant backstop from other ILO technical units. Technical and financial support from other ILO HQ-based Units (STRENGTHEN 2) contributed to the attainment of intervention objectives, particularly regarding the elaboration of the HYPHEN green hydrogen employment impact assessment (pending validation) and the dissemination of the SAM methodology (implemented by the National Statistics Institute). ITC-ILO staff co-facilitated the consultative workshop on STED (methodology adopted by the NIPDB). The Senior Specialist on Sustainable Enterprises, Productivity and Just Transition from the Decent Work Team for Eastern & Southern Africa (Pretoria) facilitated a Just Transition workshop for constituents and the Employment Specialist (ILO Pretoria) presented the results of the independent evaluation of the second national employment policy (NEP2), which served as input for the elaboration of the NEP3.

34

#### 4.2.5 Impact

RBSA funded activities, such as the continued tripartite discussion for the elaboration of the National Employment Policy, contributed to the goal of strengthening social dialogue in Namibia. However, the impact of the RBSA funded intervention is yet incipient and limited. While a NEP 3 draft has been completed, there is a need to support the process of final consultations that will lead to the final approval of the strategy.

When following up on the implementation of NEP3, the ILO should consider providing technical assistance to address some structural factors that affect policy implementation and its impact in Namibia, such as the lack of institutional coordination and implementation mechanisms, limited budget for implementation, and a lack of relevant information on the labour market. Likewise, due to recent changes in the Ministry's structures (e.g., the merger of the Labor and Justice ministries into a new entity: The Ministry of Justice and Labor Relations) it is necessary to reassess the governmental priorities in this field.

While the results regarding gender-responsive budgeting and the promotion of Decent Work in the green hydrogen sector were limited, the capacities developed at the NIPDB to apply sectoral approaches and to develop skills assessments is a promising feature that may become a sustainable institutional asset.

#### 4.2.6 Sustainability

The RBSA-funded interventions in Namibia lacked an exit strategy, as well as a follow-up mechanism to accompany their continued implementation after end of the interventions' implementation period. The ability to sustain the results of the project is dependent on the individual capacity and available resources of some government agencies. While certain agencies as the NIPDB have acquired ownership of an intervention (e.g. the STED methodology), there is no clear responsible agency that may continue carrying out, independently, employment impact assessments.

The National Employment Policy 3 (NEP3), whose draft is pending validation, is a promising output among the RBSA-funded intervention in Namibia. However, **there is still a long way to go for an effective implementation of this policy in order to attain specific outcomes.** In the meanwhile, the sustainability of the outputs delivered in Namibia through ILO's RBSA-related intervention is limited due to several structural factors that affect policy implementation, such as:

- A lack of recent reliable information on labour issues (e.g., indicators coming from a national survey) that may help guide policy design and implementation.
- A Lack of sufficient budgetary resources to implement policies. This factor, for example, affected the implementation of NEP2.
- A lack of coordination culture among public institutions on the application of policies. There is a need to institutionalize coordination and implementation mechanisms in the GON, and particularly with regards to the future implementation of NEP3.
- The country is lacking a stable, employment promotion and social dialogue mechanism. For example, the existing Labour Advisory Council has a limited functioning and scope. On their side, employers' organizations highlight the need for a more balanced input from all constituents, particularly regarding data/results from research.
- While the Ministry of Justice and Labor Relations should retain the overall coordination of the implementation of NEP3, there is the need to develop **ownership** in other, productive sectors, and to stress the cross-cutting nature of the issue of employment creation. Promoting employment should be an added function of all the other sectors (Agriculture, Mining, Trade, etc.).
- There is a need to strengthen the participation of technical working groups (TWG) in policy design/implementation by promoting a stable participation of sectoral representatives in the same. A more stable composition of TWG membership would favour an increased quality of outcomes and a steadier decision process.
- The recent changes in ministries' structure pose the need to clarify the issue of **prioritization** of employment creation within the new, combined Ministry of Justice and Labour Relations.

These factors limiting the sustainability of interventions merit the attention and action from both constituents and the ILO.

#### 4.2.7 Cross-cutting Issues

The project in Namibia had a clear gender equality approach. For example, NEP 3 recognizes as one of the main challenges of policy implementation “the need to improve employment equity across diverse groups including **gender**, age, disability, and socioeconomic lines”. Likewise, the NEP3 assumes **Gender Equality** as one of its guiding principles:

“Gender equality ensures equal opportunities and fair treatment for all employees by addressing the different needs, roles, and experiences of men and women. A gender-responsive policy actively challenges stereotypes, promotes inclusivity, incorporates gender analysis with disaggregated data, and allocates resources to advance gender equality objectives.” (NEP 3 draft, Feb. 2025, p.33)

Likewise, ILO RBSA-based interventions promoted the the establishment of gender responsive and pro-employment budgeting processes. However, while a training curriculum was developed and implemented, and a gender responsive and pro-employment budgeting toolkit was developed, the Implementation process of the toolkit/ budgeting methodology stalled due to opposition from the Ministry of Finance, which did not prioritize this issue.

#### b. Tripartism

The project was implemented on the basis of a tripartite framework, involving the Ministry of Justice and Labor Relations and various government agencies, the Namibia Employers’ Federation, and various workers’ organizations (e.g., the Trade Union Congress of Namibia; the Namibia National Labor Organization; the National Union of Namibian Workers).

#### c. Social Dialogue

On-going social dialogue was the means and road through which most project activities were implemented. The elaboration of the National Employment Policy 3 supported by the project is a clear outcome of social dialogue efforts.

## 5. Conclusions

---

### 5.1. Overall

The ILO ROAF RBSA interventions on Just Transition in Madagascar and Namibia attained diverse degrees of achievement of their expected outcomes: While in Madagascar the *Ecolangouste Sud* project contributed to a relevant attainment of its four Results, in Namibia, RBSA-based interventions contributed in a limited way to mainstreaming Just Transition policy measures in ongoing strategic policy processes and frameworks (Result 1), but had no effect in increasing capacities on mainstreaming just transition in the green hydrogen investments and ongoing policy processes for tripartite partners, as the project did not establish, as originally expected, an employment promotion social dialogue mechanism / forum to advise on the green hydrogen project, employment policies, and other key programs.

The ILO ROAF RBSA interventions on Just Transition in Madagascar and Namibia carried out most of their planned activities and were successful in achieving most of their expected outputs (e.g., policies, assessments, interprofessional frameworks, services for constituents). However, due to the limited implementation time (24 months) and available budget, as well as to the existence of administrative, technical and institutional weaknesses among the stakeholders in both countries (see below), the impact and sustainability of the results generated by the projects are limited.

The work carried out in both countries would benefit from an extended technical assistance period, for the ILO to provide follow-up on activities and mechanisms established by the interventions, help consolidate their achievements and support local stakeholders in addressing some of the challenges that affect the continuity and eventual impact of results.

### 5.2. Madagascar

The interventions financed by RBSA funds met the overall objectives of greening practices and improving the productivity of businesses in the lobster value chain, as well as transforming the work environment with a view to a just transition.

At outcome level, ILO RBSA-funded interventions Strengthened capacity of the Association of Employers of Madagascar (GEM)/ Lobster-Fishing Association of Madagascar (GLM) to implement sustainable mechanisms in the lobster industry with a view to a Just Transition. Employers, represented by GLM, are fully aware of the need to implement sustainable management mechanisms that ensure the preservation of fishing resources (minimum size of resources, annual ban period), and at the same time, to ensure acceptable working conditions for fishermen and fishmongers through the implementation of an interprofessional framework.

The interventions also strengthened the capacity of the Madagascar Conference of Workers (CTM) and SEKRIMA, articulating for a first-time fishmongers and fishermen in workers' organizations (e.g., cooperatives and associations) and affiliating them to a regional union. The project also helped the Malagasy government implement, in collaboration with employer and worker organizations, a set of sustainable management practices in the lobster value chain, through Just Transition and

digitalization, create awareness, improve governance in the fisheries sector, and implement a spatial planning approach involving all stakeholders and managing resources to improve the environment and human wellbeing.

Likewise, the productivity and resilience to climate shocks of the lobster value chain have been improved through sustainable entrepreneurship training and provision of livelihoods alternatives, skills development, and formalization of workers in cooperatives and associations.

The intervention successfully created an interprofessional framework, strengthened the capacities of diverse sector stakeholders, and developed and piloted tools for formalization and social protection in various fishing communities. The intervention had an important effect on strengthening social dialogue in the lobster-catching sector. Therefore, the project achieved most of its expected outputs.

However, the impact and sustainability of results are likely to be severely limited due to the administrative and technical weaknesses of the fishmongers' cooperatives and fishermen's associations, which would require more extensive support from the project. Likewise, the MoTEFP's is currently blocking the geographical expansion of the OSIET, a fact which will impede the decentralization of services to fishermen and their families. If not addressed, these factors may hinder workers' access to social protection and OSH and ultimately render the interprofessional scheme established by the project ineffective.

### 5.3. Namibia

38

The interventions financed by RBSA funds partially met the objective of “mainstreaming Just Transition Policy Measures in ongoing strategic policy processes and frameworks” (Result 1). However, they had no effect in “increasing capacities on mainstreaming just transition in the green hydrogen investments and ongoing policy processes for tripartite partners” (Result 2), as the project did not establish, as originally expected, an employment promotion social dialogue mechanism / forum to advise on the green hydrogen project, employment policies, and other key programs.

Relevant positive outcomes were obtained regarding the issues of a new national employment policy (NEP3) and mainstreaming Skills for Trade and Diversification within the responsibility of local stakeholders (NIPDB). However, other interventions, such as the completion of the employment impact assessment on the Hydrogen sector, the establishment of a gender-responsive budgeting process in GON, and the elaboration of a roadmap for promoting Decent Work in the green hydrogen sector were not achieved or carried out by the end of the implementation period.

The impact and sustainability of the achievements related to Result 1 are likely to be limited if further action/ follow up is not taken by the ILO to address the issues of the lack of coordination among public institutions, the lack of a stable, employment promotion social dialogue mechanism, lack of multi-institutional ownership of employment policies, and lack of budgetary resources and updated data on labour trends, needed to implement the NEP3.

