

# **Independent Final Review**

## **Nigeria Decent Work Country Programme 2015 – 2018**

**February, 2020**



**Dwight Ordoñez, PhD**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	3
ACRONYMS .....	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	6
I. BACKGROUND AND PROGRAMME DESCRIPTION .....	1
1.1 Brief Description of the Country's Context and Background .....	1
1.2 Summary of the Decent Work Context .....	2
1.3 Programme Description .....	4
II. PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE DWCP REVIEW .....	7
2.1 Purpose and scope .....	7
2.2 Clients.....	7
2.3 Evaluation Criteria and Questions .....	8
2.4 Methodology.....	8
III. FINDINGS BY CRITERIA.....	12
3.1 Relevance and Coherence of the DWCP .....	12
3.2 Validity of Design and Evaluability .....	13
3.3 Programme Effectiveness .....	15
3.4 Efficiency of Resource Use .....	20
3.5 Effectiveness of Management Arrangements.....	21
3.6 Impact Orientation.....	23
3.7 Sustainability .....	24
IV. CONCLUSIONS .....	26
V. RECOMMENDATIONS .....	28
VI. LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES .....	31
4.1 Lessons Learned.....	31
4.2 Good Practices .....	31
ANNEXES .....	32
Annex 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference .....	32
Annex 2: Master List of Evaluation Questions .....	44
Annex 3: List of Interviewees.....	47
Annex 4: List of Documents Reviewed.....	50
Annex 5 Data collection tools .....	53

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

*The Final Review of the Nigerian Decent Work Country Program (DWCP) 2015-2018 was conducted by an Independent Evaluator, Dr. Dwight Ordóñez, under the overall supervision of a taskforce group composed of Ms. Chinyere Emeka-Anuna, Senior Programme Officer Country Office (CO) Abuja, and Mr. Ricardo Furman, Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and Mr. Ferdinand Baizebbe Na Pahimi, Programme Analyst based in ROAF/Regional Programme Unit.*

The Evaluator would like to thank Mr. Dennis Zulu, Director, ILO CO Abuja for his support throughout the evaluation process, as well as that of the ILO staff (Olatawura Ladipo-Ajayi, Pius Udo, and Segun Tekun) who arranged, within a short time, interviews with various tripartite constituents and other stakeholders and who contributed their valuable time to the outcome of this review.

The evaluator would also like to thank all stakeholders who participated as interviewees for this review. The list of participants may be found in Annex 3.

## ACRONYMS

CO	ILO Country Office
CP	Country Programme
CSO	Civil society organisation
DWAA	Decent Work Agenda for Africa
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
DWT	Decent Work Team (Dakar)
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ERGP	Nigeria Economic Recovery and Growth Plan
FAO	UN Food and Agriculture Organisation
FCT	Federal Capital Territory
FMLE	Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment
GBV	Gender-based violence
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (German Aid to Development Agency)
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GON	Government of Nigeria
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection / Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
HQ	ILO Headquarters
ILO	International Labour Organisation
ILS	International labour standards
IOM	International Organization for Migration
LMIS	Labour Market Information System
MDA	Ministries, departments, agencies
MSME	Micro, small and medium-sized enterprises
NACA	National Agency for the Control of AIDS
NAPTIP	National Agency for the Prohibition of Trafficking in Persons
NASS	National Assembly
NECA	Nigeria Employers' Consultative Association
NEP	National Employment Policy
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NLAC	National Labour Advisory Council
NLC	Nigeria Labour Congress
NSITF	Nigeria Social Insurance Trust Fund
OECD/DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OSH	Occupational safety and health
RB	Regular Budget
RBM	Results-based management

RBTC	Regular Budget Technical Cooperation
RF	Results framework
ROAF	ILO Regional Office for Africa (based in Abidjan)
SC	Steering Committee
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
ToR	Terms of reference
TUC	Trade Union Congress
TVET	Technical and vocational education and training
TWG	Technical Working Group
UN	United Nations
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNSDPF	United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes the key findings, conclusions and recommendations of an independent final review of the implementation of Nigeria's 2015-2018 Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP).

### Programme Description

In 2014, with ILO support, Nigerian constituents formulated a second Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP), which followed the first one that was implemented during 2005-2009.<sup>1</sup> Following a results-based management (RBM) approach, the DWCP-II was based on a causal analysis of the problems of decent work leading to the identification of priority areas of intervention, the delineation of short and medium-term strategic outcomes and an operational implementation plan.

The constituents prioritized certain areas of intervention for the DWCP-II. Thus, the Nigeria DWCP 2015-2018 was centred on three country programme priorities: a. Employment promotion; b. Extending the scope of social protection coverage; and c. Strengthening social dialogue and tripartite plus. These three objectives encompass eight outcomes, which in turn comprise a series of outputs.

### Evaluation Purpose and Scope

The present review has three purposes: accountability, organizational learning and contributing to strategic planning. The review seeks to determine how well Nigeria has achieved the outcomes planned in its DWCP; how they were achieved, and under what conditions. The review also attempts to contribute to organizational learning by identifying lessons learned; emerging good practices; and recommendations. This information may be used by the International Labour Organization (ILO) and ILO Constituents to formulate future strategies and the design of new DWCPs.

The following objectives guided the assignment for the Evaluator:

- Examine the coherence and relevance of the 2015-2018 DWCP in relation to the Vision 20:20:20 and the Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP), UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF 2013 – 2017), UN Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (UNSDPF 2018 – 2022), the Decent Work Agenda for Africa (DWAA 2007-15), the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and other international commitments and national frameworks.
- Examine the degree of coherence between outcomes, outputs and implementation strategies of the DWCP with the ILO Programme and Budget.
- Examine the level of sustainability of the results obtained.
- Take stock of what has been accomplished in terms of changes compared to the expected and unexpected, positive and negative, results of its implementation.
- Analyse the participation and contributions of different stakeholders, including the National Steering Committee, the sectoral administrations on employment and decent work issues, social

---

<sup>1</sup> Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) have been established as the main vehicle for delivery of ILO support to Member States. DWCPs have two basic objectives: They promote decent work as a key component of national development strategies, and at the same time, they organise ILO knowledge, instruments, advocacy and cooperation at the service of tripartite constituents in a results-based framework to advance the Decent Work Agenda within the fields of comparative advantage of the Organization. Project consistence and contribution to Policy Outcomes and Country Programme Outcomes will be considered and assessed by the evaluation. ADD DATA SOURCE

partners, civil society organizations (CSO) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), development partners and the ILO Country Office (CO) in terms of program implementation, monitoring and coordination. This includes an assessment of the organizational capacities of the constituents and the ILO Country Office with regards to the overall coordination and their effective participation and ownership of the DWCP.

- Draw lessons and good practices from the development, implementation and monitoring of the DWCP 2015-2018.
- Develop the recommendations towards the next DWCP and for ILO Offices that work in similar contexts.

## **Methodology**

The DWCP review uses a mix of evaluation approaches and ensures triangulation of information. It utilizes a results-based approach to examine the Country Programme Outcome achievements and the factors leading to/ hampering such achievements; mixed methods to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings; and a participatory approach that, to the extent possible, involved ILO key stakeholders such as ILO Tripartite Constituents, ILO staff and strategic partners, and institutions benefitting from ILO technical assistance.

Evaluation methods and techniques collected primary and secondary data. Primary data consisted of information the Evaluator observed or collected directly from stakeholders about their first-hand experience with the interventions. This data was collected through focus group discussions, and interviews that involved direct contact with the respondents.

## **Conclusions**

- a. The Decent Work Country Programme was relevant and coherent to the outcomes in the Vision 20:2020, the Government of Nigeria (GON) Economic Recovery and Growth Plan, the United Nations Development Assistance Framework, the United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework, the Decent Work Agenda for Africa, and the priorities of social partners.
- b. While the DWCP carried out proper consultations with tripartite constituents during its preparation/planning stage and used a results-based approach in its design, no effective tripartite monitoring system was implemented in practice throughout the life of the DWCP. The mechanisms and tools foreseen in the DWCP for this purpose were not used to monitor the implementation and assess the outcome of the DWCP.
- c. DWCP outcomes and outputs have been achieved in an uneven way. Given the scope and size of Nigerian labour market issues, programme results are modest and major investments are still needed at national and state level to scale up a decent work response. The performance of the different components of the DWCP was either dependent on the political will of stakeholders, or donor driven on an ad-hoc basis. That is, the implementation of activities was dependent on available funding from overseas or government sources.
- d. The DWCP's greatest achievements have been in the fields of policy development and knowledge generation. The 2015-2018 DWCP implementation has contributed to establishing some initial foundational building blocks or policies that could serve as the basis for a more coherent and effective labour market governance and administration in Nigeria: E.g. an Employment Policy, an Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) Policy, relevant components of the Social Protection Policy, a Youth Policy and a Youth Employment Action Plan. Moreover, an Industrial Relations Policy is currently under development.

- e. Effective social dialogue on ad-hoc issues and commitment from GON, Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment (FMLE) and social partners contributed to the achievement of a limited number of outcomes and outputs. The lack of an operational governance mechanism for the DWCP (Steering Committee) and limited funding from GON, social partners and overseas sources, hampered the implementation of the DWCP. Likewise, the National Labour Advisory Council (NLAC), a key component of the tripartite institutional architecture needed to effectively address issues related to the world of work, was not functional.
- f. A much greater coordination role would have been needed to be adopted by all constituents in order to ensure greater ownership and sustainability of the DWCP results. In most cases, local parties considered themselves to be recipients of support or implementers of specific actions, on an ad-hoc basis, more than as leaders of the oversight, funding, implementation monitoring and periodic revision of the programme.
- g. The sustainability of the DWCP achievements is varied. The National Employment Policy, Occupational Safety and Health Policy and Youth Policy, as well as the Nigerian Youth Employment Action Plan, are the product of social dialogue and are a framework that may stand on its own. Unfortunately, without further action/ support to mainstream these policies into ministries, departments and agencies (MDA) at federal level and help implement their key provisions at state level, the above framework may not be sustainable. Programmatic action on the issues of HIV/AIDS, labour migration, child labour and trafficking in persons has been mainstreamed into the sphere of action of various MDA. Specific programs and actions on these topics are currently endorsed and funded by GON, and financially supported by other organizations, making their continuation and the sustainability of actions more likely. Programmatic action on other key Nigerian labour market issues, such as youth employment and the extension of OSH and social security schemes to the informal economy, remain an insufficiently-addressed challenge that requires further, intensive tripartite action.

### **Lessons Learned**

The DWCP review identified some lessons learned, which were drawn from some of the challenges as well as the positive results obtained through DWCP implementation.

- a. It is important that the implementation of the DWCP is linked to the existence of an effective tripartite governance mechanism (Steering Committee, Technical Working Group) in order to ensure ownership of the results by the constituents.
- b. In order to ensure political leverage and sustainability of actions, it is important to effectively put in place the tripartite, labour market governance mechanism established under Nigerian law: The National Labour Advisory Council.
- c. In order for the DWCP to remain a relevant strategy, there is a need to move away from the mobilization of donor's funding toward an increase in the investment of federal resources. This would make the implementation of the DWCP more of a GON-led strategy and less an ILO-led one.
- d. In order for the DWCP to remain a relevant strategy, there is a need to implement actions that operationalize key labour policies at both federal and state level, as well as in the informal economy sector.



## Good Practices

The evaluation identified several good practices, which contributed toward advancing the implementation of the DWCP.

- a. The design of the DCWP II was an inclusive process. Tripartite partners participated in the discussion of priorities and revision of the DWCP document.
- b. The implementation of the DWCP II kept a close coordination with the UN system, a fact which facilitated some financial contributions from other UN agencies in Nigeria, such as the UN Multi-Partner Trust Funds [MPTF]/ United Nations Development Programme [UNDP) and the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). This was supported by the UN interagency process, which aims to make interventions UN-centred, not agency-centred.
- c. Seeking collaboration from the private sector helps advance DWCP objectives and link different aspects of the DW agenda.
- d. Parallel and concurrent work with other institutional stakeholders besides ILO constituents enriches the implementation of DWCP and helps advance its objectives.

## Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the findings of this evaluation and follow from both the lessons learned and the conclusions.

**Recommendation 1: Governance and Sustainability of Tripartite Actions regarding the Labour Market** – (Re-) Activate the National Labour Advisory Council (NLAC).

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
FMLE, NLC, TUC, NECA with ILO CO support	High	Short-Term	Low

**Recommendation 2: DWCP Governance and Sustainability** - Ensure that the DWCP Steering Committee and TWG become operational and that an effective monitoring mechanism is in place.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
FMLE, NLC, TUC, NECA with ILO CO support	High	Short-Term	Low

**Recommendation 3: DWCP Design – Prioritize the development of actions and investments in a limited number of critical areas:** Specifically, labour market governance; implementation of OSH and Social Security policies; Youth employment.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
FMLE, NLC, TUC, NECA with ILO CO support	High	Short-Term	Low

**Recommendation 4: Mobilization of Resources – Accompany the DWCP with a resource mobilization plan.** This may include earmarking GON contributions to the DWCP in the FMLE annual budget and focusing ILO’s RB and RBTC resources on carrying out its social dialogue mandate (e.g. strengthening of NLAC).

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
GON: FMLE and Ministry of Planning and Budget; with ILO CO support	High	Mid-Term	Medium

**Recommendation 5: DWCP Implementation – Ensure implementation of DWCP at federal and state levels: Involve state-level stakeholders in programme implementation.** In order to promote ownership of results at all levels, when designing DWCP-related interventions, roll-out plans should be established so that pilots may start in a limited number of states and then expand to the rest of the country.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
FMLE, NLC, TUC, NECA with ILO CO support	High	Mid-Term	Low

**Recommendation 6: Gender and non-discrimination - Ensure that the benefits of DWCP implementation accrue equally to men and women.** DWCP implementers should take steps to ensure that gender concerns related to the world of work are strategically integrated into most programme interventions, and that the DWCP monitoring system keeps track, on a regular basis, of the participation of women in programme activities and of the outcome of the same.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
FMLE, NLC, TUC, NECA with ILO CO support	High	Short-Term	Low

## I. BACKGROUND AND PROGRAMME DESCRIPTION

### 1.1 Brief Description of the Country's Context and Background

The Republic of Nigeria is a federal republic composed by 36 Federating States and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT). In 2019, the total population in Nigeria was estimated at approximately 202 million. The population has been growing at a rate of 2.6% per year (2018). Half of its population (49.66%) lives in rural zones.<sup>2</sup>

According to the 1999 Nigerian Constitution, in Nigeria the issues subject to legislation are placed under the "exclusive legislative list" (under decision of the Federal Government) or, alternatively, under the "concurrent legislative list" (under decision of States and Federal Government). Labour, together with Defence, Foreign Relations, Immigration and 64 other issues are placed under the exclusive legislative list, which bind all States to a common legal framework and national authority. Other "non-Union issues" (such as Education, Health, Social Security) are under the concurrent list and therefore may differ from State to State.

Nigeria is one of the most ethnically diverse countries in Africa, with around 250 languages spoken within its territory and two main religious orientations (Islamic and Christian) followed by the majority of Nigerians. During the past decade the country has experienced various types of violence linked to diverse social and economic factors. The public security situation in diverse locations, and particularly in the North East is a major concern in the country.