## 6. Recommendations

### 6.1. Overall

Interventions on Promoting Just Transition in both countries would benefit from the following suggested action:

**Recommendation #1: Establish a longer implementation timeframe for RBSA-funded interventions, to ensure adequate consolidation and follow-up of results**

RBSA interventions' duration should be at least four years, to guarantee that the last two-year period is used for follow-up/consolidation. With regards to future initiatives, this may imply implementing a lesser number of interventions with a more substantive budget allocation per country.

| Responsible Unit(s) | Priority | Time Implication | Resource Implication |
|---------------------|----------|------------------|----------------------|
| ILO ROAF            | High     | Medium term      | High                 |

**Recommendation #2: Include a sustainability plan in the design of all RBSA-funded projects/ interventions**

The sustainability plan should state an exit strategy describing the process and conditions to be completed to ensure the continuity of results.

| Responsible Unit(s) | Priority | Time Implication | Resource Implication |
|---------------------|----------|------------------|----------------------|
| ILO ROAF            | High     | Medium term      | Low                  |

### 6.2. Madagascar

**Recommendation #3: Consolidate the results of the Eco langouste project by providing administrative and technical support to stakeholders in the sector during an additional two-year period**

Instead of aiming at expanding geographically or scaling up the scope of the project model to other sectors in Madagascar, the ILO should provide administrative and technical support to fishmongers' cooperatives and fishermen's associations for an additional period of two years, to ensure the sustainability of the results, and in particular, the effective implementation of social protection and occupational safety and health networks for current project beneficiaries. Further work is needed to promote and consolidate a culture of prevision among workers in the lobster industry value chain.

| Responsible Unit(s)                           | Priority | Time Implication | Resource Implication |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------|------------------|----------------------|
| ILO CO Antananarivo, with support of ILO ROAF | High     | Short term       | High                 |

**Recommendation #4: Carry-out high-level discussion with the MTEFoP to overcome its opposition to the geographical expansion of OSIET's services**

The geographical expansion of OSIET's services would ensure a decentralized attention to the needs of fishermen families and communities.

| Responsible Unit(s) | Priority | Time Implication | Resource Implication |
|---------------------|----------|------------------|----------------------|
| ILO CO Antananarivo | High     | Short term       | LOW                  |

### 6.3. Namibia

**Recommendation #5: Provide technical assistance to the MJLR to address key institutional weaknesses that affect the sustainability and ownership of employment policies**

The ILO should strengthen the MJLR's capacity to implement employment policy, by promoting social dialogue and providing technical assistance on planning and budgeting of policy implementation. Likewise, the ILO should support MJLR's efforts to mainstream employment issues into other key ministries' (Agriculture, Mining, Trade, Industry) agenda. Promoting employment should become a cross-cutting issue for multiple government agencies.

40

| Responsible Unit(s)                       | Priority | Time Implication | Resource Implication |
|-------------------------------------------|----------|------------------|----------------------|
| ILO CO Harare, with support from ILO ROAF | High     | Short term       | Medium               |

**Recommendation #6: The Ministry of Justice and Labour Relations should focus its efforts in the following 24 months in addressing key structural issues affecting the viability of the NEP3 implementation**

The above critical issues include:

- The need to allocate a sufficient budget for the implementation of NEP3.
- The need to develop/ strengthen a stable social dialogue mechanism on employment promotion, with decision making capacity.
- The need to strengthen government agencies' coordination on employment creation.
- The need to generate reliable information on labour issues (e.g., national survey) that may orientate policy implementation decisions.

| Responsible Unit(s) | Priority | Time Implication | Resource Implication |
|---------------------|----------|------------------|----------------------|
| MJLR-Namibia        | High     | Short term       | Medium               |

## 7. Lessons Learned

- Achieving long-lasting results in interventions promoting a Just Transition towards environmentally sustainable economies requires longer periods of implementation** and investment than the ones allocated to the RBSA-funded interventions in Namibia and Madagascar.
- While projects may be successful in achieving their expected short-term outputs, the **provision of technical assistance after the implementation period is a factor that may enhance the impact and ensure the sustainability of interventions.**

## 8. Potential Good Practices

- A participatory approach allowing for the integration of a wide range of stakeholders (tripartite, CSOs, NGOs, communities) as implementers and beneficiaries of interventions, creates a framework for synergies and coordination.**
- Promoting the formalization of workers and labor relations through inter professionalization frameworks** is a promising model that may become replicable in other sectors.
- Local governance of fishing areas (APGL) empowers local stakeholders and promotes the ownership of activities.**
- Involving other government agencies beyond the Ministry of Labor to carry out specific interventions** (e.g., NIPDB in Namibia, Ministère de la Pêche et de l'Economie Bleue -MPEB- and the Caisse Nationale de Prévision Social -CNAPS- in Madagascar) is a good way to promote cross-cutting ownership and sustainability.

## ANNEX 1: Terms of Reference

### Final Independent Clustered Evaluation of ILO ROAF RBSA Interventions on Just Transition for the Future of Work

janv.2025

#### Key-elements

|                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Titles of interventions to be evaluated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ecologisation des pratiques et amélioration de la productivité des entreprises dans la chaîne de valeur langoustière : Transformation de l'environnement de travail par la Transition Juste</li> <li>Promoting just transition and productive employment in Namibia</li> </ul> |
| TC Codes                                | MDG/23/01/RBS<br>NAM/23/01/RBS                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Administrative Units                    | CO-Antananarivo CO-Harare                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Countries                               | Madagascar<br>Namibia                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Donor                                   | RBSA                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Total Budget                            | 700,165 USD                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Type of evaluation                      | Final Independent Evaluation                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Evaluation Timing                       | January 2025 - May 2025                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Evaluation Manager                      | Abderrahim El Moulat, REO                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |

42

## 1. Introduction and Background

### 1.1. Introduction

Just Transition for the Future of Work refers to a fair and inclusive shift towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies, ensuring that the benefits of the green economy are shared widely while protecting workers' rights, livelihoods, and communities. It is a holistic approach that balances environmental, economic, and social considerations to achieve sustainable development. The concept of Just Transition is rooted in the International Labour Organization's (ILO) guidelines for a fair transition towards environmentally sustainable

economies and societies for all<sup>1</sup>, which advocate for strong social dialogue, policy coherence, and the creation of decent work opportunities.

Africa faces unique challenges and opportunities in the transition to a greener economy. The continent is highly vulnerable to climate change, with millions of workers dependent on sectors such as agriculture, mining, and energy, which are significantly impacted by environmental changes. Many economies are heavily reliant on natural resources, making the transition to low-carbon development pathways crucial yet complex. In addition, the high levels of informality in African labour markets, gender disparities, and limited social protection mechanisms further complicate efforts to ensure an inclusive and equitable transition. However, Africa also holds vast potential in renewable energy, sustainable agriculture, and circular economy initiatives, which can create new employment opportunities while addressing environmental concerns. Investments in green technologies, climate-resilient infrastructure, and skills development present an opportunity to drive economic growth, reduce poverty, and achieve social justice.

The ILO has been at the forefront of supporting African countries in achieving a Just Transition by providing technical assistance, policy advice, and capacity-building initiatives. Its work focuses on promoting social dialogue among governments, employers, and workers to develop inclusive green policies that align with national development goals and the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The ILO's engagement in Africa includes:

- Policy Support and Framework Development: Assisting governments in integrating Just Transition principles into national policies, sectoral strategies, and climate action plans to ensure economic diversification and social inclusion.
- Skills Development and Employment Promotion: Facilitating the reskilling and upskilling of workers to meet the demands of emerging green sectors, such as renewable energy, sustainable agriculture, and eco-tourism, while ensuring gender inclusivity and youth empowerment.
- Social Protection and Worker Rights: Strengthening social protection mechanisms to mitigate the socioeconomic impacts of the transition, ensuring that vulnerable groups are not left behind.
- Stakeholder Engagement and Partnerships: Promoting tripartite dialogue and collaboration with international partners, financial institutions, and civil society organizations to create sustainable pathways for green job creation and social cohesion.
- Pilot Projects and Knowledge Sharing: Implementing pilot initiatives across African countries to demonstrate scalable models for Just Transition, focusing on decent work creation, environmental sustainability, and poverty reduction.

43

By fostering an enabling environment for Just Transition, the ILO aims to ensure that Africa's shift towards a greener economy is not only environmentally sustainable but also socially and economically just, leading to improved livelihoods and economic resilience across the continent.

1 [Guidelines for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all | International Labour Organization](#)

## 1.2. ROAF RBSA Interventions on Just Transition

RBSA stands for Regular Budget Supplementary Account. Third source of funding, in addition to the Regular Budget and extra-budgetary resources, the RBSA expands and deepens decent work priorities and outcomes in dialogue with tripartite constituents in member States in the framework of UN reform and inter-agency

cooperation. The funding mechanism enables ILO to finance interventions in furthering its overall objectives as stated in the biennial Programme and Budget document.

Since 2021, the ILO Regional Office in Africa (ROAF) used the RBSA funding mechanism to support just transition efforts in at least two of African member states.

*Table 1. ROAF RBSA Interventions on Just Transition*

| Project Title                                                                                                                                                                               | Country    | Budget     | Duration                             | P&B Outputs                        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Ecologisation des pratiques et amélioration de la productivité des entreprises dans la chaîne de valeur langoustière : Transformation de l'environnement de travail par la Transition Juste | Madagascar | \$ 450,000 | February 1, 2023 - February 28, 2025 | Outputs 2.1, 2.2, 4.3, 3.2 and 8.3 |
| Promoting just transition and productive employment in Namibia                                                                                                                              | Namibia    | \$ 250,165 | February 1, 2023 - February 28, 2025 | Outputs 3.1, 3.2 and 8.3           |

- In Madagascar, the RBSA-funded intervention, implemented between February 2023 and February 2025, aims to create a conducive ecosystem for a just transition towards a productive and ecologically sustainable lobster value chain in the Anosy Region through: (i) tripartite social dialogue for sustainable ecosystem management; (ii) the promotion of sustainable entrepreneurship, productivity, just transition, and greening of enterprises; (iii) the establishment of a digital early warning and market information system; and (iv) the diversification of livelihoods with a particular focus on gender equality.

The main beneficiaries and partners include fishing communities, the Ministry of Fisheries and Blue Economy, occupational health and safety services, the Group of Enterprises of Madagascar (GEM), the Conference of Workers of Madagascar (CTM), Madagascar Lobster Producers Group, (GLM) and the NGO Aquatic Service.

The key expected results of this intervention are:

1. Strengthened capacities of CTM and GEM for social dialogue on just transition, green jobs, entrepreneurship, and sustainable value chain management;
2. The establishment of sustainable management mechanisms for the lobster value chain by the Malagasy government, in collaboration with workers' and employers' organizations;
3. Improved productivity and resilience to climate shocks of enterprises in the lobster value chain through just transition (sustainable entrepreneurship and formalisation);
4. Enhanced workforce skills in green entrepreneurship within the lobster value chain enterprises.

- In Namibia, the RBSA-funded intervention, implemented between February 2023 and February 2025, contributes towards the mainstreaming of just transition policy measures into national and sectoral development plans and investment projects in the green hydrogen sector. The Government of the Republic of Namibia has started developing a large-scale green -hydrogen industry to support inclusive and sustainable economic growth and to address climate change. A multi-billion-dollar HYPHEN Southern Corridor Development Initiative (SCDI) Namibian Green Hydrogen Project is developed at Tsau in the Khaeb National Park in the Karas Region. The ILO provides technical and policy advice on green jobs and develops the capacity of the government and the social partners on just transitions with the aim of ensuring that investments in this initiative lead to broader social impacts through skills development and job opportunities for Namibians. The intervention builds on the ILO's on-going support to constituents to formulate the 3rd National Employment Policy, to carry out employment impact assessments and to apply pro-employment and gender-responsive budgeting tools. Key stakeholders of the intervention include the government of Namibia, the HYPHEN consortium, employer and business membership organizations, and workers' organizations. The expected results of the intervention include:

1. Expanded knowledge on the impact of green hydrogen investments and on the skills needed in this value chain; and
2. A roadmap and a social dialogue mechanism for promoting decent work in the green hydrogen sector.