With an abundance of natural resources, it is Africa's biggest oil exporter, and has the largest natural gas reserves on the continent. The country held national elections in 2019 for the sixth consecutive time since its return to democracy in 1999. Nigeria's stability has been menaced in recent years by the insurgent Islamist terrorist organization Boko Haram, which carries out frequent attacks to the military and civilian population from many of its strongholds in the northeast of the country. There also have been lethal outbreaks of violence between herders and farmers in the Middle Belt region, and an increase in the number and frequency of violent, delinquent crimes throughout the country.

Between 2000 and 2014, Nigeria sustained relatively high economic growth rates, averaging 7% a year. Following the oil price collapse in 2014-2016, combined with negative production shocks, the gross domestic product (GDP) growth rate dropped to 2.7% in 2015. In 2016, during its first recession in 25 years, the economy contracted by 1.6%, and growth has remained stagnant since then, reaching 2.3% in 2019. In 2014, Nigeria had a GDP of \$488 billion<sup>3</sup>, although by 2018 it had decreased to \$397.30 billion. In 2019, it had a GDP per capita of \$5,086.<sup>4</sup> After a GDP rebasing exercise in 2014, Nigeria became the largest economy in Africa, overtaking South Africa, and it is currently ranked as the 27th-largest economy in the world in terms of nominal GDP. However, around 70% of government income and 80% of the country's foreign income still depend on petrol sales.

In 2018, inflation was estimated at 16.5%, a high rate which negatively affected workers' income and purchasing power.<sup>5</sup> Growth is too slow to lift the bottom half of the population out of poverty. The weakness of the agriculture sector weakens prospects for the rural poor, while high food inflation adversely affects the livelihoods of the urban poor. Large pockets of Nigeria's population (around 60%) still live in poverty, without adequate access to basic services. The lack of job opportunities is at the core of the high poverty levels, of regional inequality, and of social and political unrest in the

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/nigeria/overview>

<sup>3</sup> Nigeria Decent Work Country Programme.

<sup>4</sup> <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/2019-human-development-index-ranking>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.heritage.org/index/country/nigeria>

country. While Nigeria has made some progress in socio-economic terms in recent years, its human capital development remains weak due to under-investment. Nigeria ranked 158 out of 189 countries in the Human Development Index (HDI). Life expectancy at birth remains at 54.3 years.<sup>6</sup> During the last two decades, Nigeria has experienced a higher outflow than inflow of people.

## 1.2 Summary of the Decent Work Context

By Q3 of 2018, the economically active or working age Nigerian population (15-64 years of age) was estimated at 115.5 million people, while the total number of persons in the labour force being estimated at 90.5 million for the same period<sup>7</sup>. The agricultural sector dominates the employment in the country: Two out of three jobs (66%) were in this sector. In the last decade, the share of agricultural employment declined, while it grew in the service sector. The informal economy absorbs a large majority (80,4%) of the workforce.<sup>8</sup> The greater increase of households in informal businesses is located in Lagos, due to the impact of internal, rural-urban migration and insufficient formal job creation. Informal jobs are associated with lower productivity and no tax contributions.

Regarding **employment**, during the last decade Nigeria experienced the phenomenon of jobless economic growth. Despite expansion in some sectors, employment creation remains weak and insufficient to absorb the fast-growing labour force, resulting in a high rate of unemployment (23% in 2018)<sup>9</sup>, with another 20% of the labour force underemployed. Youth unemployment rates are twice as high as the national unemployment rate. A large majority of the youth entering the labour market ends up in vulnerable employment in the informal economy. By Q3 of 2018, the unemployment rate for young people (15-35 years) was 29.7% and the underemployment rate for the same population stood at 27.2%. That is, 55.4% of young people (15-35) were either underemployed or unemployed. Women experience more joblessness (26.6%) than their male counterparts (20.3%). Women are discriminated against in access to education for social and economic reasons.<sup>10</sup> Over 70 percent of women live below the poverty line, with maternal mortality ratios at 576 per 100,000. Enrollment of girls in school ranges from one third to one quarter of classroom participants and out of the 10.5 million out-of-school children, two-thirds are girls<sup>11</sup>. The literacy rate for males is 58 percent but only 41 percent for females.<sup>12</sup> Nigerian women usually face stronger barriers to labour market entry and have more difficulty finding employment; and the global financial crisis exacerbated the existing differentials. Women remain underrepresented in the formal sector but play an active and vital role in the country's important informal economy.

The persistently high unemployment rate is attributed to a number of factors that include: The existence of an increasing number of school graduates with no matching job opportunities; a freeze in employment in many public and private sector institutions; continued job losses in several sectors; limited employability of the workforce, due to the fact that graduates and young people don't have opportunities for training to the level of skill required in the world of work; vocational training schemes not adapted to current labour market needs; and lack of institutionalized guidance or counselling schemes to help young people enter the job market. The Nigerian unemployment situation is made worse with the lack of labour market information, as there is little or no data, and

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/2019-human-development-index-ranking>

<sup>7</sup> National Bureau of Statistics, Labour Force Statistics – Volume I: Unemployment and Underemployment Report (Q4 2017 – Q3 2018); Abuja, December 2018.

<sup>8</sup> ILO, Women and Men in the Informal Economy: A Statistical Picture (third edition); Geneva, 2018.

<sup>9</sup> National Bureaus of Statistics, op. cit.

<sup>10</sup> [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=3244971](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3244971)

<sup>11</sup> United Nations, 2018 UN Annual Results Report for the UN System in Nigeria

<sup>12</sup> Revised Nigeria Decent Work Country Programme – Final Version – October 2016.

where available, data are gathered by different government agencies with no coordination and coherence.

Regarding **labour standards**, Nigeria has ratified a total of 40 International Labour Organisation (ILO) Conventions, with 35 currently in force including all the eight core conventions. However, Nigeria has not ratified a number of conventions which are crucial to addressing decent work deficits. These include ILO Conventions C122, C129, C150, C187, and C188 that relate to labour market governance, C102 on social security, C181 on private employment agencies and C189 on domestic workers<sup>13</sup>. The Government and the social partners should collaboratively work towards the ratification of the relevant ILS that promote Decent Work. Implementation of the ratified conventions has not always been effective, owing to capacity challenges in ensuring compliance with such commitments, and a lack of adequate awareness about the provisions of such conventions. Labour laws that were reviewed many years ago were submitted to National Assembly for enactment, however, they have been withdrawn and are currently undergoing another review.

Regarding **social protection**-related issues, the identified decent work deficits in this area include: a limited social security system that caters only to formal sector workers; an inadequate pensions system; limited ability to provide a social welfare system for senior citizens, the younger generation, and people living with or affected by HIV; neglect of people with disabilities and their need for unemployment benefits; the limited extent of child social protection schemes; inadequate safety nets for orphans and vulnerable children; and the ineffective and unsatisfactory pace of the National Health Insurance Scheme.

Nigeria is the country with the second highest HIV burden in the world, and the highest in the West African sub-region. As of 2018, in Nigeria the HIV prevalence rate among adults aged 15–49 was 1.4%.<sup>14</sup> While a national workplace policy on HIV and AIDS is in place, when the Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) was designed, a major gap was the lack of a comprehensive programme on HIV and AIDS encompassing the world of work and covering the different elements of the national response. Identified deficits include continued stigma and discrimination of those infected by HIV+ and their relatives, inadequate access to HIV services, low uptake of voluntary testing and counselling as well as the lack of HIV and AIDS interventions tailored for the workplace and focused on most vulnerable sectors.

Nigeria is a centre of human trafficking, especially of women and children, both within the country and abroad (mainly to European and Middle East countries). Child labour averaged 28.8% of the population among young girls and boys less than 15 years.<sup>15</sup> The largest number of working children was among unpaid family workers and in the agricultural sector. Before the DWCP implementation period, the country had already developed a new National Child Policy, a National Action Plan and a list of hazardous work that were pending implementation.

**Labour Administration** in Nigeria is affected by several deficits, among which include: Inadequate funding for factory and labour inspectorates; capacity gaps in training for factory and labour inspectorates; inadequate funding for monitoring and evaluation; lack of awareness of workers' rights; inspectors' lack of power to sanction offenders; lack of collaboration among ministries, departments and agencies (MDA) with the required technical firm-specific skills to inspect and

---

<sup>13</sup> C102: Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1959; C122: Employment Policy Convention, 1964; C129: Labour Inspection (Agriculture) Convention, 1969; C150: Labour Administration Convention (1978); C181: Private Employment Agencies Convention (1997); C187: Promotional Framework for Occupational Safety and Health Convention (2006); C188: Work in Fishing Convention (2007); C189: Domestic Workers Convention (2011).

<sup>14</sup> NACA, 2019; Source: NAAIS <https://naca.gov.ng/nigeria-prevalence-rate/>

<sup>15</sup> Paquete-Perdigao, EAT-BP Dakar National context vis-à-vis Standards and Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, ILO Staff Papers, Nigeria – Child Labour, May 2010

impose sanctions; labour market segmentation, and persistent gender inequalities.<sup>16</sup> Workers often experience obstacles to exercise their rights to freedom of association and to collective bargaining. . Most of such cases go to labour courts for resolution and take a long time to be resolved, a fact that has made it increasingly difficult to organize workers into unions.

Regarding **social dialogue**, a major piece of the Nigerian labour-related institutional architecture is the National Labour Advisory Council (NLAC), a tripartite body aimed at providing a governance mechanism to the labour market. Unfortunately, due to lack of funding by the government, the NLAC has not been meeting quarterly as originally intended and it has not fulfilled its role as an advisory body on labour issues. The ILO government partner is the Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment (FMLE). The Ministry plays an intermediary role between the employers' and workers' organizations and is the Chair of the NLAC. The Nigeria Employers' Consultative Association (NECA) is the umbrella organization of the private sector employers in Nigeria. It represents the employers as the tripartite member of the ILO. There are two labour centres in Nigeria – the Nigeria Labour Congress (NLC) and the Trade Union Congress of Nigeria (TUC), to which trade union organizations are affiliated. All these are statutory members of the ILO Governing Body. Unionization of workers remains low in Nigeria, totalizing less than 15% of the total workforce.

Nigeria is a member state of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), and as such, has affirmed the regional commitment regarding the promotion of decent work among member countries. Nigeria's remaining challenge is how to improve compliance with labour laws and increase the coverage of decent work to the majority of the workforce.

### 1.3 Programme Description

In 2014, with ILO support, Nigerian constituents formulated a second Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP), which followed the first one that was implemented during 2005-2009.<sup>17,18</sup> Following a results-based management (RBM) approach, the DWCP-II is based on a causal analysis of the problems of decent work leading to the identification of priority areas of intervention, the delineation of short and medium-term strategic outcomes and an operational implementation plan. The DWCP-II is, thus, the strategic results framework around which the Government and the social partners (employers and workers) are committed to working in partnership with ILO and other key partners to achieve the goals of decent work in the country. The DWCP formulation is based on an integrated and participatory programmatic approach.

During the design phase of the DWCP, the constituents identified a series of deficits that affected the advancement of decent work in Nigeria, namely:

- Employment and Labour Market Deficits
- Labour Standards Deficits
- Deficits in Social Protection
- Labour Administration Deficits
- Social Dialogue Deficits

---

<sup>16</sup> Source: Revised Nigeria Decent Work Country Programme – Final Version – October 2016.

<sup>17</sup> Source: Government of Nigeria - ILO, *Nigeria Decent Work Country Programme II (2015 – 2018)*

<sup>18</sup> Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) have been established as the main vehicle for delivery of ILO support to Member States. DWCPs have two basic objectives: They promote decent work as a key component of national development strategies, and at the same time, they organise ILO knowledge, instruments, advocacy and cooperation at the service of tripartite constituents in a results-based framework to advance the Decent Work Agenda within the fields of comparative advantage of the Organization. Project consistence and contribution to Policy Outcomes and Country Programme Outcomes will be considered and assessed by the evaluation.

- Gender Deficits

In response to the above, the constituents prioritized certain areas of intervention for the DWCP-II. Thus, the Nigeria DWCP 2015-2018 is centred on three country programme priorities and eight corresponding outcomes, listed below.

#### **A. Employment Promotion**

- Outcome 1.1: Improved Policy Environment for Increased Job Creation
- Outcome 1.2: Improved Labour Market Governance and Administration
- Outcome 1.3: Increased Employability and Employment Opportunities for Young Women and Men

#### **B. Extending the Scope of Social Protection Coverage**

- Outcome 2.1: Improved Labour Migration Management
- Outcome 2.2: Improved Workplace Response to the HIV/AIDS Epidemic
- Outcome 2.3: Worst Forms of Child Labour Reduced

#### **C. Strengthening Social Dialogue and Tripartite Plus**

- Outcome 3.1: Improved Capacity of the Social Dialogue Institution and the Tripartite Partners
- Outcome 3.2: Enhanced Capacity of Partners involved in the Implementation of DWCP II

The above priorities and outcomes were agreed upon extensive consultations between the national tripartite constituents, development partners and the ILO. Each outcome comprises a series of related outputs for which indicators and targets were established. The DWCP outputs are as follows:

#### **Outcome 1.1: Improved Policy Environment for Increased Job Creation**

Output 1.1.1: National employment policy

Output 1.1.2: National labour laws related to employment reviewed

Output 1.1.3: Labour-based technology demonstration methodology mainstreamed and adopted

Output 1.1.4: Employment/job creation mainstreamed into national development programs

#### **Outcome 1.2: Improved Labour Market Governance and Administration**

Output 1.2.1: ILO Conventions 187, 181 and 189 ratified

Output 1.2.2: National Labour laws related to labour market governance reviewed

Output 1.2.3: Functional Labour Market Information system (LMIS) established

#### **Outcome 1.3: Increased Employability and Employment Opportunities for Young Women and Men**

Output 1.3.1: Capacities of technical and vocational education and training (TVET) and youth employment institutions enhanced

Output 1.3.2: Capacities of women entrepreneurs strengthened

Output 1.3.3: Skilled employability of youth enhanced

#### **Outcome 2.1: Improved Labour Migration Management**

Output 2.1.1: Trafficking in human beings reduced through increased awareness and cooperation

Output 2.1.2: Capacities of anti-human trafficking agencies enhanced

Output 2.1.3: Rights of migrant workers protected and victims rehabilitated

#### **Outcome 2.2: Improved Workplace Response to the HIV/AIDS Epidemic**

Output 2.2.1: Implementation of the revised HIV & AIDS in the workplace policy

Output 2.2.2: Capacities of partners strengthened and HIV and AIDS concerns mainstreamed in national projects

**Outcome 2.3: Worst Forms of Child Labour Reduced**

Output 2.3.1: Implementation of National Policy and National Action Plan on Child labour supported

Output 2.3.2: Child labour issues integrated into national development programme

Output 2.3.3: Capacity building for relevant partners (child labour)

**Outcome 3.1: Improved Capacity of the Social Dialogue Institution and the Tripartite Partners**

Output 3.1.1: C129 on Social Dialogue ratified

Output 3.1.2: Functional NLAC is in place

Output 3.1.3: Capacities of Tripartite partners on Social Dialogue enhanced

**Outcome 3.2: Enhanced Capacity of Partners involved in the Implementation of DWCP II**

Output 3.2.1: Capacities of social partners and other stakeholders on project management strengthened

Output 3.2.2: Monitoring and Evaluation System for DWCP established

**DWCP Organizational/ Governance Arrangements:** The DWCP design considered the functioning of two governance mechanisms, the Steering Committee and the Technical Working Group, which were intended to meet regularly to monitor the implementation of the DWCP and take strategic decisions regarding the same.

Regarding its **linkages with Development Frameworks**, the Nigeria DWCP II is guided by the Transformation Agenda (2011-2015) which provides a medium term strategy for the long term Vision 20: 2020. Likewise, the DCWP II is linked with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF III: 2013 – 2017) which has 4 identified areas for UN interventions. Other relevant frameworks to which the DWCP is related to are: The ILO Strategic Policy Framework (2010 – 2015), the 2014-2015 Programme and Budget, the Decent Work Agenda for Africa (2007-2015), and the Global Jobs Pact.

Regarding **funding arrangements**, the DWCP expected resources to be mobilised from various sources, such as:

- Tripartite constituent contributions: For example, GON was expected to provide funds from national annual budgetary allocations, while the employers' organization and workers organizations were also expected to contribute to the funding of identified outcomes and their outputs.
- ILO Extra-budgetary resources
- The UN system in Nigeria
- Bi-lateral contributions from donor countries or/and multilateral organizations such as the European Union, the World Bank, the African Development Bank and the Global Fund through funding of technical cooperation projects on selected topics (e.g. employment and skill development, fighting HIV/AIDs and women empowerment)
- Other International Organizations.
- The Nigerian Private sector

The DWCP document stated that: *"There will be a resource mobilisation Strategy whose objective will be to raise resources needed to implement the DWCP II. The use of any resources mobilised will be tracked throughout the implementation of the DWCP II to ensure accountability and transparency and financial reports prepared on intervals agreed with the donors."*



## II. PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE DWCP REVIEW

### 2.1 Purpose and scope

The present review has three purposes: accountability, organizational learning and contributing to strategic planning. The review seeks to determine how well Nigeria has achieved the outcomes planned in its DWCP; how they were achieved, and under what conditions. The review also attempts to contribute to organizational learning by identifying lessons learned; emerging good practices; and recommendations. This review may be used by ILO and ILO Constituents to formulate future strategies and the design of new DWCPs.

The following objectives guided the assignment for the Evaluator:

- Examine the coherence and relevance of the 2015-2018 DWCP in relation to the Vision 20:20:20 and the Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP), UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF 2013 – 2017), UN Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (UNSDPF 2018 – 2022), the Decent Work Agenda for Africa (DWAA 2007-15), the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and other international commitments and national frameworks.
- Examine the degree of coherence between outcomes, outputs and implementation strategies of the DWCP with the ILO Programme and Budget.
- Examine the level of sustainability of the results obtained.
- Take stock of what has been accomplished in terms of changes compared to the expected and unexpected, positive and negative, results of its implementation.
- Analyse the participation and contributions of different stakeholders, including the National Steering Committee, the sectoral administrations on employment and decent work issues, social partners, civil society organizations (CSO) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), development partners and the ILO Country Office (CO) in terms of program implementation, monitoring and coordination. This includes an assessment of the organizational capacities of the constituents and the ILO Country Office with regards to the overall coordination and their effective participation and ownership of the DWCP.
- Draw lessons and good practices from the development, implementation and monitoring of the DWCP 2015-2018.
- Develop the recommendations towards the next DWCP and for ILO Offices that work in similar contexts.

### 2.2 Clients

The clients of this DWCP review are specifically the ILO tripartite constituents, key stakeholders in the implementation of the 2015-2018 DWCP, and the ILO at country, regional and global levels.

The ILO Tripartite Partners in Nigeria include the following:

- Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment
- Nigeria Employers' Consultative Association (NECA)
- Nigeria Labour Congress (NLC)
- Trade Union Congress of Nigeria (TUC)

Other clients of this DWCP review are Government MDA, institutions of higher learning, the Ministry of Budget and National Planning, NAP TIP, NACA, the Ministry of Youth, the National Youth Service Corps, the Nigeria Social Insurance Trust Fund and the National Directorate of Employment.

## 2.3 Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The DWCP review addresses the general areas of focus (evaluation criteria) as per the evaluation terms of reference (TOR) and the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria for evaluating development assistance programs: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Impact; and Sustainability.

In particular, ILO policy drivers on Decent Work were taken into account when evaluating the implementation of the DWCP, including International Labour Standards, the promotion of equality between men and women and non-discrimination, environmental sustainability, and social dialogue.

A list of 26 key questions has been formulated in order to guide the information gathering, analysis, conclusions and recommendations, as well as lessons learned and good practices. The specific evaluation questions are listed in Annex 2.

## 2.4 Methodology

The evaluation follows 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).

As per the TOR, the evaluation uses a mix of evaluation approaches and ensures triangulation of information. It utilizes a results-based approach to examine the Country Programme Outcome achievements and the factors leading to or hampering such achievements; mixed methods to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings; and a participatory approach that, to the extent possible, involved ILO key stakeholders such as ILO Tripartite Constituents, ILO staff and strategic partners, and institutions benefitting from ILO technical assistance. Gender and non-discrimination and other cross-cutting themes were addressed through specific questions posed to interviewees within the "Cross-cutting issues" section of the interviewees guides (please refer to Annex 5).

### 2.4.1 Evaluation Framework

The methodology for this review takes into account: i) the need to identify issues, needs and constraints specific to Nigeria; ii) the need to evaluate levels of achievement, good practices and lessons learned; iii) the DWCP's contribution to progress in achieving decent work-related objectives; iv) the need to formulate conclusions and recommendations as an input into future DWCP strategy and follow-up; v) and the DWCP logical framework and indicators to be used as a basis for addressing key questions.

Additionally, the review addresses the ILO's cross-cutting policy drivers: International labour standards; social dialogue; environmental sustainability; and, especially, gender equality and non-discrimination. This implies the involvement of men and women, as well as other social/cultural categories as relevant, in the consultations and evaluation analysis. Moreover, the Evaluator has reviewed data and information that is disaggregated by sex and assessed the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve the lives of women and men.

### 2.4.2 Methods and Techniques

The Evaluator selected evaluation methods and techniques that aim to ensure relevant data collection and provide the evidence needed to generate useful findings, address the evaluation criteria, and answer the evaluation questions.

To strengthen the credibility and usefulness of evaluation results as well as to ensure data accuracy and facilitate its interpretation, the review used a mix of data sources collected through multiple methods and techniques. This use of mixed methods and sources or “triangulation” helped the Evaluator overcome the bias that comes from using a single information source, single method or single observation.

The evaluation collected both primary and secondary data. Primary data consisted of information the Evaluator observed or collected directly from stakeholders about their first-hand experience with the interventions. This data was collected through focus group discussions, and interviews that involved direct contact with the respondents.

The evaluator had the opportunity to engage and interview the tripartite constituents as well as a variety of other relevant DWCP stakeholders, which were directly or indirectly involved in its implementation. The evaluator also had the opportunity to interview representatives of other institutions that were considered to be relevant for the design and implementation of a future DWCP. Collection of data through interviews or focus groups was carried out in a confidential manner.

Secondary data was documentation that has direct relevance for the purposes of the evaluation and that has been produced by the ILO, other individuals or agencies for purposes other than those of the evaluation. Examples of this include sectoral policies, draft regulations, implementation plans, monitoring templates and other sources of information.

Specifically, evaluation methods and techniques included:

**a. Document mapping**

Based on the information provided in Annex 4, the Evaluator conducted a document mapping of background data, relevant documents and research at the country level.

**b. Comprehensive document review**

The evaluator reviewed a variety of documents related to the current review. Examples include: The Vision 20:20:20 document; the Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP); UNDAF (2013 – 2017); UNSDPF (2018 – 2022); the Decent Work Agenda for Africa (DWAA 2007-15); DWCP document; country programme results; official development assistance-related data; national policies on employment, social protection, youth, occupational safety and health, industrial relations; labour force survey; national occupational safety and health (OSH) profile; HIV workplace assessment report; youth employment action plan; national action plan on child labour; employment mapping – case study for Nigeria; country study for potential skills partnerships on migration; several labour bills under review; and other documents.

The Evaluator also reviewed programme planning and monitoring documents; information on technical cooperation projects; available financial information from ILO Development Cooperation Dashboard for 2015-2018, and information on regular budget (RB) and regular budget technical cooperation (RBTC) expenditures for 2016 provided by the Abuja CO. ILO Abuja CO’s change of financial system from FISEXT (based on activity lines) to IRIS (based on outputs) on April 15, 2019 eliminated the possibility for the evaluator to have comprehensive information available at local level to track programme expenditures in an exhaustive manner.

The list of documents reviewed can be found in Annex 4.

### **c. Key Informant Interviews and Focus Groups**

Between January 27 and February 5 2020 the Evaluator conducted a series of individual interviews (17) and focus groups (6) with key informants representing:

- ILO backstopping and technical officials at ROAF and CO
- Technical Cooperation Projects' Chief Technical Advisers and project teams of programmes and projects currently under implementation
- Employers' and Workers' Organizations
- Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment
- Other relevant Ministries (e.g. Youth, National Budget and Planning) and Government Agencies (National Agency for the Control of AIDS [NACA], National Agency for the Prohibition of Trafficking in Persons [NAPTIP], National Bureau of Statistics, Nigeria Social Insurance Trust Fund - NSITF)
- Representatives of the Office of the UN Resident Coordinator in Nigeria
- Nigerian Business Coalition Against AIDS (NIBUCAA)

Institutional stakeholders were selected on the basis of the following criteria:

- DWCP institutional partners (FMLE, employers' and workers' organizations)
- MDA that were recipients of DWCP support
- MDA that may provide relevant information on labour market issues (NBS, NSITF, Ministry of National Budget and Planning, Office of the Senior Special Assistant to the President on SDGs) or that may become relevant allies under the implementation of the next DWCP.
- UN staff that may provide contextual information on the country and DWCP design/ implementation
- ILO staff directly involved in DWCP design/ implementation
- ILO staff involved in other ILO current projects

The identity of the specific interviewees was decided by each institution. Depending on the circumstances, the meetings adopted several formats: One-to-one semi-structured interviews; group interviews; and Skype interviews. A total of 61 people participated in the interviews.

A list of stakeholders and schedule of interviews is included in Annex 3. Interview guides/Protocols were developed for the in-country visit and these are presented in Annex 5.

### **d. Visits to project implementation sites**

The evaluator visited a Migrant Resource Centre in Lagos and had the opportunity to interview the Deputy Director of the FMLE in this city. The purpose of the visit was to collect information directly from local implementers and beneficiaries on the process and outcome of activities.

### **e. Feedback Session**

At the end of the in-country fieldwork phase, the Evaluator, together with the Abuja CO, organized a meeting to communicate and discuss the preliminary findings of the review to the ILO CO representatives; tripartite constituents; partners and other stakeholders.

## 2.5 Limitations

Overall, the evaluation findings are based on information collected from background documents and key informant interviews. The accuracy of the evaluation findings depends on the integrity of information provided to the Evaluator from these sources, and on whether the information could be triangulated by the Evaluator.

Unfortunately, given that by the moment of the visit the country DWCP II-related direct actions had finalized, the evaluator only had the opportunity to visit activities carried out by a 2019 project in Lagos, and did not have the opportunity to interview the direct beneficiaries of DWCP- related interventions. Likewise, a representatives of the Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development, and institution originally considered as a potential stakeholder, was not available for a meeting throughout the duration of the visit. We were however informed that no relevant DWCP-related actions had been carried out with this Ministry.

Notwithstanding the above, and moreover given that most of the outcomes achieved by DWCP implementation are linked to the development of policies and strengthening of institutional capacities, the Evaluator believes that the interviews conducted during this evaluation do accurately represent the views of key institutional stakeholders, such as the FMLE and the employers' and workers' organizations, as well as those institutions that were major recipients of support under the DWCP (NACA, NAPTIP, and NIBUCAA).

### III. FINDINGS BY CRITERIA

This section analyses the findings of the evaluation, following the categories indicated in the evaluation TOR: Relevance and Coherence of the DWCP; Validity of Design and Evaluability; Programme Effectiveness; Efficiency of Resource Use; Effectiveness of Management Arrangements; Impact Orientation and Sustainability; and Sustainability. The responses to the evaluation questions have been organized accordingly. The master list of evaluation questions may be found in Annex 2.

#### 3.1 Relevance and Coherence of the DWCP

**Sources of information:** *Analysis of diverse development frameworks and comparison with the content of the DWCP document*

The Nigeria DWCP is relevant and coherent with regards to an ensemble of development frameworks pertinent to Nigeria.

The Nigeria DWCP 2015-2018 is consistent with the objectives of Pillar 1 of Vision 20:20:20 ("Guaranteeing the wellbeing and productivity of people"), particularly in regards to the objectives of developing human capital, generating employment and protecting jobs, and ensuring gender equality and women's empowerment. Likewise, the DWCP is coherent with the strategies outlined in the Nigeria Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP) which is aimed at creating jobs; developing capacity building, skills acquisition and social inclusion interventions (particularly for youth); and strengthening the capacity of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (MSME).

The DWCP is relevant to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) III 2014-2017's Strategic Intents #2 (Social Capital Development), #3 (Equitable and Sustainable Economic Growth) and #4 (Human Security and Risk Management), specifically with regards to Outcomes 2.1 (Education), 2.3 (HIV and AIDS), 2.4 (Social Protection), 3.1 (Investment Climate), 3.5 (Employment), 4.2 (Conflict Prevention and Management) and 4.4 (Migration, Illicit Drugs and Crime Management). Concurrently to the above, the DWCP is consistent with the United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (UNSDPF) 2018-2022's Result Areas 2 (Equitable Quality Basic Services) and 3 (Sustainable and Inclusive Growth and Development), specifically with regards to Outcomes 3 (HIV and AIDS), 4 (Learning and Skills Development), 6 (Protection), 7 (Diversified Economic Growth) and 8 (Population Dynamics dealing with Migration/Labour Migration). Consistency with UN Development Frameworks was supported by the UN interagency process, which aims to make interventions UN-centred, not agency-centred, contributing to the coordination of actions among agencies and avoiding duplication of efforts.

DWCP priorities are in full adherence with the drivers of the decent work policy portfolio within ILO's Decent Work Agenda for Africa 2007-2015 (e.g. Full and productive employment and enterprise development; Social Protection for all; and Improving governance in the world of work and the labour market), and particularly in relation to DWAA Strategies 3.1 (policies for employment-rich growth and sustainable enterprises), 3.4 (Skills Development and Employability), 5.2 (children in school not work), 5.3 (ending forced labour), 5.6 (promoting tripartism and social dialogue) and 5.9 (labour market, information and statistics). Moreover, the DWCP is aligned to the priorities expressed in the Addis Ababa Declaration of 2013, as well as to the ILO Programme and Budget for the biennium 2016-2017 and 2018-2019.

Finally, the objectives, expected outcomes and suggested activities for DWCP implementation were agreed by consensus among government and social partners and reflect the priorities established by the same at the time of its formulation.