Given that the two RBSA interventions will be fully implemented by March 2025, and considering the desire and commitment of the ROAF to obtain a holistic and integrated assessment of the effects and lessons learned from its interventions under this mechanism to support just transitions across the continent, it has been decided to group the two interventions for a clustered final independent evaluation. This approach aims to optimize evaluation costs, consolidate cross-learning on the important theme of just transition for decent work in the continent, and foster exchange and sharing of experiences on the subject across country offices.

45

## 2. Objectives & Scope of the Evaluation

### 2.1. Objective of the Evaluation

ILO considers evaluation as an integral part of the implementation of its projects and interventions. The evaluations are conducted to achieve accountability, improve management and foster learning to support the knowledge base. The aim of this final clustered evaluation is to assess the overall implementation and achievements of the RBSA interventions in the two countries against their planned objectives. It will provide evidence-based information on what worked and what did not work well and why and whether the underlying theories and assumptions used to design and implement interventions to support just transition are relevant, effective and achieved their intended goals. This evaluation mainly intends to provide information on the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the two RBSA interventions on just transition, as well as document lessons learnt and emerging good practices in the area of just transition across the continent.

#### 2.1.1. Specific Objectives

More specifically, the final clustered evaluation of RBSA interventions on just transition should:

- Assess the relevance of the interventions' design and implementation strategies in relation to the relevant ILO, UN and national development frameworks (i.e. SDGs and UNSDCF) of countries covered and final beneficiaries' needs.

- Review and substantiate emerging evidence related to the achievements of the interventions' goals and their contribution to the advancement of just transition efforts in the respective countries and across the continent.
- Assess the extent to which the interventions have achieved their stated objectives and expected results, while identifying the supporting factors and constraints that have led to them, including strategies and implementation modalities chosen, partnership and coordination arrangements.
- Identify unexpected positive and negative results of the RBSA interventions.
- Assess the level of implementation efficiency of the interventions.
- Assess the extent to which the interventions' outcomes and observed impacts will be sustainable in the respective countries.
- Identify lessons learned and emerging good practices for the key stakeholders, including ILO in Africa, to guide its efforts in supporting just transitions.
- Provide strategic recommendations for the different key stakeholders to promote sustainability and support further development, as well as to inform the design of future similar interventions of the ILO in support to just transition.

## 2.2. Evaluation Audience

The primary users of this final clustered evaluation are the ILO Country Offices (COs), their key implementing partners, National Governments of Madagascar and Namibia as well as and their relevant ministries and institutions, as well as the ILO relevant Technical Units and tri-partite constituents in the two countries. The final evaluation findings, recommendations and lessons learned will also be used by the ILO ROAF to inform the design and implementation of any future projects and initiatives related to just transition in the continent.

46

## 2.3. Evaluation Scope

### 2.3.1. Period and Scope of the Evaluation

The final clustered and independent evaluation will cover the full implementation period of the two RBSA interventions (as outlined in Table 1), including any extension period. The evaluation will also assess the attainment of all intervention's outputs, outcomes and objectives as described in their respective logical frameworks. The evaluation will also integrate gender equality as a cross-cutting concern throughout its processes and methodological approach and deliverables (in line with EVAL guidance note n° 4), as well as tripartism, social dialogue and transition to environmental sustainability as transversal themes.

### 2.3.2. Geographical Scope

The final evaluation will cover the two countries where the RBSA interventions were implemented (Madagascar and Namibia), including any particularly targeted zones and areas as outlined in the projects' documents.

## 2.4. Evaluation Criteria and Key-Questions

The evaluation should be carried out in adherence with the ILO Evaluation policy and guidelines, as well as UNEG norms and standards. It should, as well, be guided by the OECD/DAC main evaluation criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability) in addition to ILO cross-cutting criteria. The final evaluation will be guided by the following main evaluation questions, to be refined during the evaluation design and planning stage:

**Relevance & Strategic Fit** - Are the intervention addressing the right issues?

## Final Evaluation of ILO ROAF RBSA Interventions on Just Transition in Namibia and Madagascar

1. To what extent are the RBSA interventions on just transition aligned to the needs and priorities of tripartite stakeholders and beneficiaries identified in the project documents and during implementation?
2. How well do the RBSA interventions on just transition support national development commitments, regional priorities, and relevant SDGs?
3. To what extent are the interventions' objectives aligned with the socioeconomic realities and specific challenges of each target country (Madagascar and Namibia)?
4. Did the projects' design reflect a logical, realistic, and purposeful approach toward achieving their

objectives in different national contexts?

**Coherence** - How well do the interventions fit within the broader context?

5. How well do the interventions complement and align with other ongoing ILO programmes and projects in the respective countries and across the region?
6. Are there any overlaps, synergies, or potential duplications with other donor-supported projects or national programs?
7. To what extent have the interventions been designed to maximize systemic and sustainable changes at national and regional levels?
8. How well are the interventions aligned with national policy frameworks, regional priorities, and international commitments, including the Sustainable Development Goals and ILO frameworks and guidelines?
9. How effectively do the interventions collaborate with other donors, partners, and stakeholders across two countries to ensure coherence?

47

**Effectiveness** - Are the interventions achieving their intended results?

10. To what extent are the interventions likely to achieve their intended objectives by the end of the implementation period?
11. Have the interventions been effective in improving just transition and decent work across the two countries?
12. What are the key success factors and challenges encountered in achieving the expected outcomes?
13. Have the interventions followed their Theory of Change, and have the assumptions and development hypotheses been validated by performance data?
14. Have the interventions achieved their targeted outputs and outcomes equitably across geographic areas and for intended beneficiaries (e.g., women, youth, informal workers)?
15. What unexpected results, both positive and negative, have emerged from the interventions?

**Efficiency** - Are resources being used optimally?

16. How effective was the technical support and backstopping provided by ILO's Decent Work Teams

(DWTs) and headquarters?

17. How efficiently have the financial, human, and technical resources been allocated and utilized across the interventions to achieve their objectives?
18. Have project funds and interventions been delivered in a timely manner, and what were the key bottlenecks encountered in implementation?
19. Could similar results have been achieved with fewer resources or through alternative approaches?
20. Have the interventions adequately incorporated gender and inclusion objectives within their budgeting and planning processes?
21. Has an effective risk management, monitoring, and evaluation system been established and implemented across the interventions?

**Impact Orientation** - What difference have the projects made?

22. How have the interventions contributed to long-term improvements in the lives of beneficiaries, particularly women and youth?
23. What tangible changes have the interventions brought at the policy and practice levels in terms of governance, technical capacity on just transition, and access to decent work?
24. To what extent have the interventions contributed to broader national, regional and global development goals?
25. What evidence exists of the interventions' contributions to strengthening local institutions, social

partners, and governance systems?

26. What lessons can be drawn from the impact of the interventions to inform ILO future just transition projects and interventions?

**Sustainability** - Will the benefits last beyond interventions' completion?

27. Are the interventions' results structured to ensure long-term sustainability beyond their lifecycle?
28. How effectively have the interventions built local ownership, institutional capacity, and stakeholder commitment to sustain their outcomes and impacts?
29. What are the main risks to the sustainability of the interventions' achievements, and how have these risks been mitigated?
30. To what extent are national institutions and implementing partners prepared to sustain the outcomes without continued ILO support?
31. Have realistic and effective exit strategies been developed and implemented to ensure ongoing benefits for beneficiaries and partners?
32. Will the interventions' beneficiaries, such as women and informal workers, continue to experience improved access to just transition support after the end of ILO support?

**Cross-Cutting Issues**

33. To what extent did the interventions mainstream gender equality and non-discrimination principles into their design and implementation?

34. How effectively did the interventions promote strong and independent worker and employer organizations and facilitate constructive social dialogues?

### 3. Evaluation Approach and Modalities

#### 3.1. Evaluation Methodology

The final clustered evaluation of ILO RBSA interventions on just transition should comply with evaluation norms and standards, ethical safeguards, specified in ILO's evaluation procedures and guidelines (see Annex II). The ILO adheres to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) evaluation norms and standards, as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards. This is a final independent evaluation and as such, the final methodology and evaluation questions will be determined by the successful consultant in consultation with the Evaluation Manager.

The evaluation is expected to apply a mixed-methods approach, using both quantitative and qualitative data to address the evaluation questions and triangulating data sources and methods to increase the validity and rigor of the evaluation findings. The evaluation should also be participatory, engaging, as much as feasible, with the key stakeholders of the interventions in the two countries at all stages of the evaluation process (See Guidance Note 7 in Annex II). The bidding consultants are encouraged to propose innovative approaches and methods to allow the evaluation to rigorously assess the interventions' results and impacts across the two countries, to derive holistic and integrated lessons learned on the support to just transition in Africa, as well as to formulate strategic and actionable recommendations to guide ILO future interventions on the thematic area.

The evaluation should use, but not be restricted to, the following methods:

49

- Desk Review: Of the two RBSA interventions' documentation and literature, including the projects' documents, progress reports, monitoring reports, financial reports, relevant associated research and studies, and any other documentation related to the interventions. The evaluator should also conduct a brief literature review on just transition for decent work processes and best practices in Africa and globally, as a benchmark against which the interventions' design and implementation strategies should be assessed. Preliminary findings from the desk review will be used to refine the evaluation scope, questions and methodology.
- Interviews with the Main Stakeholders: Remote or in-person interviews will be conducted with ILO relevant staff in the two countries, as well as with the interventions' partners, beneficiaries and key stakeholders in each country. Interviews will also be conducted with ILO specialists on just transition both at the regional and HQ offices. The list of stakeholders to consult as part of the evaluation will be consolidated by the evaluation manager in consultation with ILO staff in each CO, and the evaluator will be tasked with performing any relevant sampling exercise to optimize the data collection process.
- Quantitative Monitoring Data: Collected by the ILO management throughout the implementation of the interventions in the two countries. The evaluator should analyze any available such data at the country-level and across countries and triangulate the conclusions with the findings from qualitative sources to strengthen the evaluation validity and credibility.

#### 3.2. Evaluation Process

The evaluation will be conducted and managed as per the following process:

1. Inception Phase: An inception meeting will be organized by the evaluation manager after the completion of the hiring process of the evaluation consultant and the finalization of the contract. The meeting will gather the ILO RBSA interventions' managers, the evaluator and the evaluation

2. manager, and will be the opportunity to refine the evaluation scope and questions, to discuss its methodological aspects, as well as to clarify its logistical details. At the end of this phase and following the desk review and preliminary interviews with relevant ILO staff, the evaluator will submit an inception report detailing the evaluation plan, including its methodological approach, its data collection tools and its timelines. The evaluation Inception Report is to be approved by the evaluation manager.
2. Data Collection Phase: During which the evaluator will deploy the agreed evaluation approach, including the data collection activities with the identified evaluation respondents. Most interviews and other forms of consultation with the stakeholders will be conducted remotely; however, the evaluator will specify in the methodological approach if field visits in any of the covered countries are justified and necessary.
3. Stakeholders' Consultation Workshop: To be virtually organized by ILO staff and facilitated by the evaluator, gathering the main stakeholders in each of the covered countries. During the consultation workshop, the evaluator will present the preliminary findings of the evaluation, explore the evaluation stakeholders' interpretation of the early findings and recommendations, and gather further information with the stakeholders to narrow any data or knowledge gap related to the evaluation questions.
4. Reporting Phase: After the completion of the evaluation data collection and interpretation, the evaluator will submit a draft evaluation report, to be reviewed and circulated by the evaluation manager to consolidate feedback and comments from the evaluation main stakeholders. A final report will be, subsequently, submitted by the evaluator addressing the stakeholders' feedback, before being subjected to quality control as per ILO evaluation guidelines and quality standards by the evaluation manager, the ILO Regional M&E and ILO EVAL/HQ. The final report should be ultimately validated and approved by EVAL/HQ.

50

### 3.3. Evaluation Management

The final evaluation will be managed by an ILO certified Evaluation Manager not linked with the interventions and implemented by a selected independent evaluator, following a transparent selection process. The roles and responsibilities in the evaluation process will be as follow:

- The Evaluation Manager: Will be responsible for the overall management of the evaluation process, ensuring that the evaluation is conducted as per its ToRs and initial plans and that its final deliverables are up to ILO quality standards. More specifically, the evaluation manager will:
  - Finalize the evaluation ToRs with inputs from key stakeholders.
  - Select the independent evaluator in coordination with EVAL.
  - Review and approve the inception report.
  - Brief the evaluator on ILO evaluation policies, guidelines and procedures.
  - Coordinate with ILO CO teams on the data collection logistics.
  - Review and circulate the first draft of the evaluation report for comments by the key stakeholders.
  - Ensure the final version of the evaluation report addresses stakeholders' comments and meets

- Approve the draft version of the evaluation report and submit it to EVAL for final approval.
- The ILO Country Teams: Will provide any logistical assistance to the evaluator as may be required and will be responsible for:
  - Providing relevant and necessary documentation on the RBSA interventions to the evaluator.
  - Preparing a list of recommended interviewees in their respective countries.
  - Coordinating logistical arrangements during the data collection phase.
  - Reviewing and providing comments on the draft evaluation reports.
  - Organizing and participating in the stakeholder consultation workshop.
- The Selected Evaluator: Will be responsible for conducting the evaluation as per ILO evaluation guidelines and quality standards. More specifically, s/he will be responsible for:
  - The design of appropriate and targeted evaluation approach and methodology, as well as their associated data collection tools and schedule.
  - The conduction of appropriate and agreed on data collection activities, ensuring a proper participation of the evaluation stakeholders and its main respondents.
  - The facilitation of a virtual stakeholders' consultation workshop to present the preliminary findings of the evaluation and facilitate a discussion around the evaluation recommendations and lessons learned.
  - The submission of draft and final evaluation reports in line with ILO evaluation guidelines, quality standards and templates as outlined in Annex II.
  - Address and integrate feedback and comments received on the evaluation outputs.

### 3.4. Evaluation Deliverables

The selected consultant is required to deliver the following evaluation outputs:

- Inception Report: Including a detailed evaluation approach, a detailed work plan and the associated data collection instruments. The inception report should follow ILO EVAL Checklist 3 and include:
  - Description of the evaluation methodology and instruments to be used in sampling, data collection and analysis;
  - Data collection tools;
  - Detailed fieldwork plan (virtual or in person) for the two countries developed in consultation with the Evaluation Manager and ILO country teams;
  - Agenda for the stakeholders' workshop;
  - The proposed evaluation report outline.

The inception report will be reviewed and approved by the evaluation manager after being circulated to the evaluation stakeholders for their comments.

- Draft and Final Evaluation Reports: In English (maximum 30 pages, excluding), strictly following ILO template (Annex I) and ILO/EVAL Checklist 5 "Preparing the Evaluation Report" (Annex II). The evaluator will submit a draft evaluation report to the evaluation manager, who will have approximately seven days

to consolidate both his/her comments on the analytical strength of the report, its findings, lessons learned and recommendations, as well as comments and feedback from the evaluation stakeholders. Once the stakeholders' feedback on the draft report is shared with the evaluator, he will have seven to ten days to address all comments before sending a final draft evaluation report. The evaluation manager will again review the final evaluation report, before sharing it with the ILO Regional Evaluation Specialist for quality review. Once the final evaluation report is deemed satisfactory by the ILO Regional Evaluation Specialist, it will be submitted to EVAL/HQ for a final quality review. The evaluation report will be considered as final after its review and validation by EVAL/HQ, and the selected evaluator should be available to address comments and feedback at each step of the quality assurance process.

- Evaluation Executive Summary: To be appended to the final evaluation report, following ILO template (Annex II).

#### 4. Evaluation Timelines

The evaluation process should start mid-February 2025, after the finalization of the evaluation contract, and last approximately 26 days. The evaluation will be conducted following the below approximate schedule:

| Activity                                                             | Responsibility     | Timeline                                                    | Number of days of consultation | Approximate Dates                           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Inception Meeting with the evaluator and the ILO teams               | Evaluation Manager | One week after the signature of the consultancy contract    | 1 day                          | End of April 2025                           |
| Desk Review; Preliminary Interviews<br>Deliverable: Inception Report | Evaluator          | Two weeks after the signature of the consultancy contract   | 3 days                         | First week of May; May 9 2025               |
| Field-work Data Collection (remotely and/or in- person)              | Evaluator          | Three weeks after the signature of the consultancy contract | 10 days                        | Namibia: May 12-16<br>Madagascar: May 19-23 |
| Stakeholders' Consultation Workshop                                  | Evaluator          | Five weeks after the signature of the consultancy contract  | 1 day                          | Namibia: May 15<br>Madagascar: May 23       |
| Draft Evaluation Report                                              | Evaluator          | Six weeks after the signature of the consultancy contract.  | 7 days                         | June 13 2025                                |

## Final Evaluation of ILO ROAF RBSA Interventions on Just Transition in Namibia and Madagascar

|                                                      |                    |                                                             |         |              |
|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------|--------------|
| Initial feedback on the draft evaluation report      | Evaluation Manager | Seven weeks after the signature of the consultancy contact. | -       | June 30 2025 |
| Consolidated feedback on the draft evaluation report | Evaluation Manager | Nine weeks after the signature of the consultancy contract  | -       | July 21 2025 |
| Final version of the evaluation report               | Evaluator          | Ten weeks after the signature of the consultancy contact.   | 3 days  | July 25 2025 |
| Total working days                                   |                    |                                                             | 26 days |              |

## 5. Evaluation Budget & Required Qualifications

### 5.1. Payment schedule and modalities

The consultancy for this final evaluation shall commence mid-February 2025 and conclude no later than mid-May 2025 after which the contract will expire. The ILO standards for payment is output-based and payments will be made upon the submission and approval of deliverables as outlined in section 3.4 of the present ToRs. Payments will be made following the below schedule:

- 20% for Inception Report;
- 30% for Draft Evaluation Report, and ;
- 50% for the Final Evaluation Report along with the Evaluation Executive Summary.

A budget for this evaluation has been allocated to cover the evaluator's fees, potential costs of international and domestic travels and the organization of the consultation workshop with stakeholders. The evaluation budget includes:

- Fees for the evaluator for 26 non-consecutive workdays. The bidding consultant should provide, as part of their financial proposal, daily fees in US dollars.
- Cost of international travel, if relevant, from the evaluator's home to countries of visit. In accordance with the relevant ILO rules, the ILO will provide pre-paid air tickets in economy class and by the most direct route.
- Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) during the field mission, if relevant. The ILO will pay DSA at the standard UN rate for the dates of the trips to cover lodging, meals and incidentals while on travel, as per ILO policy.
- Cost of the consultation workshop organization.

A detailed budget and contract with the evaluator will be prepared by the ILO Regional Office for Africa.

### 5.2. Evaluator Required Experience and Qualifications

## Final Evaluation of ILO ROAF RBSA Interventions on Just Transition in Namibia and Madagascar

The independent evaluator will be selected following a selection process managed by the Evaluation Manager and based on proven experience and qualifications meeting the consultancy requirements. Selection will be based on the following criteria:

- A master's degree in any of the following, social sciences, development studies, economics, or other

related graduate qualifications.

- A minimum of 5-7 years of professional experience specifically in evaluating international multi-country development or capacity-building initiatives, including UN projects/programmes, and with policy level work and institutional building related work.
- Experience in qualitative and quantitative approaches applied to evaluation.
- A good understanding of ILO mandate and tripartite structure.
- Experience in facilitating workshops to present and discuss evaluation findings.
- Have no previous or current involvement – or offers of prospective employment – with the ILO in the relevant countries.
- Knowledge and previous experience on just transition for decent work in Africa, as well as in the intervention countries or sub-regions will be an asset.
- Fluent English and French, both spoken and in writing.

### ► Annex I: Structure of the Evaluation Report

54

The evaluation report will be structured as follows:

#### 1. Cover Page

Containing project details (project title, project number, donor, start and end dates, budget, relevant technical sector, ILO management unit, geographical coverage) and evaluation details (type of evaluation: independent, ILO management unit, start and end dates of the evaluation mission, name(s) of the evaluator(s), date of report submission).

#### 2. Executive Summary

#### 3. Background, Brief Description of the Project, and Its Intervention Logic

#### 4. Purpose, Scope, and Intended Audience of the Evaluation

#### 5. Methodology and Limitations

#### 6. Review/Analysis of Project Implementation

#### 7. Detailed Presentation of Findings for Each Evaluation Criterion

#### 8. Conclusions

#### 9. Recommendations (including intended recipients, priority level, and necessary resources)

#### 10. Lessons Learned and Good Practices

#### 11. Annexes (including terms of reference for the evaluation, documents used, people interviewed, evaluation schedule, lessons learned).