The great majority of outputs and activities included in the revised version of the programme implemented between 2015 and 2018 are consistent with the overall goal of the DWCP and the achievement of its objectives. Most outputs show a direct link to the outcomes they support. However, in some cases, such outputs are formulated more like outcomes, not directly dependent of project activities. For example, output 2.1.1: (“trafficking in human beings reduced through increased awareness and cooperation”) contributing to outcome 2.1 (“improved labour migration movement”)

### 3.2 Validity of Design and Evaluability

**Sources of information:** a. Analysis of diverse program documents (DWCP results matrix of 2016 - results framework, implementation plan, monitoring plan-, Abuja Office 2017 work plan, program briefs, minutes of ILO-FMLP review planning meeting on Nigeria, ILO CO Partners Work Plan 2016-2017, etc.; b. Data collected on the basis of interview questions to key stakeholder on relevant issues

The DWCP carried out a proper consultation mechanism during its preparation/planning stage in 2014-2015. That is, key stakeholders met to analyse the main issues (labelled “deficits”) affecting the Nigerian labour market and to discuss and agree on the “national response” to the same. In 2016, a revision of DWCP was carried out by the tripartite constituents. Members of the Tripartite Steering Committee received a results-based monitoring (RBM) training in 2016, and after the training the partners were able to review the Results Chain thereby improving the document.

In principle, the DWCP should be evaluable, given that it used a results-based approach in its design. That is, the DWCP has a detailed results framework, which was revised in 2016 to streamline the number of indicators. It also has a detailed implementation plan. Likewise, it has a monitoring plan that links each indicator with targets, milestones and means of verification.

The results framework (RF) of the DWCP states its intended outcomes and links these with specific indicators and sources of data. It also aligns the country programme outcomes with UNDAF outcomes and national development plans, and also links them with P&B outcomes and the regional agenda (DWAA). The information is presented in a clear and detailed way.

However, while data sources are specified in the RF, the indicator list is missing a column specifying the definition of the same, particularly in the cases of those indicators that are service/beneficiary-related, and which lack a clear description of the indicator’s numerator/ denominator. Without a clear indication of the specific size of the numerator and denominator it is not viable to assess the completion of outcomes. Take for example the case of indicator 2.1.4 (“number of migrants supported to ensure protection of their labour rights”): The indicator states as target a percentage (15%) with no reference to a specific figure. In another case (indicator 1.2.2: Amended national labour laws), the specific regulations to be improved/modified are not identified.

The RF highlights in each case the relevant critical assumptions and risks. The latter mainly refer in each case to the “availability of funding/ budget allocations” and “the effective collaboration among

partners". However, the DWCP implementation plan only mentions funding from RBTC and donors funding **and makes no mention of government and social partners specific financial commitment to the programme.**

The DWCP implementation plan indicates the outputs related to each outcome, its expected timing for delivery, the parties responsible for each of the latter, and the estimated sources/gap in funding. In most cases, targets are sufficiently precise and make reference to attainable figures within a 4-year period (e.g. 2.3.4 Number of child labour law violations reported: 5,000 people; 2.3.3 Number of workers accessing VCT and PMTCT services in and through the workplace: 80,000 people). However, some targets seem very low and insufficient for a programme with 90 million people in the workplace. (e.g. 1.3.3 Number of young entrepreneurs who have established their own business: 20 people; 2.1.5 Number of victims of human trafficking, male and female, reintegrated into society: 30 people; 2.3.5 Number of children, male and female, withdrawn from WFCL: 30).

The timing of activities and the milestones established for the delivery of outputs as per the DWCP implementation plan were not followed, partly given the limited financial resources available for program implementation, and also because the programme lacked a governance mechanism effectively in place. Thus, while the implementation of most activities was carried out in consultation, on an ad-hoc basis, and with involvement of the tripartite constituents, for most of the DWCP lifetime the Steering Committee (SC) and the Technical Working Group (TWG) did not meet.

This implies that **the programme lacked, in practice, an effective tripartite monitoring mechanism** that involved the active participation of constituents. That is, **no system/ routine was put in place by the constituents to consistently track the DWCP results and provide evidence/ feedback to stakeholders on the incremental outcome of DWCP implementation.**

As a result of the above, the mechanisms and tools described before (e.g. results framework, implementation plan, monitoring plan) were not used to monitor/ assess the implementation and outcome of the DWCP. As a consequence of the above, there is no systematic evidence/ database on DWCP results for the 2015-2018 period.

No consistent explanation was provided by stakeholders on "why" they did not comply with the organizational structure and duties they had established in the DWCP document.

The ILO CO carried out some monitoring activity on its own (e.g. it **check-listed** some of the outputs/ outcomes achieved throughout the life of the DWCP, mainly for internal reporting within ILO and reporting to UN and to donors on specific projects). However, it did not use a proper result-based management approach during DWCP implementation as originally intended (e.g. systematic collection of data, tripartite analysis and feedback to/ adjustment by key stakeholders).

Regarding the attention given to gender issues within DWCP monitoring, while gender discrimination is addressed in the programme document and within most policy-related outputs (e.g. national policies and action plans on diverse topics), gender discrimination was **not addressed in a systematic/ ongoing manner** within monitoring and evaluation of DWCP implementation, particularly with regards to direct beneficiaries/ participants in DWCP activities.

Thus, while data collection was carried out on a gender-disaggregated basis for some activities/ projects (e.g. the Food Africa Project, HIV/AIDS Project, activity attendance sheets in training events), **there is no evidence that data was consolidated in the same way for the overall DWCP.**



### 3.3 Programme Effectiveness

*Sources of information: a. DWCP-related products: policies, draft-regulations, implementation reports and other documents; b. Data collected on the basis of interview questions to key stakeholder on relevant issues; c. Comparison with expected results in the results matrix*

The implementation of the DWCP had its **greatest achievements** in two areas:

- a. **Policy Development:** E.g., the formulation of the National Employment Policy, National OSH Policy, Draft Nigerian Youth Employment Action Plan, and the National Youth Policy; contributions to the GON 2017 National Social Protection Policy, which includes strategies on poverty reduction, human capital development and access to basic social services, among others.
- b. **Knowledge generation:** E.g. the formulation of a National OSH Profile, the Employment Mapping, an Institutional Assessment and Coordination Mechanism Study, the National HIV Workplace Assessment Study, etc.

The **supporting factors** that contributed to success were the implementation of effective social dialogue **on ad-hoc issues** and the commitment from GON institutions and the social partners to address the same.

Otherwise, **DWCP outcomes and outputs were achieved in an uneven way.**

**Regarding DWCP outcomes**, some were fully achieved, other partially achieved (that is, achieved on a limited basis) and others not achieved during the implementation period, as follows:

Level of Achievement	Outcomes
Fully achieved	CP Outcome 2.2: World of work responds effectively to the HIV/AIDS epidemic
Partially achieved	CP Outcome 1.1 Improved policy environment for increased job creation
	CP outcome 1.2: Improved Labour Market Governance and Administration
	CP outcome 1.3: Increased Employability and Employment Opportunities for Young Women and Men
	CP outcome 2.1: Improved Labour Migration Management lead to increased Migrants Protection and Reduced Trafficking in Persons (although not systematized, comprehensive country data available)
	CP outcome 2.3: Worst Forms of Child Labour Reduced through Strengthened Government Capacities (no systematized country data on beneficiaries available)

	CP outcome 3.2: Enhanced Capacity of Partners involved in the Implementation of DWCP II
<b>Not achieved</b>	CP outcome 3.1: Improved Capacity of the Social Dialogue Institution and the Tripartite Partners

**Regarding the achievement of outputs**, of the variety of 23 outputs included within the DWCP, the following nine (9) outputs (around 40% of the total) were **produced as planned**:

<b>Outputs produced as planned</b>	<b>Related Outcome</b>
Output 1.1.1: National employment policy	CP Outcome 1.1 Improved policy environment for increased job creation
Output 1.1.2: National labour laws related to employment reviewed (e.g. bills submitted to the National Assembly [NASS], but drafts were stalled/ not approved for years by NASS)  By the time of the evaluation, the pending labour bills at the NASS had been withdrawn for review to take care of some emerging issues. The review process is ongoing. When completed, the bills will be forwarded back to NASS for consideration and approval.	
Output 1.2.2: National Labour laws related to labour market governance reviewed (e.g. bills submitted to NASS, but drafts were stalled/ not approved for years by NASS; OSH Policy)  By the time of the evaluation, the status of the pending bills was similar to that of those in Output 1.1.2 above.	CP outcome 1.2: Improved Labour Market Governance and Administration
Output 2.1.2: Capacities of anti-human trafficking agencies enhanced	CP outcome 2.1: Improved Labour Migration Management lead to increased Migrants Protection and Reduced Trafficking in Persons
Output 2.2.1: Implementation of the revised HIV & AIDS in the workplace policy	CP outcome 2.2: World of Work Responds Effectively to the HIV/AIDS Epidemic
Output 2.2.2: Capacities of partners strengthened and HIV and AIDS concerns mainstreamed in national projects	
Output 2.3.1: Implementation of National Policy and National Action Plan on Child labour supported	CP outcome 2.3: Worst Forms of Child Labour Reduced through Strengthened Government Capacities (no systematized country data on beneficiaries available)
Output 2.3.3: Capacity building for relevant partners (child labour)	
Output 3.1.3: Capacities of Tripartite partners on Social Dialogue enhanced	CP outcome 3.1: Improved Capacity of the Social Dialogue Institution and the Tripartite Partners

The reasons for achieving the outputs above are related to the Commitment of the Government of Nigeria (GON) and the social partners in addressing some issues on an ad-hoc basis, as well as the active support received from some implementing agencies (FMLE, NACA, NAP TIP, others) towards the attainment of the same.

Seven (7) other outputs were **partially achieved** (that is, achieved on a limited basis):

Outputs partially achieved	Related Outcome
Output 1.1.4: Employment/job creation mainstreamed into national development programs	CP Outcome 1.1 Improved policy environment for increased job creation
Output 1.3.1: Capacities of technical and vocational education and training (TVET) and youth employment institutions enhanced	CP outcome 1.3: Increased Employability and Employment Opportunities for Young Women and Men
Output 1.3.2: Capacities of women entrepreneurs strengthened	
Output 1.3.3: Skilled employability of youth enhanced	
Output 2.1.3: Rights of migrant workers protected and victims rehabilitated (However, no comprehensive, systematized country data on beneficiaries are available)	CP outcome 2.1: Improved Labour Migration Management lead to increased Migrants Protection and Reduced Trafficking in Persons
Output 2.3.2: Child labour issues integrated into national development programmes	CP outcome 2.3: Worst Forms of Child Labour Reduced through Strengthened Government Capacities
Output 3.2.1: Capacities of social partners and other stakeholders on project management strengthened	CP outcome 3.2: Enhanced Capacity of Partners involved in the Implementation of DWCP II

Finally, the following seven (7) outputs (around 30% of the total), were **not produced as planned**:

Outputs not produced as planned	Related Outcome
Output 1.1.3: Labour-based technology demonstration methodology mainstreamed and adopted	CP Outcome 1.1 Improved policy environment for increased job creation
Output 1.2.1: ILO Conventions 187, 181 and 189 ratified	CP outcome 1.2: Improved Labour Market Governance and Administration
Output 1.2.3: Functional Labour Market Information system (LMIS) established	

Output 2.1.1: Trafficking in human beings reduced through increased awareness and cooperation	CP outcome 2.1: Improved Labour Migration Management lead to increased Migrants Protection and Reduced Trafficking in Persons
Output 3.1.1: C129 on Social Dialogue ratified	CP outcome 3.1: Improved Capacity of the Social Dialogue Institution and the Tripartite Partners
Output 3.1.2: Functional NLAC is in place	
Output 3.2.2: Monitoring and Evaluation System for DWCP established	CP outcome 3.2: Enhanced Capacity of Partners involved in the Implementation of DWCP II

Several factors contributed to the uneven results above:

- There was an initial delay of several months in the start of DWCP implementation due to the change of government in 2015.
- In the absence of an operational DWCP Steering Committee (SC) and Technical Working Group (TWG), programme implementation lacked a governance and follow up mechanism. Social dialogue and reaching consensus among parties is a political process that takes more time than what may be initially expected. Although the ILO supported the training of social partners in Turin and developed other significant efforts to promote social dialogue, the absence of a DWCP governance mechanism did not help advance the implementation process.
- The lack of a labour market governance mechanism; that is, the fact that the NLAC has not held meetings/ been functional for several years, hampered the implementation of the DWCP. In the absence of a functioning NLAC, some expected outcomes (regulations, ratification of ILO Conventions) were not backed with enough leverage before authorities. Political will from all parties is needed to make NLAC come to life.<sup>19</sup>
- Complementary to the above, the lack of a Labour Market Information System/ updated data to guide tripartite action.
- The performance of the different components of the DWCP was dependent on the political will/ prioritization of stakeholders or was donor-driven, on an ad-hoc basis. That is, the implementation of activities was dependent on available funding from overseas or government sources – e.g. the National Agency for the Control of AIDS (NACA), the National Agency for the Prohibition of Trafficking in Persons (NAPTIP), FMLE (e.g. on the issues of child labour, forced labour, HIV/AIDS, migration).
- There was a very limited amount of donors' funding availed for DWCP implementation, as well as limited funding of DWCP by government and social partners. Much more would have been achieved if a greater amount of financial resources had been allocated both from foreign and particularly from national sources, at both federal and state level.

<sup>19</sup> ILO informed the evaluator that FMLE expects to convene and NLAC meeting soon, as well as to ensure that under a future DWCP III, an operational SC and TWG are in place.

- High turnover of FMLE staff due to change in government in 2015 and other factors, leads to delays in discussions/ decision-making (i.e. several senior officials –four Directors of the Employment and Wages Department at FMLE- went into retirement, and the permanent secretary position at FMLE was occupied by four different people throughout DWCP II lifetime).

Notwithstanding the above, tripartite constituents managed to discuss on an ad-hoc basis several issues and put in place some foundations of decent work (diverse policies) that may provide an opportunity and a relevant framework for future implementation of programs related to international labour standards (ILS), employment creation and social security.

Overall, given the scope and size of Nigerian labour market issues, programme results for 2015-2018 were relatively modest. Major financial investments and greater coordinated action are needed from GON and social partners at national and state level to scale up a Decent Work response.

Regarding the support provided by ILO to the implementation of the DWCP, the Abuja Country Office provided decisive technical and financial support for the implementation of the DWCP, although DWCP implementation was carried out more on an ad-hoc and reactive basis, rather than under a comprehensive, tripartite-led strategy. The Abuja Office was effective in mobilizing the commitment of constituents and other agencies, particularly with regards to the development of policies, plans, assessments and studies.

ILO Geneva HQ provided limited support to the implementation of the DWCP. ILO's Employment and Labour Market Policies Branch (EMPLAB) provided technical support for the finalization of the Employment Mapping, Institutional Assessment and Coordination Mechanism study.

ILO Decent Work Team (DWT) at Dakar provided technical support to the Abuja Office through Decent Work experts (ACTRAV, ACTEMP, STAT, employment experts). Examples of this support are the training organized on data collection tools on labour market and migration; support on strategies to address HIV in the workplace; training of constituents on RBM, training of workers' and employers' organizations' members, etc.

Policy-related outputs should accrue equally and strategically to men and women. In the case of DWCP support to NACA (the governmental agency on HIV/AIDS), the evaluation detected an interesting practice by which the programme sought collaboration from other institutions that provide social support to women (e.g. the Abuja Enterprise Agency, a public/private institution that organizes skills training) in order to mobilize private resources and address gender and labour-related issues, in relation to HIV, from an empowerment-related framework. Given the high prevalence of gender-based violence (GBV), the inclusion of women with HIV in the labour market was also a way to provide alternatives to GBV and help women empower themselves to take important decisions regarding their lives.