**Annexe II: ILO/EVAL Guidelines & Templates**

1. Code of conduct form (To be signed by the evaluator)  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_206205/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206205/lang--en/index.htm)
2. Checklist No. 3 Writing the inception report  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165972/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165972/lang--en/index.htm)
3. Checklist 5 Preparing the evaluation report  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165967/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang--en/index.htm)
4. Checklist 6 Rating the quality of evaluation report  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165968/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang--en/index.htm)
5. Template for lessons learned and Emerging Good Practices  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_206158/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206158/lang--en/index.htm)  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_206159/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206159/lang--en/index.htm)
6. Guidance Note 7: Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165982/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165982/lang--en/index.htm)
7. Guidance note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E of projects  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165986/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm)
8. Template for evaluation title page  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_166357/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166357/lang--en/index.htm)
9. Template for evaluation summary: <http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/edmas/eval/template-summary-en.doc>



## **ANNEX 2: Evaluation Matrix**



| Issue Areas to Explore During the Evaluation                                                                                                                                                                    | Document Review | ILO | Govt Agencies | Employers' Organizat | Workers' Organizat | Other agencies | Workers | Monitoring Data |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----|---------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|
| <b>Relevance and Strategic Fit</b>                                                                                                                                                                              |                 |     |               |                      |                    |                |         |                 |
| 1. To what extent are the RBSA interventions on just transition aligned to the needs and priorities of tripartite stakeholders and beneficiaries identified in the project documents and during implementation? | X               | X   | X             | X                    | X                  | X              | X       |                 |
| 2. How well do the RBSA interventions on just transition support national development commitments, regional priorities, and relevant SDGs?                                                                      | X               | X   | X             |                      |                    |                |         |                 |
| 3. To what extent are the interventions' objectives aligned with the socioeconomic realities and specific challenges of each target country (Madagascar and Namibia)?                                           | X               | X   | X             | X                    | X                  |                | X       |                 |
| 4. Did the projects' design reflect a logical, realistic, and purposeful approach toward achieving their objectives in different national contexts?                                                             | X               | X   |               |                      |                    |                |         | X               |
| <b>Coherence</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                |                 |     |               |                      |                    |                |         |                 |



|                                                                                                                                                                                                               |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| How well do the interventions complement and align with other ongoing ILO programmes and projects in the respective countries and across the region?                                                          | X | X |   |   |   |   |  |  |
| 6. Are there any overlaps, synergies, or potential duplications with other donor-supported projects or national programs?                                                                                     | X | X | X |   |   | X |  |  |
| 7. To what extent have the interventions been designed to maximize systemic and sustainable changes at national and regional levels?                                                                          | X | X | X |   |   |   |  |  |
| 8. How well are the interventions aligned with national policy frameworks, regional priorities, and international commitments, including the Sustainable Development Goals and ILO frameworks and guidelines? | X | X | X |   |   |   |  |  |
| 9. How effectively do the interventions collaborate with other donors, partners, and stakeholders across two countries to ensure coherence?                                                                   | X | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| <b>Effectiveness</b>                                                                                                                                                                                          |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |

|                   |                                                                                                                                                                              |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |
|-------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| 10.               | To what extent are the interventions likely to achieve their intended objectives by the end of the implementation period?                                                    | X | X | X | X | X |  | X | X |
| 11.               | Have the interventions been effective in improving just transition and decent work across the two countries?                                                                 |   | X | X | X | X |  | X | X |
| 12.               | What are the key success factors and challenges encountered in achieving the expected outcomes?                                                                              |   | X | X | X | X |  | X |   |
| 13.               | Have the interventions followed their Theory of Change, and have the assumptions and development hypotheses been validated by performance data?                              | X | X |   |   |   |  |   | X |
| 14.               | Have the interventions achieved their targeted outputs and outcomes equitably across geographic areas and for intended beneficiaries (e.g., women, youth, informal workers)? | X | X | X | X | X |  | X | X |
| 15.               | What unexpected results, both positive and negative, have emerged from the interventions?                                                                                    | X | X | X | X | X |  | X |   |
| <b>Efficiency</b> |                                                                                                                                                                              |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |



|                           |                                                                                                                                                      |   |   |   |  |  |  |                |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|----------------|
| 16.                       | How effective was the technical support and backstopping provided by ILO's Decent Work Teams (DWTs) and headquarters?                                |   | X |   |  |  |  |                |
| 17.                       | How efficiently have the financial, human, and technical resources been allocated and utilized across the interventions to achieve their objectives? | X | X |   |  |  |  | Financial data |
| 18.                       | Have project funds and interventions been delivered in a timely manner, and what were the key bottlenecks encountered in implementation?             | X | X |   |  |  |  | Financial data |
| 19.                       | Could similar results have been achieved with fewer resources or through alternative approaches?                                                     | X | X | X |  |  |  | Financial data |
| 20.                       | Have the interventions adequately incorporated gender and inclusion objectives within their budgeting and planning processes?                        | X | X |   |  |  |  | Financial data |
| 21.                       | Has an effective risk management, monitoring, and evaluation system been established and implemented across the interventions?                       | X | X |   |  |  |  | X              |
| <b>Impact Orientation</b> |                                                                                                                                                      |   |   |   |  |  |  |                |

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| 22.                   | How have the interventions contributed to long-term improvements in the lives of beneficiaries, particularly women and youth?                                                    |   | X |   |   |   |  | X | X |
| 23.                   | What tangible changes have the interventions brought at the policy and practice levels in terms of governance, technical capacity on just transition, and access to decent work? |   | X | X | X | X |  | X |   |
| 24.                   | To what extent have the interventions contributed to broader national, regional and global development goals?                                                                    | X | X | X |   |   |  |   |   |
| 25.                   | What evidence exists of the interventions' contributions to strengthening local institutions, social partners, and governance systems?                                           | X | X | X | X | X |  |   |   |
| 26.                   | What lessons can be drawn from the impact of the interventions to inform ILO future just transition projects and interventions?                                                  |   | X | X | X | X |  | X |   |
| <b>Sustainability</b> |                                                                                                                                                                                  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |
| 27.                   | Are the interventions' results structured to ensure long-term sustainability beyond their lifecycle?                                                                             |   | X | X | X | X |  | X |   |

|     |                                                                                                                                                                            |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 28. | How effectively have the interventions built local ownership, institutional capacity, and stakeholder commitment to sustain their outcomes and impacts?                    |   | X | X | X | X |   | X |   |
| 29. | What are the main risks to the sustainability of the interventions' achievements, and how have these risks been mitigated?                                                 |   | X | X | X | X |   | X |   |
| 30. | To what extent are national institutions and implementing partners prepared to sustain the outcomes without continued ILO support?                                         |   | X | X | X | X | X | X |   |
| 31. | Have realistic and effective exit strategies been developed and implemented to ensure ongoing benefits for beneficiaries and partners?                                     | X | X | X |   |   |   | X |   |
| 32. | Will the interventions' beneficiaries, such as women and informal workers, continue to experience improved access to just transition support after the end of ILO support? |   | X | X |   |   |   | X |   |
| 33. | To what extent did the interventions mainstream gender equality and non-discrimination principles into their design and implementation?                                    | X | X | X | X | X |   | X | X |



|                                                                                                                                                          |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| 34. How effectively did the interventions promote strong and independent worker and employer organizations and facilitate constructive social dialogues? | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|

## ANNEX 3: Documents and Other Information Reviewed

### 1. Internal Documents

#### Madagascar

- Analyse de système de marché pour identifier et formuler des interventions permettant de diversifier les moyens de subsistance et les sources de revenus en faveur des paysans pêcheurs et des membres de leurs familles, notamment les jeunes et les femmes (Evolutis Projects Development SARL, Rapport final, Nov 2024)
- Analyse du gap de compétences pour le développement des emplois verts dans les secteurs à fort potentiel à Madagascar (Cabinet TRAYKEF, Organisation Internationale du Travail, 2025)
- Appui à la création et au renforcement de compétences des coopératives et associations, regroupant les acteurs par maillon de la chaîne de valeur (Rapport Final, CARA, 2024)
- Cadre de Plaidoyer pour la filière langouste à Madagascar (Organization Internationale du Travail, Avril 2024)
- Document d'évaluation des risques sur les milieux de travail des acteurs langoustiers (Organisation Internationale du Travail, 2024)
- Étude de structuration des Coûts et Proposition d'axe d'intervention pour Accroître la Productivité et la durabilité environnementale de la chaîne de valeur Langoustière (Organisation Internationale du Travail, 2024)
- Formation sur la Sécurité et la Santé au Travail dans la Filière Langouste : Faire avancer la justice sociale et promouvoir le travail décent (**Présentation**) (Vision Zero Fund, Organisation Internationale du Travail, 2024)
- Matrice Suivi RBSA Trimestriel (Monitoring Data) (XLS)
- Planification Stratégique de la Mise en Conformité de l'Inspection du Travail dans la Région d'Anôsy : Amélioration de la Sécurité et de la Santé au Travail, Formalisation des Emplois Informels dans la Chaîne de Valeur Langoustière à Madagascar (Organisation Internationale du Travail, Projet Eco Langouste, 2024)
- Projet Eco Langouste - Pour la mise en place de mesures de gestion durable de la chaîne de valeur langouste à travers la Transition Juste et la Digitalisation (Rapport Final, Aquatic Service 2024)
- RBSA Proposal for Madagascar (MDG103 801 802\_RBSA final)
- Rapport d'Avancement Project RBSA - 2023 (Organisation Internationale du Travail, Décembre 2023)



## Final Evaluation of ILO ROAF RBSA Interventions on Just Transition in Namibia and Madagascar

- Rapport d'Avancement Project RBSA - 2024 (Organisation Internationale du Travail, Décembre 2024)
- Rapport d'Avancement Project RBSA – 2025 (Organisation Internationale du Travail, Février 2025)
- Rapport d'Atelier -Formation/ Renforcement de capacités de : Groupement des Entreprises de Madagascar (GEM) et de la Conférence de Travailleur de Madagascar (CTM) (OIT, sep 2023)
- Rapport Final Projet RBSA (Organisation Internationale du Travail, Avril 2025)
- Registres des bénéficiaires des diverses activités du projet et des participants dans de diverses formations
- Situation du Budget Eco Langouste Sud - Récapitulatif du budget par Output (situation au 05/05/2025) (XLS)

### Namibia

- A just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all (**Presentation**), Workshop in Windhoek, Sep 5-6, 2024
- Assessment report – Elaboration of SAM - Draft (ILO, 7 March 2023)
- Biomass Subsector Sub-sector Dashboard – Key data at glance (NIPDB, draft v.1TC, ?)
- Concept note: Skills for Trade and Economic Diversification (NIPDB, September 2023)
- Development of a skill strategy for the energy sector - Stakeholder validation workshop 26 March 2025, Windhoek, Namibia, (NIPDB, ILO)
- Employment Impact Assessments (EmplA) in Namibia - Advisory note on Institutionalizing Employment Impact Assessments within the Government of Namibia DRAFT Version 2.1- ILO, March 2025)
- Handover Notes – Namibia National Officer - Natalia Halweendo, December 2024
- Independent Evaluation of Namibia's Second National Employment Policy (NEP2), 2013/14 –2016/17; Final Report (ILO December 2019)
- Independent evaluation of NEP2 (**Presentation**) Findings and recommendations - Dr Bernd Mueller, Employment Specialist ILO Pretoria
- Namibia Advanced Trainings Report 2023; Windhoek, 21-24 November (ILO-STRENGTHEN2)
- Namibia General and Advanced Trainings Report 2023; Windhoek, April 24-26, 2023 (ILO - STRENGTHEN 2)
- Namibia Project Executive Summary - NAM126-RBSA 2023-2024
- NAM126\_RBSA Program Decision Minute

- Namibia's Third National Employment Policy 2025/2026 - 2029/2030 -revised draft (Republic of Namibia, MLIREC, February 2025)
- Oil and Gas Subsector Sub-sector report draft v.1TC (NIPDB, , ?)
- Pro-employment and gender responsive budgeting tool-kit –PEGBR Final version (ILO, ?)
- RBSA Proposal for Namibia (NAM126\_RBSA Final approved)
- Recommendations on meeting priority skills gaps v2 (ILO, 2024)
- Report: 2019 SAM for Namibia (ILO, September 2023)
- SAM update in Namibia – Summary (ILO – STRENGTHEN 2, Nov 2023)
- Sector Skills Strategy for the Energy Sector in Namibia – Draft Strategy (ILO, March 2025)
- Sectoral Review Study and Drafting of a Sector Skills Strategy for the Energy Sector in Namibia – Sector Background Study (ILO, Dec 2024)
- Skills for Trade and Economic Diversification (STED) - Namibia inaugural stakeholder consultation - Country report (NIPDB, February 2024)
- Social Account Matrix format for Namibia (NSA, Oct 2023)
- The Labor Advisory Council and Social Dialogue in Namibia (report), ILO, 2011

## 2. Published Documents: Guidelines, Legislation, Reports and Studies

66

- Harambee Prosperity Plan II (2021-2025) (Republic of Namibia, 2021)
- Hyphen Socio Economic Debelopment (SED) Framework, 2024
- ILO Just Transition Guidelines, 2015
- Namibia Decent Work Country Program 2019-2023 (ILO CO for Zimbabwe and Namibia, 2019)
- Programme Pays pour le Travail Décent - Madagascar, 2021 – 2023 (Bureau international du travail, 2021)
- Situational Analysis of the Lobster Fishing Communities of Sainte Luce, Ebakika and Itapera (SEED Madagascar, September 2018)
- Stratégie Nationale de l'Économie Bleue (MPEB, 2022)

## 3. Relevant Evaluation and Policy Guidelines

- ILO Policy Guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. [http://www.ilo.ch/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS\\_571339/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.ch/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm)
- Code of conduct form [http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_206205/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206205/lang--en/index.htm)
- Checklist No. 3: Writing the inception report [http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165972/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165972/lang--en/index.htm)



- Checklist 5: preparing the evaluation report  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165967/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang--en/index.htm)
- Checklist 6: rating the quality of evaluation report  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165968/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang--en/index.htm)
- Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_206158/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206158/lang--en/index.htm)
- Guidance note 7: Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation  
[https://www.ilo.org/global/docs/WCMS\\_165982/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/global/docs/WCMS_165982/lang--en/index.htm)
- Guidance note 4: Integrating gender equality in the monitoring and evaluation of projects  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165986/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm)
- Template for evaluation title page  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_166357/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166357/lang--en/index.htm)
- Template for evaluation summary  
<http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/edmas/eval/template-summary-en.doc>
- UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation  
<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866>

## ANNEX 4: List of Participants in Key Informant Interviews and FGD

| Interviewee                                | Organization                                              | Position                                                                     | Date   |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| <b>NAMIBIA (Windhoek)</b>                  |                                                           |                                                                              |        |
| Adolphus Chinomwe                          | International Labor Organization                          | Senior Program officer                                                       | May 12 |
| Mahongora Kavihuha                         | Trade Union Congress of Namibia                           | Secretary General                                                            | May 12 |
| Michael Akupa                              | Labour Resource and Research Institute (LaRRI)            | Director                                                                     | May 12 |
| Helene Ochs                                | Namibia Employers Federation                              | Acting Secretary General                                                     | May 13 |
| Stalin Maharero                            | Namibia National Labor Organization                       | Secretary General                                                            | May 13 |
| Nangulu<br>NeluluUaandja<br>Julia Muetudan | Namibia Investment Promotion Development Board            | Chief Executive Officer<br><br>Executive Talent, Innovation and Productivity | May 13 |
| Gonzalo Leitao                             | European Union Delegation-Namibia                         | EAAS                                                                         | May 13 |
| David Iigonda                              | Ministry of Justice and Labour                            | Director of Labour Market Services                                           | May 14 |
| Job Munijaro                               | National Union of Namibian Workers (NUNW)                 | Secretary General                                                            | May 14 |
| Asher Nachickaku                           | Ministry of Trade                                         | Director of Trade                                                            | May 14 |
| Ralph Krueger                              | ILO – HQ                                                  | Chief Technical Advisor – Employment impact assessments and targeting        | May 15 |
| Maikel Lieu-Kie-Song                       | ILO – HQ                                                  | Senior Employment Intensive Specialist                                       | May 16 |
| Jens Dyring Christensen                    | Decent Work Team for Eastern & Southern Africa - Pretoria | Senior Specialist Sustainable Enterprises, Productivity and Just Transition  | May 16 |
| <b>MADAGASCAR (Fort Dauphin)</b>           |                                                           |                                                                              |        |
| Interviewee                                | Organization                                              | Position                                                                     | Date   |

|                                                                                                       |                                                        |                                                   |                |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Valencia Assanally                                                                                    | ILO                                                    | Coordinator, Eco Langouste Project                | May 19         |
| Jasper Andriamanantsoa                                                                                | Direction Régionale de la Pêche et de l'Économie Bleue | Director                                          | May 19         |
| Jose Randrianasolo                                                                                    | Conférence des Travailleurs de Madagascar              | Secretary General                                 | May 19, remote |
| Lalaina Rivosoa                                                                                       | Direction Régionale du MTEFoP                          | Directrice Générale                               | May 20         |
| Naina Rabearimanana                                                                                   | CARA                                                   | Directeur Exécutif                                | May 20         |
| Tajona Rakotoson                                                                                      | GiZ Prada                                              | Chargé Technique Chaîne Pêche, Project Prada      | May 20, remote |
| Joelson Guy<br>Andriamahalaza<br>Valerio Dizano<br>Vaitiriana Sitrika<br>Rachel<br>Rasolocondriantsoa | Trainees/ Trainers in the GERME methodology            | METFP<br>Aquatic Service<br>CARA<br><br>FEDS      | May 20         |
| Rolance Alidah<br>Hanitriniaina<br>Jasper<br>Andriamanantsoa                                          | Trainees/ Trainers in the COOP methodology             | CARA<br><br>DRPEB                                 | May 20         |
| Anthony<br>Randrianandrasana<br>Louisiana Ravaomalala                                                 | SEKRIMA                                                | Président<br><br>Assistante                       | May 20         |
| Valerio Dizano                                                                                        | Aquatic Service                                        | Director                                          | May 20         |
| Anicet Emilson<br>Rambintsoa                                                                          | CNaPS, Direction Générale Tolagnaro                    | Délégué du Directeur General                      | May 20         |
| Laureat<br>Rasolofoniarison                                                                           | ILO                                                    | Chargé du Programme Vision Zero Fund              | May 20, remote |
| <b>Focus Group Discussion</b> with 24 people <b>at the Mokala community</b>                           | 21 fishermen<br>3 fishmongers                          | 2 women, 22 men<br><b>(names held in reserve)</b> | May 21         |
| Faly<br>Razafindramanana                                                                              | OSIET                                                  | Medecin Chef                                      | May 21         |
| Alain Ducas                                                                                           | OSIET<br>GLM                                           | President OSIET<br>Secretary General              | May 21         |
| Patrick Rafetra                                                                                       | Direction Régionale de la Pêche et de l'Économie Bleue | Inspecteur de Pêche, Région Anosy                 | May 21         |
| Sylvianne Volololaina                                                                                 | ILO – CO<br>Antananarivo                               | Chargée des Programmes                            | May 22         |



### ANNEX 5: EVAL Template 4.1 - Lessons Learned

#### ILO ROAF RBSA Interventions on Just Transition in Namibia and Madagascar

Project DC/SYMBOL:MDG/23/01/RBS and NAM/23/01/RBS

Name of Evaluator: Dwight Ordóñez. PhD

Date: July 5, 2025

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.

| LESSON LEARNED ELEMENT                                                           | 1. A need for longer periods of implementation of RBSA interventions                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Brief description of lessons learned</b><br>(link to specific action or task) | Achieving long-lasting results in interventions promoting a Just Transition towards environmentally sustainable economies requires longer periods of implementation and investment than the ones allocated to the RBSA-funded interventions in Namibia and Madagascar |
| <b>Context and any related preconditions</b>                                     | Before starting a project, it is important to assess if its timeframe and resources are sufficient for implementation and follow-up/ consolidation of its expected results                                                                                            |
| <b>Targeted users /Beneficiaries</b>                                             | ILO DWTs, project implementers, relevant government agencies                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| <b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>                             | Limitations in available time and resources for implementation may affect the sustainability of interventions                                                                                                                                                         |
| <b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>                                | Longer implementation timeframes allow for needed time for project staff to implement exit strategy, promote ownership and consolidate results                                                                                                                        |
| <b>ILO Administrative Issues</b><br>(staff, resources, design, implementation)   | Expand minimum timeframes for RBSA project implementation, to be reflected in project design (e.g., implementation and follow-up phases); allocate appropriate amount of resources for implementation and follow-up phases                                            |

70

| LESSON LEARNED ELEMENT                                                           | 2. Provide technical assistance/follow-up after implementation period                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Brief description of lessons learned</b><br>(link to specific action or task) | While projects may be successful in achieving their expected short-term outputs, the provision of technical assistance after the implementation period is a factor that may enhance the impact and ensure the sustainability of interventions               |
| <b>Context and any related preconditions</b>                                     | Additional technical support to direct beneficiaries and local implementing institutions, at local (Madagascar) and national (Namibia) levels, would help consolidate local capacities for successful continuation of activities and delivery of outputs    |
| <b>Targeted users /Beneficiaries</b>                                             | ILO DWTs staff, project implementers, relevant government agencies                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| <b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>                             | N/A                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| <b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>                                | An intensive schedule of follow-up activities would help improve the administrative and technical skills of participants at community level (Madagascar), and promote an increased engagement of tripartite constituents in policy implementation (Namibia) |
| <b>ILO Administrative Issues</b><br>(staff, resources, design, implementation)   | Design and budget for at least a year of monthly accompaniment/ additional training activities of beneficiaries at community level (Madagascar), as well on a mechanism for quarterly social dialogue and policy implementation meetings (Namibia)          |