### 3.4 Efficiency of Resource Use

*Sources of information: a. Data collected on the basis of interview questions to key stakeholder on relevant issues; b. Financial and other data provided by CO staff c. Financial data on Nigeria programme obtained from ILO webpage*

Resources availed by the ILO and constituents were used strategically to achieve broader programme outcomes, such as the development/ improvement of various policies and strengthening of the capacity of constituents to address diverse labour market and labour administration issues. ILO's support, through studies, consultants and organization of technical meetings, was key to the elaboration of a National Youth Policy and, currently, to the elaboration of an Industrial Relations Policy. These two policies were not originally included within the DWCP II document but are relevant to the advancement of the issues of youth employment and decent work in Nigeria. Likewise, during DWCP II lifetime, ILO's technical and financial support tactically contributed to operationalize the national workplace policy on HIV and AIDS approved in 2013. ILO also contributed to the elaboration of a National Social Protection Policy, which includes several components related to the world of work.

The ILO Abuja CO is responsible for ILO's technical cooperation assistance in four countries (Ghana, Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone) and serves as the liaison office for the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). The Abuja CO has a limited number of regular technical staff (five, including the CO Director) to provide assistance in target countries. The CO has also access to DWT Dakar specialists for assistance. Within this context, during 2015-2018, the ILO Abuja CO staff made an efficient use of its staff services, as well as that of consultants hired for specific tasks, in order to support of the delivery of the Nigerian DWCP outputs.

The Abuja CO also made an extensive and efficient use of its available regular budget technical cooperation (RBTC) funds and regular budget (RB) funds, as well as project funds obtained from a two other international sources<sup>20</sup>. In general terms, the resources available for implementation of the DWCP were very limited, and even more so given the size of Nigerian labour-related issues. The DWCP implementation did not offer major alternative opportunities from which to take advantage.

During its lifetime (2015-2018) the Nigerian DWCP received a very limited amount of overseas cooperation. Likewise, the resources allocated by national stakeholders for DWCP implementation were also limited.

Given the size of the country, its population and the extent of the labour-related issues it faces, the total financial contributions to the DWCP were largely insufficient to meet its implementation needs.

According to ILO Development Cooperation Dashboard ([www.ilo.org](http://www.ilo.org)), between 2015 and 2018 Nigeria received funds from the following sources for two projects/ Country Programme Outcomes:

- Promoting sustainable enterprises: From the UN Multi-Partner Trust Funds [MPTF]/ United Nations Development Programme [UNDP];

---

<sup>20</sup> Ref: The UN Multi-Partner Trust Funds [MPTF]/ United Nations Development Programme [UNDP] and the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS [UNAIDS].

- Protection of workers from unacceptable forms of work: From the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS [UNAIDS].

Annual available RBTC and RB funds/ expenditures were also limited.

In addition, during the DWCP period of implementation there was a regional, European Union-funded project for ECOWAS countries, led by the IOM, under which funds were allocated between 2013 and 2020 (eight years) to work on the issues of trafficking of persons and labour migration in 16 countries. Nigeria benefitted from this project.

Government, private sector and union budget/ cash allocations for the implementation of the DWCP objectives were also limited, if existent. Constituents' contributions were mainly composed of human resources (for national policy design and programme implementation) and contributions in kind (space, materials).

The effective start of DWCP implementation was delayed for some months due to the electoral year/ change in government in 2015. This introduced a general delay in the implementation timeline. Likewise, in several cases where positive outcomes were obtained, the original timeline for delivery could not be followed. Due to limited funds or occasional delays in some stakeholders' response, the timeline for coordinating activities was longer than expected.

Given the above, some actions initiated during the DWCP lifetime started seeing results in the following years (e.g. discussions and activities – concept note, TOR and engagement of consultant-leading to the elaboration of a National Industrial Relations Policy started to bear fruit in 2019), while the strategic results for other important tripartite work was stalled due to limited political will (e.g. employment and labour market-related bills submitted to the NASS, whose approval stalled for several years and then were sent back for revision by an inter-institutional committee in 2018).

### 3.5 Effectiveness of Management Arrangements

*Sources of information: a. Data collected on the basis of interview questions to key stakeholder on relevant issues; b. DWCP document; c. Monitoring-related documents*

The 2015-2018 Nigerian DWCP lacked, in practice, an effective management and governance arrangement. While originally considered within the DWCP document, the Tripartite Steering Committee and the Technical Working Group were not in place during programme implementation. Likewise, there was no tripartite arrangement in place to address the need of monitoring for the DWCP.

The FMLE played a weak role in coordinating the implementation of the DWCP and had a limited capacity in moving the agenda of the NLAC forward, citing lack of funds to organize NLAC meetings. Thus, the National Labour Advisory Council, a key piece of the tripartite institutional architecture needed to effectively address issues related to the world of work, was not functional throughout the lifetime of the DWCP and has not been operational since.

While the DWCP design included a results framework, an implementation plan and a monitoring plan, the above were not used (even less in a tripartite manner) as M&E tools to conduct a periodic follow-

up of programme implementation and/or to provide overall feedback to management on the status of programme activities and the completion of targets.

The ILO, from its side, monitored the implementation of programme/ project-related activities and the achievement of some outcomes, although there is no updated/ consolidated database available regarding the periodic, tripartite monitoring of the DWCP. While gender equality and non-discrimination were part of the general orientation and implementation of the DWCP, the evaluation found limited evidence of the disaggregation of data by sex, nor any consolidation of DWCP results using this criterion.

The DWCP received adequate political, technical and administrative support from the ILO as well as technical support from its national partners. Constituents' political and administrative support may have been insufficient given that both the DWCP SC and the NLAC were not able to be implemented. Tripartite constituents participated in the promotion of the DWCP to a limited extent. They also contributed their own human and material resources to the implementation of some DWCP activities on an ad-hoc basis.

Although DWCP-related activities have been discussed and agreed upon by tripartite constituents, the implementation of the DWCP has often been oriented by the ILO and driven by the availability of external funding. In the absence of a functional Steering Committee, the DWCP lacked a relevant mechanism to carry out resource mobilization efforts, that is, a means to coordinate a comprehensive mobilization of resources at federal and state level.

With regards to the understanding of roles and responsibilities, in most cases tripartite actors regarded themselves as recipients of support or implementers of specific actions on an ad-hoc basis, rather than responsible for leading the oversight, funding, implementation monitoring and periodic revision of the whole DWCP.

Are the issues highlighted above specific to the implementers of DWCP II (2015-2018)?

Not necessarily. Seemingly, the shortcomings experienced in the implementation of the DWCP II are not very different to the ones included as "lessons learnt from Nigeria DWCP I (2005-2009)" within the DWCP II document and experienced a decade before, during the implementation of DWCP I; that is:

- Lack of awareness on the roles and responsibilities of the various implementing partners
- Partners had the wrong impression that ILO was to provide all the resources required for the implementation of the DWCP
- Lack of an effective monitoring and evaluation plan
- Lack of a resource mobilization strategy
- The coordinating Ministry, Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment did not effectively manage the implementation of the DWCP and did not organize regular meeting of the working committee.

In another section of the DWCP II (p.6), the document stated:

*"The ministry (FMLE) has been limited in its capacity in moving the agenda of the NLAC forward and also in dealing with labour issues. It has failed in its capacity to organize NLAC meetings originally scheduled*



*to hold every quarter of the year and is weak in its role of a facilitator of tripartism and social dialogue and in its role as the coordinating body for the implementation of the DWCP.”*

The next DWCP to be developed in Nigeria (number III) would need to ensure a more balanced financial contribution from all parties and be based on a more proactive role from all constituents. Likewise, more decisive action is needed from all parties to ensure that there are effective DWCP tripartite governance mechanisms in place and that there is a greater level of ownership of DWCP implementation and results by constituents, leading to greater sustainability of actions.

### 3.6 Impact Orientation

*Sources of information: a. Data collected on the basis of interview questions to key stakeholder on relevant issues; b. Institutional documents/ reports provided by stakeholders*

The 2015-2018 DWCP implementation has contributed toward some foundational building blocks or policies that could serve as the basis for a more coherent and effective labour market governance and administrative system in Nigeria. The tripartite formulation of an employment policy, an occupational safety and health policy, and a youth policy, are a promising path towards the establishment of a conducive environment for decent work in Nigeria. There is also a draft youth employment action plan pending final approval and an industrial relations policy under development.

The DWCP strengthened the understanding of constituents and other national institutions regarding ILS, as well as the capacity of constituents to carry out social dialogue. There is an increased awareness on the part of key institutional stakeholders about the importance of addressing diverse labour-related issues in the country. Programmatic action on the issues of HIV/AIDS in the workplace, labour migration, child labour and trafficking in persons has been mainstreamed into the sphere of action of various MDA (e.g. FMLE, NACA, NAPTIP, others). Specific programs and plans on these topics are currently endorsed and funded by GON and being implemented. For example, FMLE has continued addressing the issue of Child Labour among its priorities, and the issue has been included, under Policy Measure 6, in the National Social Protection Policy approved in 2017. On its side, NACA has incorporated the issue of HIV/AIDS in the workplace within its work plan. Likewise, after implementing a project to rescue child victims of human trafficking with ILO support four years ago, and receiving support to equip its shelters, NAPTIP continues running a network of shelters in the six regions of the country and the DCT. GON initiatives are financially supported by other organizations such as UNAIDS, International Organization for Migration (IOM), the German Aid to Development Agency (GIZ), and the European Union, making their continuation and the sustainability of actions more likely. For example, NAPTIP is developing a new national action plan and is to receive funding from the 11th European Development Fund (under a joint effort with the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime -UNODC, the IOM and the Federal Investigation Agency -FIA).

Constituents' capacity to implement projects was strengthened, although in certain cases to a limited extent. For example, in 2019 with support from different enterprises and the ILO, NIBUCAA continued carrying out HIV/AIDS awareness campaigns and providing HIV testing services in the workplace and for ordinary citizens. However, one third of NIBUCAA's programme budget is still dependent on ILO's contributions.

On its side, NACA has continued to implement a variety of activities regarding HIV/AIDS in the workplace. It runs awareness-raising campaigns regarding stigma and discrimination, and coordinates preventative actions with MDAs and governorships, through their teams responsible for workplace issues. It has also worked with NECA, building capacity of the latter's affiliates regarding workplace policies, and has provided training on how to provide counselling and administer tests, as well as donated testing kits to campaigns on HIV run by trade unions.

Likewise, NECA periodically runs job fairs (the latest on January 2020) and provides career counselling to youth, and has continued endorsing a Technical Skills Development Project, in support/ collaboration with GON's Industrial Training Fund.

In 2018 the FMLE completed data collection in 36 states applying, with ILO support, a General Report Template on the implementation of the NAP for the elimination of child labour in Nigeria. However, after a year it is still pending to consolidate and analyse the data.

A greater level of ownership is needed from all constituents in order to ensure the sustainability of DWCP results. In some cases, institutions see themselves as recipients of support or implementers of specific actions on an ad-hoc basis, rather than the organizations responsible for leading the oversight, funding, implementation monitoring and periodic revision of the whole DWCP.

The national employment policy, social protection policy, occupational safety and health policy and youth policy, as well as the Nigerian youth employment action plan, are the product of social dialogue and are a framework that may stand on its own. Unfortunately, without further action/ support to mainstream these policies into MDA at federal level and help implement their key provisions at state level, the above framework may not be sustainable.

Thus, programmatic action on some key Nigerian labour market issues, such as youth employment (including employability and skills) and the extension of OSH and social security schemes to the informal economy, remain a major challenge for an upcoming, new DWCP, and would require further, intensive tripartite action.

### 3.7 Sustainability

*Sources of information: a. Data collected on the basis of interview questions to key stakeholder on relevant issues*

The following factors, which may affect the viability and determine the non-sustainability of the DWCP, were identified during the evaluation:

- **Lack of an effective tripartite governance mechanism.** The effective implementation of NLAC is an urgent need for tripartite constituents in order to have a tripartite governance structure in place. A functional NLAC would serve as a forum in which stakeholders would be able to discuss relevant labour market issues on an ongoing basis, as well as a means to address the National Assembly in order to promote the ratification of ILO Conventions and pass pending labour-related bills. A functional NLAC would facilitate cooperation with MDA and private institutions in support of the decent work agenda.

- **Lack of effective, tripartite governance and monitoring mechanisms in place for the DWCP.** For example, the Steering Committee and Technical Working Group of the DWCP II were not operational through the lifetime of the DWCP. ILO supported work on some issues, on an ad-hoc basis, with/ through key partners at federal level, but a more comprehensive and integrated action is needed to ensure that policies and programmes are effectively mainstreamed to other MDA and at the state level.
- **Lack of involvement/coordination of DWCP-related actions with other relevant stakeholders at state level.** For example, in Lagos (the Nigerian state with the greatest population and workforce in the country) there is a state-run “Ministry of Employment and Job Creation” which is not linked to the action of FMLE and the DWCP. That is, although Labour is an “Exclusive List matter”, some state-level actors have recently started to separately invest their own resources in this area. Could state priorities align with federal ones and state financial resources be used in support of DWCP implementation?
- **Insufficient allocation of financial resources by government and other stakeholders into specific DWCP priority activities.** For example, FMLE stated that it does not have available resources to fund the NLAC meetings.

**The DWCP II did not include an “exit plan” and there was no comprehensive strategy in place to ensure that institutions at various levels (local, state, national) would sustainably take ownership of the DWCP results.**

Looking forward, more action is needed to ensure the ownership of products at the level of target groups. Addressing the needs of informal economy actors (which involves 80% of the Nigerian workforce) and of the agricultural sector remains a relevant challenge for the ILO and the Nigerian tripartite constituents.

The DWCP II ended in 2018 and a new DWCP needs to be co-designed and agreed by tripartite constituents. The FMLE has requested ILO’s technical assistance to develop a new version of the DWCP for 2020-2023. Addressing the issues above should be considered when carrying out this task.

## IV. CONCLUSIONS

- A. The Decent Work Country Programme was relevant and coherent to the outcomes in the Vision 20:2020, the GON Economic Recovery and Growth Plan, the United Nations Development Assistance Framework, the United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework, the Decent Work Agenda for Africa, and the priorities of social partners.
- B. While the DWCP carried out proper consultations with tripartite constituents during its preparation/planning stage and used a results-based approach in its design, no effective tripartite monitoring system was implemented in practice throughout the life of the DWCP. The mechanisms and tools foreseen in the DWCP were not used to monitor the implementation and assess the outcome of the DWCP.
- C. DWCP outcomes and outputs have been achieved in an uneven way. Given the scope and size of Nigerian labour market issues, programme results are modest and major investments are still needed at national and state level to scale up a decent work response. The performance of the different components of the DWCP was either dependent on the political will of stakeholders, or donor driven on an ad-hoc basis. That is, the implementation of activities was dependent on available funding from overseas or government sources.
- D. The DWCP's greatest achievements have been in the fields of policy development and knowledge generation. The 2015-2018 DWCP implementation has contributed to establishing some initial foundational building blocks or policies that could serve as the basis for a more coherent and effective labour market governance and administration in Nigeria: E.g. an Employment Policy, an OSH Policy, relevant components of the Social Protection Policy, a Youth Policy and a Youth Employment Action Plan. An Industrial Relations Policy is currently under discussion.
- E. Effective social dialogue on ad-hoc issues and commitment from GON, FMLE and social partners contributed to the achievement of a limited number of outcomes and outputs. The lack of an operational governance mechanism for the DWCP (Steering Committee) and limited funding from GON, social partners and overseas sources, hampered the implementation of the DWCP. Likewise, the National Labour Advisory Council, a key component of the tripartite institutional architecture needed to effectively address issues related to the world of work, was not functional.
- F. A much greater coordination role would have been needed to be adopted by all constituents in order to ensure greater ownership and sustainability of the DWCP results. In most cases, local parties considered themselves to be recipients of support or implementers of specific actions, on an ad-hoc basis, more than as leaders of the oversight, funding, implementation monitoring and periodic revision of the programme.
- G. The sustainability of the DWCP achievements is varied. The National Employment Policy (NEP), Occupational Safety and Health Policy and Youth Policy, as well as the Nigerian Youth Employment Action Plan, are the product of social dialogue and are a framework that may stand on its own. The NEP has a coordinating Council to oversee its implementation. Unfortunately, without further action/ support to mainstream these policies into MDA at federal level and help implement their key provisions at state level, the above framework may not be sustainable. Programmatic action on the issues of HIV/AIDS, labour migration, child labour and trafficking in persons has been mainstreamed into the sphere of action of various MDA (e.g. FMLE, NACA, NAPTIP, other). Specific programs and actions on these topics are currently endorsed and

funded by GON, and financially supported by other organizations such as UNAIDS, IOM, GIZ, and the European Union, making their continuation and the sustainability of actions more likely. Programmatic action on other key Nigerian labour market issues, such as youth employment and the extension of OSH and social security schemes to the informal economy, remain an insufficiently-addressed challenge that requires further, intensive tripartite action.