### ANNEX 6: EVAL Template 4.2 – Good Practices

#### ILO ROAF RBSA Interventions on Just Transition in Namibia and Madagascar

Project DC/SYMBOL:MDG/23/01/RBS and NAM/23/01/RBS

Name of Evaluator: Dwight Ordóñez, PhD

Date: July 5, 2025

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

| GOOD PRACTICE ELEMENT                                                                                               | 1. Using a participatory approach                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Brief summary of the good practice</b> (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.) | <b>Madagascar:</b> The project developed a participatory approach allowing for the integration of a wide range of stakeholders (tripartite, CSO, NGO, communities) as implementers and beneficiaries of interventions, creating a framework for synergies and coordination.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |    |
| <b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>           | An important feature of the <i>Ecolangouste Sud</i> project is the way in which it managed to interact with and promote synergies among government agencies, trade unions, workers/ fishing communities, CSO and the private sector. Whether through training, awareness raising initiatives or implementation of activities, the project actively <b>promoted social dialogue</b> and convened a wide range of stakeholders behind the common goal of greening work practices, improving value chain productivity, and improving workers' access to social security, OSH and labor rights. | 72 |
| <b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b>                                                                  | Project implementation was made possible due to the mediating role assumed by employers' and workers' organizations, government agencies and CSO.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |    |
| <b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>                                                        | Several representatives of employers' and workers' organizations, and government agencies interviewed by the evaluator highlighted the way in which cooperation and synergy among organizations contributed to the positive outcome of the project.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |    |
| <b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>                                                                        | Future projects/ interventions should consider continuing using this synergic dynamic to attain similar results.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |    |
| <b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals</b> (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)  | Social dialogue and cooperation among tripartite constituents are the basis of ILO's mandate.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |    |
| <b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>                                                                         | N/A                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |    |

| GOOD PRACTICE ELEMENT                                                                                               | 2. Link access to social security and OSH services to formalization by linking informal workers to formal companies                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Brief summary of the good practice</b> (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.) | <b>Madagascar:</b> Promoting the formalization of workers and labor relations through inter professionalization frameworks is a promising model that may become replicable in other sectors.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| <b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>           | Difficult transport and accessibility conditions during the rainy season, together with long distances to most fishing communities and difficult conditions of roads hamper communities' access to social security and OSH services. In this context, it is important to allow OSIET ( <i>l'Organisation Sanitaire Inter Entreprise de Taolagnaro</i> ) to extend the coverage of its services beyond 30 Km, to attend onsite the preventive and health needs of fishing communities |
| <b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b>                                                                  | The offer of social security registration and OSH services, and establishment of fishing quotas and stable rates, influenced the formalization of fishmongers and fishermen                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| <b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>                                                        | This intervention helped formalize, for the first time, 263 fishmongers and fishermen at targeted communities                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| <b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>                                                                        | Future projects working in other value chains should consider using a similar approach (inter professionalization framework/ agreement) to attain similar results.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals</b> (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)  | The referred good practice is aligned with priority 2 of the Madagascar DWCP (2021-2023): Amélioration et extension de la protection sociale pour tous les travailleurs et travailleuses et amélioration de la sécurité et santé au travail dans les entreprises malagasy                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| <b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>                                                                         | N/A                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |

73

| GOOD PRACTICE ELEMENT                                                                                               | 3. Utilization of an Area-based approach                                                                                                                                               |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Brief summary of the good practice</b> (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.) | <b>Madagascar:</b> Local governance of fishing areas (APGL) empowers local stakeholders and promotes the ownership of activities                                                       |
| <b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>           | Local governance of fishing areas (APGL) aims to improve the socio-economic viability of the lobster value chain, and the the resilience of local stakeholders to environmental shocks |

|                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Establish a clear cause- effect relationship</b>                                                                | The use of a territorial approach facilitated establishing agreements with all concerned parties, pooling-in resources from different sources and reaching concrete agreements                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| <b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>                                                       | Fishermen and companies on-going respect for the APGL rules provide evidence of the result of this practice.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| <b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>                                                                       | The use of area-based approach as a mean to promote Just Transition practices is potentially useful in most value chains                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)</b> | This good practice is consistent with ILO <i>Guidelines for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all</i> , which under its section on <i>Policy coherence and institutional arrangements for a just transition for all</i> (16.e.v), states: "Governments and social partners should promote cooperation at the local level, where local authorities, employers, trade unions and research and training institutions need to cooperate to effectively integrate measures for a just transition into local sustainable economic development". |
| <b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>                                                                        | N/A                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

74

| <b>GOOD PRACTICE ELEMENT</b>                                                                                        | <b>4. Involve other government agencies beyond the Ministry of Labor</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Brief summary of the good practice</b> (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.) | <b>Madagascar and Namibia:</b> Involving other government agencies beyond the Ministry of Labor (MOL) to carry out specific interventions is a good way to promote cross-cutting ownership and sustainability.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>           | As national and local governance are complex matters that imply governmental stakeholders from diverse sectors, this practice involves mapping which would be the best additional entry points for ILO support to Member States, and ensuring in advance their buy-in before project design, while assuring that MOLs remain the main ILO governmental partners                                                                                                                                                    |
| <b>Establish a clear cause- effect relationship</b>                                                                 | As labor-related matters are cross-cutting issues concerning most Ministries and government agencies, expanding the variety of government stakeholders involved in project implementation increases ownership and sustainability of initiatives by expanding the participants in initiatives                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>                                                        | The involvement of other government agencies allowed for the adoption of the Social Account Matrix by the National Statistics Agency (NSA), and of the SKILLS for Trade and Economic Diversification (STED) methodology by the National Investment Development Promotion Board (NIDPB) in Namibia. On its side, the Ministry of Blue Economy and Fishing in Madagascar (MPEB) played a key role in the pilot implementation of an APGL conducive to the promotion of a Just Transition scheme in the Anosy region. |



|                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>                                                                       | Involving other government agencies beyond the MOL in ILO's support to Member States is a strategy to be considered when aiming to enhance project outcomes                                |
| <b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals</b> (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework) | This approach is consistent with the Madagascar and Namibia DWCPs, which include within their proposed implementation strategy the collaboration with a wide range of government agencies. |
| <b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>                                                                        | N/A                                                                                                                                                                                        |

## ANNEX 7: Interview Guides

### Introduction to the Interview Guides

Interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders will be based on qualitative questions that will be open-ended, that is, the respondents will provide their responses in his/her own words, so to get in-depth information about their perceptions, insights, attitudes, experiences, or beliefs regarding the project.

Interviews/focus groups will also be useful to follow-up with questions the evaluation team may have after analysing data from other evaluation methods such as document review. The evaluation team members may ask the same question to different individuals or informant categories to compare their responses and analyse how these individual differences may reflect on the project.

**The items included on the interview guides are exhaustive, but generic.** As the interview guides are intended to help the evaluation team develop semi-structured interviews/focus groups, they **will be adapted depending on each context** and set of interventions; **the profile and attitudes of the respondent; and the results of previous interviews** with other stakeholders; in order to help better focus each interview.

76

### Introduction to the interview

Thank you for participating in this interview. My name is **<insert name>**. I am conducting the Evaluation of the ILO - implemented interventions in **<insert country>**, aimed at advancing a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies in your country.

The purpose of this interview is to help us better understand this work, its results and effects. In order to do so, We would like you to respond to some questions, **based on your experience and perspective**.

Your answers will be treated with the strictest **confidentiality**.

The evaluator will ask the respondent to introduce him/herself and his/her role/participation in the project

Do you have any questions before we begin?



## Tool 1 – Guide for Key Informant Interview (KII) - ILO Representatives

Approximately, up to two interviews of 90 minutes

**Stakeholders:** ILO CO Madagascar: National Coordinator and other relevant staff; ILO Namibia: Programme Officer-Harare

|                               |  |                     |  |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| a) Interview No.              |  | Name of Interviewer |  |
| b) Country                    |  |                     |  |
| c) Date and time of interview |  |                     |  |
| d) Location                   |  |                     |  |
| e) Respondent(s) Name(s)      |  |                     |  |
| f) Organization               |  |                     |  |
| g) Position/ Title(s)         |  |                     |  |
| h) Sex of Respondent(s)       |  |                     |  |

### Preface

77

- 1) What has been your role in the design/implementation of the ILO's RBSA interventions on Just Transition in Madagascar/ Namibia?
- 2) How long have you been in this role?
- 3) Were there particular aspects of the intervention that you were involved in? What aspects?

#### a) Relevance & Strategic Fit

*Extent to which the intervention is responsive/ adapted to stakeholders' evolving needs and priorities.*

9. To what extent are the RBSA interventions on just transition aligned to the needs and priorities of tripartite stakeholders and beneficiaries identified in the project documents and during implementation?
10. How well do the RBSA interventions on just transition support national development commitments, regional priorities, and relevant SDGs?

11. To what extent are the interventions' objectives aligned with the socioeconomic realities and specific challenges of each target country (Madagascar or Namibia)?

#### b) Coherence

*The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.*

12. How well do the interventions complement and align with other ongoing ILO programmes and projects in the respective countries and across the region?
13. Are there any overlaps, synergies, or potential duplications with other donor-supported projects or national programs?
14. How well are the interventions aligned with national policy frameworks, regional priorities, and international commitments?
15. How effectively do the interventions collaborate with other donors, partners, and stakeholders across two countries to ensure coherence?

**c) Effectiveness:**

*The extent to which the interventions achieved, or are expected to achieve, its objectives and its results, including any differential results across groups*

16. Which of the interventions are more likely to achieve their intended objectives by the end of the implementation period? Which were less successful? Why? [AFTER ANSWER, PROMPT THROUGH THE INTERVENTIONS' LIST FOR THE COUNTRY]  
Was any of the foreseen interventions not implemented as planned? Why?
17. Which interventions been more effective in improving just transition and decent work across the two countries? Why?
18. What are the key success factors and challenges encountered in achieving the expected outcomes?
19. Have the interventions achieved their targeted outputs and outcomes equitably across geographic areas and for intended beneficiaries (e.g., women, youth, informal workers)? Can you provide a table on actual outputs and/ or evidence of the same?
20. What unexpected results, both positive and negative, have emerged from the interventions?

78

**d) Efficiency of resource use**

*The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.*

22. How effective was the technical support and backstopping provided by ILO's Decent Work Teams (DWTs) and headquarters?
23. How efficiently have the financial, human, and technical resources been allocated and utilized across the interventions to achieve their objectives? Can you provide examples of optimization of resources? (human, time, expertise, funds)?

24. Have project funds and interventions been delivered in a timely manner, and what were the key bottlenecks encountered in implementation?
25. Could similar results have been achieved with fewer resources or through alternative approaches?
26. Have the interventions adequately incorporated gender and inclusion objectives **within their budgeting and planning processes**? Can you provide evidence of this?
27. Has an effective risk management, monitoring, and evaluation system been established and implemented across the interventions? Can you provide evidence of this work?

**e) Impact Orientation**

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

27. How have the interventions contributed to long-term improvements in the lives of beneficiaries, particularly women and youth? Can you provide examples of this?
28. What tangible changes have the interventions brought at the policy and practice levels in terms of governance, technical capacity on just transition, and access to decent work?
29. To what extent have the interventions contributed to broader national, regional and global development goals?
30. How did the interventions contributed to strengthening local institutions, social partners, and governance systems?
31. What lessons can be drawn from the impact of the interventions to inform ILO future just transition projects and interventions?

79

**g) Sustainability**

*The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.*

33. Are the interventions' results structured to ensure long-term sustainability beyond their lifecycle?
34. How effectively have the interventions built local ownership, institutional capacity, and stakeholder commitment to sustain their outcomes and impacts?



35. What are the main risks to the sustainability of the interventions' achievements, and how have these risks been mitigated?
36. To what extent are national institutions and implementing partners prepared to sustain the outcomes without continued ILO support?
37. Have realistic and effective exit strategies been developed and implemented to ensure ongoing benefits for beneficiaries and partners?
38. Will the interventions' beneficiaries, such as women and informal workers, continue to experience improved access to just transition support after the end of ILO support?

**h) Cross-cutting issues: Social dialogue, gender equality and non-discrimination.**

35. To what extent did the interventions mainstream gender equality and non-discrimination principles into their design and implementation? Can you provide examples of this?
36. How effectively did the interventions promote strong and independent worker and employer organizations and facilitate constructive social dialogues?



## Tool 2 – Guide for Key Informant Interview (KII) – Ministries, Employers’ Organizations, Workers’ Organizations, public services, NGOs/ partner institutions

Approximately, 30 to 60 minutes for each organization

|                                        |  |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|----------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| a) Interview No.                       |  | b) Name of Interviewer                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| c) Date & time of interview            |  |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| d) Country                             |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Madagascar <input type="checkbox"/> Namibia                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| e) Location (in Madagascar)            |  | <input type="checkbox"/> FTU <input type="checkbox"/> Mokala <input type="checkbox"/> Tana                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| f) Organizations Namibia               |  | <input type="checkbox"/> MLRIEC <input type="checkbox"/> NPC <input type="checkbox"/> HYPHEN<br><input type="checkbox"/> EMBO <input type="checkbox"/> Workers Organization <input type="checkbox"/> ?? |                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| g) Organizations Madagascar            |  | <input type="checkbox"/> MPEB<br><input type="checkbox"/> MTEFoP<br><input type="checkbox"/> GLM<br><input type="checkbox"/> GEM<br><input type="checkbox"/> CTM                                        | <input type="checkbox"/> GiZ Prada<br><input type="checkbox"/> Aquatic Service<br><input type="checkbox"/> CPaS<br><input type="checkbox"/> OSIET<br><input type="checkbox"/> SEKRIMA |
| h) Name and position of interviewee(s) |  |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| i) Sex of Respondent(s)                |  |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                       |

81

### Preface

- 1) How long have you been in this position?
- 2) What kind of activities has your institution carried out with ILO’s support?
- 3) For how long?
- 4) Where did this happen?
- 5) What was the overall purpose of this work?
- 6) How did this contribute to advancing Just Transition and Decent Work in your country? (prompt their understanding of Just Transition goals)

### Relevance

- 7) Were these activities aligned to the needs and priorities of your organization/ its members?
- 8) Did they align with the socioeconomic realities and specific challenges of the region/ country?

### Coherence

- 9) **Only for Ministries:** How well are the interventions aligned with national policy frameworks?

### Effectiveness

- 10) Where the activities implemented successful? Which were the main outcomes?
- 11) How many people were benefitted and how?
- 12) What are the key success factors and challenges encountered in achieving the expected outcomes?



- 13) Where there any unexpected results, both positive and negative, emerging from this work?
- 14) Did ILO support contributed to enhance your organization's understanding of Just Transition or/and strengthen your organization's capacity to implement similar activities/ services?

#### **Efficiency**

- 15) Could similar results have been achieved with fewer resources or through alternative approaches?

#### **Impact Orientation**

- 16) How have the interventions contributed to long-term improvements in the lives of beneficiaries, particularly women and youth? Can you provide examples of this?
- 17) **Only for Ministries:** What tangible changes have the interventions brought at the policy and practice levels in terms of governance, technical capacity on just transition, and access to decent work?

#### **Sustainability**

- 18) Do you think your institution will be able to continue implementing these activities/ services in the years to come without ILO support?

82

#### **Cross-cutting issues**

- 19) To what extent did the interventions mainstream gender equality and non-discrimination principles into their design and implementation? Can you provide examples of this?
- 20) How effectively did the interventions promote strong and independent worker and employer organizations and facilitate constructive social dialogues?

## Tool 3 – Guide for Focus Group Discussions

### 1. General Features of Focus Group Discussions

**Total number of FGD and Participants:** A total of 3 FGD, in Madagascar, the total number of participants and distribution per sex to be determined in the field.

| Target Groups                                                                                                           | Sex |   | Age    |         | Work Status |       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|---|--------|---------|-------------|-------|
| ?? participants per FGD... / Distributed as follows:                                                                    | M   | F | X < 30 | 31 or + | Informal    | Waged |
| a. <b>Lobster-catching fishers</b> , that benefitted from training and support to SMEs & cooperatives (20 participants) |     |   |        |         |             |       |
| b. Trainers-of-trainers: GERME (4 participants)                                                                         |     |   |        |         |             |       |
| c. Trainers-of-trainers: COOP (7 participants)                                                                          |     |   |        |         |             |       |

- **Informal = Non-salaried, self-employed or seasonal**
- **Waged = Salaried**

83

The **location and the dates of FGD** are listed in Annex 4 of the Inception Report. The **meeting venue** is to be arranged by the ILO team.

**Duration of FGD:** 90 minutes (lobster-catching fishers)  
60 minutes (trainers-of-trainers)

### 2. Structure of FGDs

- Introduction of the FGD facilitator, FGD purpose, duration and relevant guiding topic(s).
- Presentation of participants (name, age, work status, village of origin). At the same time, participants fill-in an assistance sheet.
- Guiding Topics relevant for FGD:
  - For lobster-catching workers:
    - Organizational and livelihoods support (e.g. SMEs & cooperatives)
    - Gender equality and non-discrimination
    - Awareness and access to social security (*if/as applicable*)
    - OSH in the lobster-catching value chain (*if/as applicable*)
    - Labour rights (*if/as applicable*)

b) For trainers-of-trainers

- i. Implementation of ILO toolkits' training

**3. Content of Guiding Topics for Lobster-Catching Workers**

The facilitator will primarily focus on the topic above which is relevant to each group.

In case participants' interventions are completed well before the assigned time (e.g. 30 -45 minutes left), the facilitator may include another topic in which participants may have received information/ training/ other support from the ILO (e.g. OSH, social security, labour rights).

**Topic I: Organizational and Livelihoods Support**

- a. Which are the main issues that lobster-catching fishers and rabatteurs face to organize and improve their economic activities?
- b. Have participants received specific support to strengthen their organization (creation of SME or cooperatives) and improve their production standards?
- c. Which kind of support and by whom?
- d. Can they briefly explain the learning acquired?
- e. Have they taken steps to put this knowledge support into practice? (e.g., how many SME / cooperatives have been formed?)
- f. Which are the main challenges that producers face to strengthen their organization and improve their income and production standards?
- g. Do they feel they can continue with these activities (SME, cooperatives), without further ILO support?

84

**Topic II: Gender Equality**

- a. Are working conditions in lobster-catching (worktime, pay, status, tasks, workload) equal for both men and women?
- b. Which are the inequalities that affect negatively women?
- c. Are women's strategic gender needs (more decision-making power, equal pay and greater access to credit) respected at their community or/and household?
- d. How has the ILO interventions specifically supported women and youth?
- e. Has there been any changes in women's status, participation, or income before and after the project?
- f. What would be needed to improve women's access to greater level of equality?
- g. What could be done at community or workplace level to address these issues?

**Topic III: Awareness and access to social security**

- a. Check how many of the participants know and can explain about CPaS, its benefits and procedures.
- b. Ask how many participants have received information from project staff or from the local social security office staff regarding social security (CPaS). How did they receive this information? Was the information provided clear for them?

- c. Ask from participants if one or more members in their family, including them, are registered in social security. Since how long ago is this? How did they enrol in SS (CPaS)?
- d. What are the benefits they obtain from SS? Have they used them already?
- e. Are they satisfied with the services received?
- f. What are the difficulties to access/ remain registered in the SS system?
- g. Do women have the same opportunities than men register in the SS system?

**Topic IV:** OSH in the lobster-catching value chain

- a. Ask participants which are the main hazards they confront in their work in the lobster-catching sector, that may lead to occupational accidents or illness.
- b. Are there differences between women and men regarding OSH hazards?
- c. Check if in the past 12 months the participants/their family members/their workers ever experienced work-related injury or sick in the lobster-catching sector.
- d. What are the main reasons for unsafe working conditions?
- e. What would be needed to be done for improving the safety and health of workers?
- f. Have they received specific information on OSH from any source/ organization? Which?
- g. Have they received any OSH-related services from OSIET?
- h. Have they participated in any awareness-raising campaign or training concerning OSH?
- i. Did this led to any changes in the way they organize their work, in order to prevent OSH hazards?
- j. What kind of preventative measures have they taken, if any, to mitigate the risk of OSH hazards in their workplace?

85

**Topic V:** Labour Rights

- a. Check how many of the participants know and can explain about labour rights or ever attend dissemination meeting on labour law (e.g. labour contract, working hours, minimum wage, access to social security and safe working conditions).
- b. How many of the participants are (or have been before) members of a union
- c. Ask how lobster-catching workers are more often recruited.
- d. What are the most common unfair treatment to the workers?
- e. What have you learned from the project about how to affirm/ defend your labour rights?

#### 4. Content of Guiding Topics for Trainers-of-Trainers

Participants fill-in an assistance sheet.

**Topic I:** Implementation of ILO Toolkits' Training

- a. What is the work you normally develop for a living?
- b. What is your professional training and institutional affiliation?
- c. How did you become involved with ILO's work in the sector?
- d. What kind of training (GERME, COOP, other) did you received? For how long (number of sessions, along how many months)?
- e. Was the training presential or online?
- f. Have you had the opportunity to implement/reproduce this training with local workers in the lobster-catching value chain?
- g. Was it successful? Do you think this training is adapted to local people's capacities and needs?
- h. Why or why not?
- i. How many trainings have you organized/ completed on your own?
- j. How many people attended?
- k. % of female attendees?
- l. Average age of participants?
- m. Which were the difficulties you may have faced in implementing the trainings?
- n. Have you had the opportunity to follow up on the eventual application of training-related learning by the people you trained?