## V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the findings of this evaluation and follow from both the lessons learned and the conclusions.

### **Recommendation 1: Governance and Sustainability of Tripartite Actions regarding the Labour Market – (Re-) Activate the National Labour Advisory Council (NLAC).**

In order to establish an effective labour market governance mechanism, which may provide constituents with additional leverage and interlocution capacity, it is necessary to (re-) activate the National Labour Advisory Council so that its tripartite members hold regular meetings, on a quarterly basis, to address labour market issues.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
FMLE, NLC, TUC, NECA with ILO CO support	High	Short-Term	Low

### **Recommendation 2: DWCP Governance and Sustainability - Ensure that the DWCP Steering Committee and TWG become operational and that an effective monitoring mechanism is in place.**

In order to ensure adequate monitoring and ownership of DWCP by the constituents, it is critical to ensure that the DWCP Steering Committee and Technical Working Group are established and become operational since the start of DWCP III. The SC and TWG shall include representative of the tripartite constituents (e.g. FMLE, NECA, NLC, TUC). All efforts should be made to ensure that the SC and/ or the TWG assume an effective and ongoing role in monitoring the implementation of DWCP III. Social partners should be given relevant roles within the monitoring mechanism.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
FMLE, NLC, TUC, NECA with ILO CO support	High	Short-Term	Low

### **Recommendation 3: DWCP Design – Prioritize the development of actions and investments in a limited number of critical areas: Labour market governance; implementation of OSH and Social Security policies; Youth employment.**

When developing the upcoming DWCP III, tripartite constituents and the ILO should take into consideration that some labour-related issues (e.g. labour migration, child labour, trafficking in persons, HIV/AIDS in the workplace, where active interventions were carried out under DWCP II) will probably continue receiving support from both the GON and the international donor community. Thus, the FMLE, its social partners and the ILO may find it useful to prioritize a limited number of outcomes where investments would be highly relevant in order to address certain critical issues.

The areas suggested as strategic priorities for DWCP III, as well as for priority financial investment from constituents and ILO, would be the following:

- a. An effective labour market governance and administration structure (NLAC): Changes in labour law and regulations and the ratification of key ILO Conventions.
- b. Development of interventions to gradually implement the OSH Policy and Social Security provisions, particularly aiming at the formalization of MSME and the expansion of decent working conditions in the informal economy.
- c. Youth employment (e.g. entrepreneurship, employability and skills development, as well as LMIS and employment creation). Public-private partnerships and public works should be considered as a means to implement interventions within this component.

The design of the DWCP needs to be actively linked in these key areas to GON's SDG-related targets and the ERGP. In fact, the DWCP should serve as a means for GON to implement the country's Employment, OSH and Social Protection Policies.

The National Social Insurance Trust Fund and the National Pension Commission should be included as partners/implementing agencies within component "b" above. The Federal Ministry of Youth and Sports Development should be included as a responsible unit regarding the implementation and monitoring of the Nigerian Youth Employment Action Plan, within component "c" above.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
FMLE, NLC, TUC, NECA with ILO CO support	High	Short-Term	Low

**Recommendation 4: Mobilization of Resources – Accompany the DWCP with a resource mobilization plan. Earmark GON contributions to the DWCP in the FMLE annual budget. Focus ILO's RB and RBTC resources on carrying out its social dialogue mandate (e.g. strengthening of NLAC).**

The formulation of the next DWCP (III) should be accompanied by a resource mobilization plan. Government contributions to the DWCP should be determined/ discussed in advance and included every year in the annual budget request submitted by the FMLE to the Federal Government. NLAC funding should be a first line charge in the FMLE annual budget. Because donor resources for specific aspects of the DWCP will still be needed, FMLE should be allowed to explore funding opportunities with funding agencies. Budget allocation for DWCP purposes should be ensured through active coordination of the FMLE and the ILO with the Ministry of Budget and National Planning's UN Cooperation Office. Likewise, DWCP objectives should be mainstreamed into specific GON programmes and projects to be funded by the same.

Given the relative shortage of international cooperation resources for labour-related issues in Nigeria, ILO should allocate its limited available RB and RBTC resources to building the capacity of the social partners for effective social dialogue in Nigeria. The GON should invest a substantively bigger amount of resources in the implementation of key areas of the DWCP as well as in the effective functioning of the NLAC.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
GON: FMLE and Ministry of Planning and Budget; with ILO CO support	High	Mid-Term	Medium

**Recommendation 5: DWCP Implementation – Ensure implementation of DWCP at federal and state levels: Involve state-level stakeholders in programme implementation.**

There is a need to develop projects and programmes around the DWCP at federal and state level, in order to have a more structured implementation and promote ownership of results at all levels. When designing DWCP-related interventions, roll-out plans should be established so that pilots may start in a limited number of states and then expand to the rest of the country. This would require the involvement of a greater number of institutional stakeholders at federal and state level in the implementation of the DWCP, including state governorships.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
FMLE, NLC, TUC, NECA with ILO CO support	High	Mid-Term	Low

**Recommendation 6: Gender and non-discrimination - Ensure that the benefits of DWCP implementation accrue equally to men and women**

DWCP implementers should take steps to ensure that gender concerns related to the world of work are strategically integrated into most programme interventions, and that the DWCP monitoring system keeps track, on a regular basis, of the participation of women in programme activities and of the outcome of the same.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
FMLE, NLC, TUC, NECA with ILO CO support	High	Short-Term	Low



## VI. LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

### 4.1 Lessons Learned

The DWCP review identified some lessons learned, which were drawn from some of the challenges as well as the positive results obtained through DWCP implementation. This section lists only a selection of the most relevant of these lessons learned, so that they can be taken into consideration when designing the next DWCP for Nigeria.

- a. **It is important that the implementation of the DWCP is linked to the existence of an effective tripartite governance mechanism** (Steering Committee, Technical Working Group) in order to ensure ownership of the results by the constituents.
- b. In order to ensure political leverage and sustainability of actions, **it is important to effectively put in place the tripartite, labour market governance mechanism established under Nigerian law: The National Labour Advisory Council.**
- c. In order for the DWCP to remain a relevant strategy, **there is a need to move away from the mobilization of donors' funding toward an increase in the investment of federal resources.** This would make the implementation of the DWCP more of a GON-led strategy and less an ILO-led one.
- d. In order for the DWCP to remain a relevant strategy, **there is a need to implement actions that operationalize key labour policies at both federal and state level, as well as in the informal economy sector.** This is being done, for example, with the Child Labour Policy.

### 4.2 Good Practices

The evaluation identified several good practices, which contributed toward advancing the implementation of the DWCP.

- a. **The design of the DCWP II was an inclusive process.** Tripartite partners participated in the discussion of priorities and revision of the DWCP document.
- b. **The implementation of the DWCP II kept a close coordination with the UN system,** a fact which facilitated some financial contributions from other UN agencies in Nigeria. This was supported by the UN interagency process, which aims to make interventions UN-centred, not agency-centred.
- c. **Seeking collaboration from the private sector helps advance DWCP objectives and link different aspects of the DW agenda.** NACA's (the governmental agency on HIV/AIDS) collaboration with the Abuja Enterprise Agency (a public/private institution that organizes skills training), in order to provide social support to women, is a good example of this principle.
- d. **Parallel and concurrent work with other institutional stakeholders besides ILO constituents enriches the implementation of DWCP and helps advance its objectives.** On several topics, ILO convened technical meetings for officers of various MDA, apart from the FMLE, in order to collect their input and engage in dialogue. This contributed to the development of more comprehensive policies and programmes.

## ANNEXES

### Annex 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference

#### TERMS OF REFERENCE

#### THE FINAL REVIEW OF THE DECENT WORK COUNTRY PROGRAMME (DWCP) FOR NIGERIA (2015-2018)

**Responsible Administrative Unit:** ILO CO Abuja & ROAF/RPU Task force

#### I. CONTEXT AND JUSTIFICATION FOR THE REVIEW

A DWCP is the document that defines, in each country, how the ILO constituents with the support of the ILO and other key partners work together towards the attainment of promoting full employment and ensuring access for every man and woman to decent and productive work in conditions of freedom, equity, security and human dignity.

The ILO provides technical and institutional assistance to its tripartite constituents (governments, employers 'organizations and workers' organizations) in its Member States to achieve this goal articulated around four strategic objectives:

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

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

- **The DWCP 2015-2018**

The Nigeria DWCP 2015-2018 is centred on three country programme priorities and 8 corresponding outcomes namely:

### **1. Employment Promotion**

Outcome 1.1: Improved policy environment for increased job creation

Outcome 1.2: Improved Labour Market Governance and Administration

Outcome 1.3: Increased Employability and Employment Opportunities for Young Women and Men

### **2. Extending the Scope of Social Protection Coverage**

Outcome 2.1: Improved Labour Migration Management

Outcome 2.2: Improved Workplace Response to the HIV/AIDS Epidemic

Outcome 2.3: Worst Forms of Child Labour Reduced

### **3. Strengthening Social Dialogue and Tripartite Plus**

Outcome 3.1: Improved capacity of the Social Dialogue Institution and the Tripartite Partners

Outcome 3.2: Enhanced Capacity of Partners involved in the Implementation of DWCP II

The above priorities and outcomes were agreed upon after extensive consultations, between the national tripartite constituents, development partners and the ILO.

The 2015-2018 DWCP of Nigeria is, therefore, in principle a contribution to achieving the country's development priorities as outlined in the Transformation Agenda (2011-2015) which provides a medium term strategy for the long term Vision 20: 2020. The DWCP II also aligns with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF III: 2013 - 2017) for Nigeria which has four identified areas for UN interventions in Nigeria (see Annex 1 for UN interventions and gaps).

#### **• Rationale for the final review**

As DWCPs are formulated based on results-based management principles, the reviews and/or evaluations are mandated to ensure learning for future DWCPs and general decent work interventions. This final review should draw lessons learned from the 2015-2018 DWCP and inform the formulation of the new DWCP by focusing on national goals not only in the world of work but also the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (UNSDPF former UNDAF) for 2018-2022 and National Strategies and Plans.

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

## **II. Purpose, Clients and Objectives**

The purpose of the Country Programme Review (CPR) is to examine the achievements made so far in attaining the outcomes identified and take stock of recommendations, lessons learned, good practices and challenges to inform the next DWCP.

The clients of the CPR are specifically the ILO tripartite constituents, key stakeholders in the implementation of the 2015-2018 DWCP and the ILO at country, regional and global levels.

The ILO Tripartite Partners in Nigeria are the following:

- Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment
- Nigeria Employers' Consultative Association (NECA)
- Nigeria Labour Congress (NLC)
- Trade Union Congress of Nigeria (TUC)

The following objectives will guide the assignment for the consultant:

1. Examine the coherence and relevance of the 2015-2018 DWCP in relation to the Vision 20:20:20 and the Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP), UNDAF (2013 – 2017), UNSDPF (2018 – 2022), the Decent Work Agenda for Africa (DWAA 2007-15), the SDGs and other international commitments and national frameworks;
2. Examine the degree of coherence between outcomes, outputs and implementation strategies of the DWCP with the ILO Program and Budget.
3. Examine the level of sustainability of results obtained.
4. Take stock of what has been accomplished in terms of changes compared to the expected results of its implementation and the unexpected, positive and negative results.
5. Analyse the participation and contributions of different stakeholders, including the National Steering Committee, the sectoral administrations on employment and decent work issues, social partners, civil society organizations and NGOs, development partners and the ILO Country Office in terms of program implementation, monitoring and coordination. This will include the assessment of the organizational capacities of the constituents and the ILO Country Office with regards to the overall coordination and their effective participation and ownership of the DWCP;

6. Draw lessons and good practices from the development, implementation and monitoring of the DWCP 2015-2018.
7. Develop the recommendations towards the next DWCP and for ILO Offices that work in similar contexts.

### **III. Criteria and review Questions**

The ILO follows the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria for evaluating development assistance: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

In particular, ILO concerns on Decent Work, including the International Labor Standards, the promotion of equality between men and women and non-discrimination and social dialogue, should be explicitly taken into account when evaluating the project.

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

#### **1. Relevance and coherence of the DWCP**

- Is the Programme relevant and coherent to the outcomes in the Vision 20:20:20, ERGP, the UNDAF, the UNSDPF, DWAA, and the priorities of social partners?
- Are the activities and outputs of the Programme consistent with the overall goal (s) and the attainment of its objectives?

#### **2. Validity of design and evaluability**

- Has the DWCP carried out a proper consultation and involvement of tripartite constituents during planning, implementation and monitoring?
- Is the DWCP evaluable? Was the DWCP developed in a results-based approach?
- Were DWCP indicators and targets sufficiently defined in the DWCP?
- Does the DWCP have a monitoring and evaluation system that could have been effective towards understanding how and why the DWCP achieved specific results?
- Have gender issues been addressed in the Programme document and monitoring and evaluation system?

#### **3. Programme effectiveness**

- To what extent have the expected outputs and outcomes have been achieved?
- Have outputs been produced as planned? Which ones not and why?
- What were the results achieved versus those planned? Which are the main reasons for the achievement or not of them?

- In which area (geographic, component, issue) does the DWCP have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors?
- How effective were the backstopping support provided so far by ILO (Abuja Office, ROAF and Geneva HQ) to the Programme?
- Do the benefits accrue equally and strategically to men and women?

#### 4. Efficiency of resource use

- Were resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) allocated by the ILO and constituents used strategically to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader Programme outcomes?
- Have the results been achieved in a timely manner?
- Has the DWCP been implemented in the best efficiency conditions in view of other existing opportunities?
- To what extent have resources been mobilized for the implementation of the DWCP?

#### 5. Effectiveness of management arrangements

- Was the management and governance arrangement of the DWCP adequate to the implementation and monitoring needs? Has been a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?
- Has been a monitoring & evaluation system in place and used for management, reporting and learning has been the data disaggregated by sex (and by other relevant characteristics if relevant) and analyzed?
- Has the DWCP being receiving adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners/implementing partners and ILO?
- Did the tripartite constituents effectively use existing linkages to promote the DWCP and contribute towards resource mobilization efforts

#### 6. Impact orientation and sustainability

- What concrete changes has the implementation of the DWCP brought to ILO tripartite constituents and ultimate beneficiaries of it?
- Has the DWCP strengthened the capacity of constituents and national institutions and strengthened an environment (policies, laws, skills, attitudes, etc.) that promotes the sustainability of results?

## 7. Sustainability

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

## IV. Methodology

This final review is an independent evaluation that will be carried out with the support of a consultant. The participation of ILO staff and the tripartite constituents and relevant stakeholders involved from inception to implementation of the DWCP would be ensured. Such participation should be through appropriate methodologies such as meetings, interviews with staff and stakeholders and workshop, including the ILO development cooperation (DC) project staff.

The gender dimension will have to be a transversal dimension in the collection and analysis of data. This means that men and women should be involved in the consultations. The data collected by the evaluator should be disaggregated by sex and on this basis, the analysis should assess the relevance and effectiveness of the strategies and achievements for both men and women. The recommendations should reflect this analysis.

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

The DWCP review will take place in three phases, including: (i) the preparation of the Inception Report, preliminary discussions with the ILO and the Chair of the Steering Committee (by Skype or telephone) and the desk review; (ii) fieldwork and (iii) developing the draft report and then final report

### *Desk Review*

Before conducting field visits, the consultant will review the DWCP, the UNDAF, national plans and other strategic documents such as relevant progress reports, baseline surveys and national development plans and other relevant documents. In parallel, the consultant makes use of the findings from the review to feed into the draft country context.

### *Individual interviews with ILO staff and field interviews*

The evaluator will conduct individual interviews with the tripartite DWCP committee collectively, including the relevant individuals from the Ministry of Labour and Employment, the Workers Organisations and the Employers' Organisation, the ILO CO Programme staff, relevant DC project staff, ILO DWT specialists and local actors in selected locations. The selected locations should cover successful and less successful cases to learn from these extreme experiences.

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

### *Stakeholders' workshop*

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

The review should follow the ILO Country Programme Reviews (CPR) guide (Annex 1). The detailed methodology is to be developed in consultation with the ILO Abuja Country Office and ROAF.

## **V. Key deliverables of the consultancy**

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

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

All reports, including drafts, will be written in English. Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with the ILO and the evaluator. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.



## **VI. Layout of the evaluation reports**

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

1. Title page
2. Table of Contents
3. Acronyms
4. Executive Summary
5. Background and Programme Description
6. Purpose and scope of Evaluation
7. Evaluation Methodology and limitations
8. Programme Status
9. Findings by criteria
10. Conclusions
11. Lessons Learnt and Good Practices
12. Recommendations (maximum 8-10)
13. Annexes: including (i) A summary matrix indicating for each defined outcome/output as attained, carried out, changes made; (ii) The monitoring plan on performance indicators showing progress; (iii) The terms of reference; (iv) The work plan for the Country Programme Review; (v) The people met; (vi) references; and (vii) Any other relevant factor.

## **VIII. Responsibilities in the management of the review and deadlines**

### **ILO task force**

The ILO has set up a taskforce consisting of members of the Regional Program Unit at ROAF and the ILO Country Office. This taskforce is composed of Mr. Ricardo Furman, Regional Manager of Monitoring and Evaluation based in South Africa and Chinyere Emeka-Anuna, Senior Programme Officer based in Abuja. This taskforce will be responsible for the technical quality of the review. Among other tasks, the task force will:

- Coordinate the review
- Develop and validate the ToRs in collaboration with stakeholders.
- Approve TOR and consultant selection

- Recruit a consultant.
- Technically and financially support the review process.
- Submit the report of the review to stakeholders for comments
- Validate technically the report
- Follow-up the implementation of the recommendations contained in the review

#### **ILO Country Office**

- Brief partners on the process and their participation
- Develop the consultant's contract.
- Compile relevant documents – project and programming info including work plans, progress reports, evaluations, key communications, etc. and provide all documents, contacts, etc. to the consultant
- Propose the list of interviewees to the consultant.
- Support the field work
- Support the organization of the presentation and validation workshop of the review report.
- Contribute to the technical and logistical support required as part of the review process.
- Disseminate the evaluation report to relevant Partners and stakeholders.
- Follow up on recommendations of the DWCP review
- Provide the management response, developed jointly with DWCP tripartite partners.

#### **The Steering Committee**

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

## The consultant

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

## VII. Timeline

The Tentative timetable for the process of the review during the 25 working days involves the following steps:

Steps	Tasks	Responsible	Tentative schedule	Number of work days consultant
1.	Preparation of the TOR	ILO task force	October-November 2019	0
2.	Share the TOR to the DWCP Steering Committee and other relevant stakeholders for inputs	ILO task force	November 2019	0
3.	Recruitment of the evaluator	ILO task force	November 2019	0
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Desk review</li><li>• Initial interviews with ILO officers and the Steering committee chair</li><li>• Development of the inception report</li></ul>	Consultant	13-24 January 2020	5
5.	Interview with the Steering Committee and other relevant stakeholders	Consultant	27 January-6 February 2020	9

	Field visits			
6	Stakeholders' validation workshop	Consultant with support of the CO Abuja	7 February 2020	1
7	Development and submission of the first draft report of the review	Consultant	10-14 February 2020	5
8	Transmission of the first draft report of the review to the national stakeholders and ILO for comments tripartite	ILO task force	17-28 February 2020	0
9	Finalization of the report integrating the comments	Consultant	2-3 March 2020	2
10	Sharing of the final and approved report	ILO task force	March 2020	0
	TOTAL			22

#### **VIII. Profile of the consultant**

To carry out this mission, the international or national consultant should have the following profile:

- Have a post-graduate degree in Economics, Development Planning, Social Sciences, Political Science, and Management of Organizations or in a similar field.
- Six to seven years of proven experience in the field of evaluations, particularly in evaluations of development programs or sectoral strategies preferable as sole evaluator or team leader.
- He / she must also have a good knowledge of the United Nations and ILO evaluation policies including the results-based management methodology.
- Have good knowledge of Nigeria or West African countries, particularly in the areas of decent work themes.
- The consultant must also have a strong analytical and drafting ability.
- He / she must demonstrate knowledge and experience in the field of employment and decent work.
- He / she must have the ability to communicate in English

Applications from women are encouraged.

#### **IX. Resources**

- Fees that must not exceed 22 days of work;
- Travel and DSA costs of the consultant in accordance with ILO regulations and policies;
- Stakeholders' workshop at the end of the mission.
- The project will facilitate the logistical aspects of the consultant's field trips.
- ILO resources will cover the cost of the review.

## Annex 2: Master List of Evaluation Questions

Assessment Criteria	Questions to be addressed
Relevance and Coherence of the DWCP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the Programme relevant and coherent to the outcomes in the Vision 20:20:20, ERGP, the UNDAF, the UNSDPF, DWAA, and the priorities of social partners?</li> <li>▪ Are the activities and outputs of the Programme consistent with the overall goal (s) and the attainment of its objectives?</li> </ul>
Validity of Design and Evaluability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Has the DWCP carried out a proper consultation and involvement of tripartite constituents during planning, implementation and monitoring?</li> <li>▪ Is the DWCP evaluable? Was the DWCP developed in a results-based approach?</li> <li>▪ Were DWCP indicators and targets sufficiently defined in the DWCP?</li> <li>▪ Does the DWCP have a monitoring and evaluation system that could have been effective towards understanding how and why the DWCP achieved specific results?</li> <li>▪ Have gender issues been addressed in the Programme document and monitoring and evaluation system?</li> </ul>
Programme Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To what extent have the expected outputs and outcomes have been achieved?</li> <li>▪ Have outputs been produced as planned? Which ones not and why?</li> <li>▪ What were the results achieved versus those planned? Which are the main reasons for the achievement or not of them?</li> <li>▪ In which area (geographic, component, issue) does the DWCP have the greatest achievements? Why? What have been the supporting factors?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How effective were the backstopping support provided so far by ILO (Abuja Office, ROAF and Geneva HQ) to the Programme?</li> <li>▪ Do the benefits accrue equally and strategically to men and women?</li> </ul>
Efficiency of Resource Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Were resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) allocated by the ILO and constituents used strategically to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader Programme outcomes?</li> <li>▪ Have the results been achieved in a timely manner?</li> <li>▪ Has the DWCP been implemented in the best efficiency conditions in view of other existing opportunities?</li> <li>▪ To what extent have resources been mobilized for the implementation of the DWCP?</li> </ul>
Effectiveness of Management Arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Was the management and governance arrangement of the DWCP adequate to the implementation and monitoring needs? Has been a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?</li> <li>▪ Has there been a monitoring &amp; evaluation system in place and used for management, reporting and learning? Has the data been disaggregated by sex (and by other relevant characteristics if relevant) and analysed?</li> <li>▪ Has the DWCP been receiving adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners/implementing partners and ILO?</li> <li>▪ Did the tripartite constituents effectively use existing linkages to promote the DWCP and contribute towards resource mobilization efforts?</li> </ul>
Impact Orientation and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What concrete changes has the implementation of the DWCP brought to ILO tripartite constituents and ultimate beneficiaries of it?</li> <li>▪ Has the DWCP strengthened the capacity of constituents and national institutions and strengthened an</li> </ul>

	environment (policies, laws, skills, attitudes, etc.) that promotes the sustainability of results?
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To what extent are the results of the DWCP sustainable?</li> <li>▪ What are the main factors that affect the viability or non-sustainability of the DWCP? Have strategies being considered to ensure that institutions at various levels (local, national) will sustainably take ownership of the results?</li> <li>▪ What is the level of ownership of the products by partners and target groups?</li> </ul>



### Annex 3: List of Interviewees

Name	Institution	Position	Interview/ FGD
International Labour Organization			
ILO CO for Nigeria, Ghana Liberia, Sierra Leone & Liaison Office for ECOWAS	Dennis Zulu	Director	KII
	Chinyere Emeka-Anuna	Senior Programme Officer	
	David Kwabla Dorkenoo	ACTRAV Specialist	
	Dino Corell	Employment and Migration Officer	
	Kesiena Okorho	Chief, Finance & Administration	
	Augustine Erameh	NPO, LMER Project	
	Lotte Kejser	CTA, FMM Project	
	Agatha Kolawole	NPC, ACCEL Project; Focal Point on Child Labour and Trafficking	
Tripartite Constituents			
Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment	Nyamali John A.	Director, Employment & Wages	FGD
	Gloria Oghifo	Deputy Director, EW	
	Uyi Osagie	PLO, Employment & Wages	
	Adisa Olabisi	CLO, Employment & Wages	
	Ero Hanwa	PLO, Employment & Wages	
	Williams Cecilia Uche	PLO, Employment & Wages	
	Abu Sunday	Deputy Director, OSH	
	Ejeh Dennis O.	Assistant Director, Inspectorate	
	Crocksm N Ogbuji	Assistant Director, PM & LS	
	Augusta I. Olanoghwe	Assistant Director, TWHR	
	Amos Johnson L.	Assistant Director, SDC	
	Joseph Akpan	Deputy Director, Empl. & Wages	
	Olatund Olasehinde	SIF, OSH	
	Emmanuel Ignbinosun	Deputy Director, Labour	
	Ajiboye, Dorcus E	Director, Social Security/ CD	
FMLE in Lagos, Migrants Resource Centre	Mienye Badejo	Deputy Director, FMLE Office in Lagos	KII
Nigeria Employers’ Consultative Association	Timothy Olawale	Director General	FGD
	Celine Oni	Director, Learning Dept.	
	Thompson Akpabio	Dir., Legal, Regulatory & Tax	
Nigeria Labour Congress	Emmanuel Ugboaja	General Secretary	FGD

Name	Institution	Position	Interview/ FGD
	Comrade Bello	Deputy General Secretary	
	Com.Maureen	Lead, HIV/AIDS Unit	
	Ismahil Unyia	Head, Health & Safety	
	Uchenna Ekwe	Head International Relations Department & Liaison to the Parliament	
	Muttafa Yushau	Head of Education	
	Benson Upah	Head of Information and Public Affairs	
Trade Union Congress	Hassan Salihu	Assistant Secretary General, ILO Desk Officer	KII
<b>Ministries, Departments and Agencies</b>			
Nigeria Social Insurance Trust Fund	Barr. Adebayou Kolawole Somefun	MD/CE	FGD
	Cathrine Ugbe	Head, Information and Communication Technology Department	
	Chris Esedebe	Head, Claims and Compensation Department	
	Kelly Nwagha	Head, Health Safety and Environment Department	
	Musa Lateef	Head, Enforcement	
	Alexandra Mede	Head, Corporate Affairs Department	
	Ijeoma Oji-Okonkwo	Head, Servicom	
	Shehu Abubakar	Head, Social Security Department	
	Zwalda Ponkap	Audit Department	
	ThankGod Max-Egba	Investment Department	
Federal Ministry of Budget and National Planning	Dr. Sanjo Faniran	Deputy Director, International Cooperation Department, Multilateral Economic Cooperation Division, United Nations Development System Unit (UNDS)	KII
Office of the Senior Special Assistant to the President on Sustainable Development Goals	Bala Yusuf Yunusa	Senior Technical Advisor	KII
National Agency for Control of AIDS	Dr. Gambo G. Aliyu	Director General	FGD
	Mr. Alex Ogundipe	Director, Community Prevention, Care and Support	

Name	Institution	Position	Interview/ FGD
	Dr. Akuelo Ikpeazu	Director, Performance Management and Resource Mobilization	
	Dr. Effiong Eno	Policy, Planning and Coordination	
	Mr. Femi Olukoya	Chief Administrative Officer	
	Aneke C. Collins	Principal Programme Officer, Policy, Planning and Coordination	
	Dr. Yinka Falola Anoemuaah	Deputy Director and Lead for Gender, HR and Care Services	KII (Skype)
National Bureau of Statistics	Tula Ugundiyi	Head of Households Statistics Division	KII
Federal Ministry of Youth and Sports Development	Emmanuel Essien	Deputy Director – Enterprise Division	FGD
	Ugwoke V. Chukwuma	Chief, Youth Department Officer	
	Ebiho Agun	Chief Youth Development Officer	
National Agency for Prohibition of Trafficking in Persons	Ismahil Aderonmou	Chief Intelligence Officer – Protection Services	KII
<b>Private Sector Initiatives</b>			
Nigerian Business Coalition Against AIDS (NIBUCAA)	Gbenga A. Alabi	Executive Secretary	KII
<b>United Nations Resident Coordinator Office</b>			
UN Resident Coordinator Office	Akwasi Amankwaah	Past Head, UN RCO, Abuja (currently posted in Ethiopia)	KII (Skype)
	Ernest Mutanga	Transition Resilience Advisor	KII

## Annex 4: List of Documents Reviewed

### I. DCWP and Projects-related information

- Government of Nigeria - ILO, *Nigeria Decent Work Country Programme II (2015 – 2018)*
- ILO, *Nigeria Fact Sheet*, 2015
- ILO – Government of the Netherlands, *Accelerating Action for the Elimination of Child Labour in Supply Chains in Africa (ACCEL Africa) – Project Summary*, 2018
- Food Africa - *Empowering Youth and Promoting Innovative PPPs through More Efficient Agro-Food Value Chains in Nigeria* - Project Document
- Brief Note: ILO Initiative for Labour Migration, Employment and Reintegration in Nigeria and Ghana (LMER), at: [https://www.ilo.org/africa/countries-covered/nigeria/WCMS\\_713426/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/africa/countries-covered/nigeria/WCMS_713426/lang--en/index.htm)

### II. Action Plans-related documents

- Federal Ministry of Youth and Sports Development, *Nigerian Youth Employment Action Plan (NIYEAP) - 2019-2023 (Draft)*; Abuja, 2019
- Federal Ministry of Labour and Productivity, *National Action Plan for the Elimination of Child Labour in Nigeria (2013-2017)*
- National Action Plan for the Elimination of Child Labour (2013-2017) - *General Report Template on the Implementation of the NAP for Elimination of Child Labour in Nigeria*

### III. National Policy-related documents

- Federal Government of Nigeria, *National Employment Policy*; Abuja, 2017
- Federal Government of Nigeria, *National Policy on Occupational Safety and Health (revised)*; Abuja, 2019
- Federal Government of Nigeria - Ministry of Budget and Planning, *National Social Protection Policy*; Abuja, 2017
- Federal Republic of Nigeria, *National Youth Policy 2016 - Enhancing Youth Development and Participation in the context of Sustainable Development*
- Federal Republic of Nigeria/ Federal Ministry of Labour and Productivity, *National Workplace Policy on HIV and AIDS – 2013*
- Federal Republic of Nigeria, *National Policy on Labour Migration – 2014*
- Federal Ministry of Labour and Productivity, *Guidelines for the Implementation of the National Workplace Policy on HIV and Aids and National Action Plan*, 2014
- Prof. Sola Fajana (ILO external consultant), *Development of a National Policy on Industrial Relations in Nigeria - Review of Archival and Background Information & Preliminary Survey Reports*; 04 June, 2019
- Prof. Sola Fajana (ILO external consultant), *Development of the National Policy on Industrial Relations - Draft Progress Report I*

### IV. Studies (reports and presentations)

- National Bureau of Statistics, *Labour Force Statistics – Volume I: Unemployment and Underemployment Report (Q4 2017 – Q3 2018)*; Abuja, December 2018.

- Government of Nigeria - ILO, *Nigeria Country Profile on Occupational Safety and Health*; Abuja 2016
- OGWO, B. A. and EZEKOYE, B. N. (ILO consultants), *Country Study for Potential Skills Partnerships on Migration in Nigeria - Final Report*; Abuja, July 20, 2019
- ILO, *Employment Mapping, Institutional Assessment & Coordination Mechanism Study – The Case of Nigeria*; Abuja, 2015
- *Report of the National HIV Workplace Assessment Study in Nigeria (first draft)*; Abuja, September 2018
- Isiaka Olarewaju - Head (Real Sector & Household Statistics Department), *Presentation of Labour Statistics based on revised Concepts and Methodology for Computing Labour Statistics in Nigeria*; National Bureau of Statistics; Abuja, 14 May 2015

## **V. Reports on Workshops and Events**

- 8.7 Alliance – Pathfinder Country, *Launch, National Consultation and Strategic Planning Workshop -Report*; Abuja, 9 May 2019
- Abiodun O. Folawewo (ILO consultant), *Report on One-Day Nigerian National Dialogue on the Future of Work*
- NECA, *Job Fair 2020 (Programme) – Theme: Promoting Employability for National Development*, Jan. 30, 2020
- Albert, Omar Mruma (consultant), *Report of consultancy services towards the development and management of agricultural cooperatives in Kaduna state, Nigeria through delivery of training of trainers workshop* (Jan 7-18, 2019)
- ILO, *The training of trainers workshop on work improvement in neighbourhood development (WIND) programme*; training report, December 4-6, 2018
- ILO, *Start and Improve Your Business (SYIB) - SYIB Training of Trainers in Kaduna -Training Report*, October 2018

## **VI. Industrial Relations and Other Bills-related documents**

- Omolara Olanrewaju (lead consultant), *Achieving the Rule of Law in Industrial Relations Practice in Nigeria* - Report of a Study Commissioned by The Federal Ministry of Labour and Productivity & International Labour Organization (ILO) for presentation at the stakeholders' meeting on November 2012; Abuja, 2013
- Experts' Meeting to Discuss *Modus Operandi for the Development of Industrial Relations Policy in Nigeria - Protocol*
- *Roadmap for the Elaboration of National Policy on Industrial Relations in Nigeria*, March 5, 2017
- *Framework for the Development of an Industrial Relations Policy* - Synopsis of Proceedings of Technical Session of Meeting of Experts/Stakeholders; Abuja, 5 March 2018
- *Employees' Compensation Act, 201* – Federal Republic of Nigeria Official Gazette

## **VII. Labour Bills under Review**

- Standards Bill
- Collective Labour Relations Bill
- Occupational Health and Safety Bill
- Labour Institutions Bill
- Nigeria Social Insurance Trust Fund Bill

### **VIII. Nigeria Employers' Consultative Association (NECA)- related documents**

- NECA, Annual Report and Accounts - 2018
- ITF-NECA, Technical Skills Development Project (TSDP), informative brochure

### **IX. Development and Cooperation Framework-related documents**

- Federal Government of Nigeria, *Nigeria Vision 20: 2020* (Abridged Version); Abuja, Dec 12, 2010
- Federal Republic of Nigeria, Ministry of Budget and National Planning, *Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP) 2017-2020*; Abuja, Feb 2017
- United Nations Sustainable Development Planning Framework – *Nigeria UNSDPF 2018 -2022*
- United Nations Development Assistance Framework – *Nigeria UNDAF III 2014-2017*
- ILO, *The Decent Work Agenda in Africa: 2007–2015*
- Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment – International Labour Organization, *Nigeria's Future of Work Report, 2019*.

### **X. General Information Documents: SDG, Labour Migration and Other**

- ILO, *Towards Inclusive and Sustainable Development in Africa through Decent Work – Report of the Director-General – 13<sup>th</sup> African Regional Meeting – Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (30 Nov. – 3 Dec. 2015)*
- ILO World Employment Social Outlook Report – Trends 2018
- ILO, *World Social Protection Report 2017-2019 –Universal Social Protection to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals* (2017)
- Federal Republic of Nigeria - Office of the Senior Special Assistant to the President on Sustainable Development Goals, *Implementation of the SDGs – A National Voluntary Review*, June 2017
- African Union, ILO, IOM, ECA - *Report on Labour Migration Statistics in Africa in 2015* (AUC, Addis Ababa, March 2017)
- ILO, UNAIDS, SIDA - *Educated, Empowered, Inspired - Transforming lives through the response to HIV and AIDS in East and Southern Africa –Lessons from the Economic Empowerment Approach*
- United Nations Nigeria, *2018 UN Annual Results Report – for the UN System in Nigeria*
- UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), North-east Nigeria Humanitarian Situation Update, Jan. 2019
- ILO, *Women and Men in the Informal Economy: A Statistical Picture* (third edition); Geneva, 2018

### **XI. ILO Evaluation Guidelines, Terms of Reference and Other Relevant Evaluation-related documents**

- ILO Evaluation Office, ILO Policy Guidelines for Evaluation - Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations - *i-eval* resources - 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition
- ILO Evaluation Office, *Conducting High-level Evaluations in the ILO: A knowledge transfer note from the Evaluation Office to Evaluators (Jan 2019)*
- ILO Evaluation Office, ILO Code of Conduct: Agreement for Evaluators - *Updated October 2018*
- Evaluation Planning Matrix Template
- ILO Evaluation Office, Checklist 3 - Writing the Inception Report
- [http://training.itcilo.org/delta/ILO-EVAL/ILO\\_Self-induction\\_Module\\_for\\_Evaluation\\_Consultants-Part-I/story\\_html5.html](http://training.itcilo.org/delta/ILO-EVAL/ILO_Self-induction_Module_for_Evaluation_Consultants-Part-I/story_html5.html)

## Annex 5 Data collection tools

### 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, in order 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 Evaluator may have after analysing data from other evaluation methods such as document review.

The Evaluator 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 Evaluator develop semi-structured interviews/focus groups, they **will be adapted depending on each context** and project implementation degree; **the profile and attitudes of the respondent; and the results of previous interviews** with other stakeholders; in order to help focus each interview.

### Introduction to the interview

Thank you for participating in this interview. My name is **<insert name>**. I am conducting the Review of the Nigeria DWCP on behalf of the ILO.

The purpose of this interview is to help us better understand the DWCP, its results and effects in Nigeria. In order to do so, I 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?

## ILO Representatives

### A. Demographic Info:

1. **Date:**
2. **Interview location:**
3. **Interviewer Name:**
4. **Respondent Name:**
5. **Respondent Title (during life of Activity):**
6. **Respondent Institution (during life of Activity):**
7. **Sex of respondent:**

**Preface:** What has been your role in the design/implementation of ILO assistance for the DWCP? How long have you been in this role? Were there particular aspects of ILO assistance for the DWCP that you were involved in? What aspects?

### Relevance and Coherence of the DWCP

1. Was the support provided by the ILO for the Nigeria DWCP relevant to the needs of the constituents?

Prompts: Were some actions more relevant than others? If so, what were some examples of well-targeted actions? What were examples of less well targeted actions? Was the support provided by the ILO for the DWCP more relevant to the needs of some constituents than others? If so, which constituents were more/or less well served by the plan?

2. Is the DWCP relevant to national, regional and international development frameworks (including to the SDGs?) Are they relevant to the ILO's Programme and Budget Outcomes?
3. In the years since the DWCP was developed, have there been any significant developments that affected the relevance of the DWCP? To what extent did the ILO adapt its support taking into consideration developments in the country or other unanticipated opportunities/challenges during the last five years?

### Validity of Design and Evaluability

4. What mechanisms were put in place to monitor progress on the DWCP? Which institutions/constituents were involved? How effective has the mechanism been? What have been the main factors affecting the efficiency of DWCP monitoring?
5. Did the log frame (including the indicators that were proposed) facilitate monitoring? Is there data available on the extent planned activities were implemented? Is there data available on what extent the activities and outputs contributed toward achieving the planned outcomes? Are there any examples of how data from the M&E system has been used for decision-making?



### **Programme Effectiveness**

6. Are there examples of ILO support to national constituents for the design/implementation of the DWCP that you consider especially effective? What was the nature of the assistance? How was it delivered? By whom? Why do you think it was effective? What evidence is there of effectiveness?
7. Are there examples of ILO support to national constituents for the design/implementation of the DWCP that you consider could have been improved? If so, what are they? What could have been done better/differently?
8. What factors facilitated the success of ILO support to constituents for the design/implementation of the DWCP?
9. What were the main internal and external constraints/challenges that constrained/limited the success of ILO support to constituents for the implementation of the DWCP?
10. Were there any unanticipated outcomes to ILO support, either positive or negative?

### **Efficiency of Resource Use**

11. Based on your knowledge of the resources (human, financial, other material resources) available to the ILO to assist national constituents for the implementation of the DWCP, to what extent were available resources well-allocated? What if anything might have been done differently to make better use of available resources?
12. To what extent was the ILO able to leverage additional resources to support the DWCP from other strategic partners? To what extent did the ILO coordinate and collaborate with other organizations intervening in Nigeria to implement the DWCP?

### **Effectiveness of Management Arrangements**

13. Was the management and governance arrangement/ Steering Committee of the DWCP adequate to the implementation and monitoring needs? Has there been a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?
14. Has the DWCP been receiving adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners/implementing partners and ILO?
15. How has your organization used its existing institutional linkages to promote the DWCP and contribute towards resource mobilization efforts?

### **Impact orientation and Sustainability**

16. What were the most significant achievements of the DWCP? How did this achievement contribute to the promotion of decent work in Nigeria?
17. What have been the main lessons learned regarding the implementation of the DWCP in the last five years? To what extent has knowledge gained been articulated, documented and/or shared with relevant stakeholders?

### **Cross Cutting Issues**

18. To what extent did ILO assistance for the DWCP address the special needs and concerns of women? Of other vulnerable groups?
19. To what extent did ILO assistance for the DWCP contribute to the advance of international labour standards in Nigeria?
20. To what extent did ILO assistance for the DWCP contribute to social dialogue in Nigeria?
21. To what extent did ILO assistance for the DWCP contribute to environmental sustainability in Nigeria?

### **Sustainability**

22. To what extent are the positive outcomes of ILO's assistance for the implementation of the DWCP in Nigeria likely to be sustained in the coming years? What factors contribute to sustainability? What factors hinder sustainability?
23. How can the findings of this evaluation inform the region's strategic direction?
24. What recommendations do you have to improve ILO assistance moving forward?
25. Are there any other issues you would like to address/discuss?

## Government Institutions

### A. Demographic Info:

1. Date:
2. Interview location:
3. Interviewer Name:
4. Respondent Name:
5. Respondent Title (during life of Activity):
6. Respondent Institution (during life of Activity):
7. Sex of respondent:

**Preface:** What has been your role in the design/implementation of ILO assistance for the DWCP? How long have you been in this role? Were there particular aspects of ILO assistance for the DWCP that you were involved in? What aspects?

### Relevance and Coherence of the DWCP

1. Was the support provided by the ILO for the Nigeria DWCP relevant to the needs of your institution?

Prompts: Were some actions more relevant than others? If so, what were some examples of actions that were particularly helpful to your institution? What were examples of less useful actions? Do you think ILO support for the design/implementation of the DWCP was fairly distributed among ILO constituents?

2. In the years since the DWCP was developed, have there been any significant developments that affected the relevance of the DWCP? To what extent did the ILO adapt its support taking into consideration developments in the country or other unanticipated opportunities/challenges during the last five years?

### Validity of Design and Evaluability

3. What mechanisms were put in place to monitor progress on the DWCP? Which institutions/constituents were involved? How effective has the mechanism been? What are the main factors that affected the efficiency of DWCP monitoring?
4. Did the log frame (including the indicators that were proposed) facilitate monitoring? Is there data available on the extent planned activities were implemented? Is there data available on what extent the activities and outputs contributed toward achieving the planned outcomes (ie on the indicators proposed in the DWCP document)? Are there any examples of how data from the M&E system has been used for decision-making?

### Programme Effectiveness

5. Are there examples of ILO support to your institution for the implementation of the DWCP that you consider especially effective? What was the nature of the assistance? How was it

delivered? By whom? Why do you think it was effective? What evidence is there of effectiveness?

6. Are there examples of ILO support to your institution for the implementation of the DWCP that you consider could have been improved? If so, what are they? What could have been done better/differently?
7. What external or internal factors facilitated ILO support to your institution for the implementation of the DWCP?
8. What were the main internal and external constraints/challenges that constrained/limited the success of ILO support for the implementation of the DWCP?
9. Were there any unanticipated outcomes of the ILO's support for the DWCP, either positive or negative?

### **Efficiency of Resource Use**

10. Based on your knowledge of the resources (human, financial, other material resources) available to the ILO to assist national constituents for the implementation of the DWCP, to what extent were available resources well-allocated? What if anything might have been done differently to make better use of available resources?
11. To what extent was the ILO able to leverage additional resources to support the DWCP from other strategic partners? To what extent did the ILO coordinate and collaborate with other organizations intervening in Nigeria to implement the DWCP?

### **Effectiveness of Management Arrangements**

12. Was the management and governance arrangement/ Steering Committee of the DWCP adequate to the implementation and monitoring needs? Has there been a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?
13. Has the DWCP been receiving adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners/implementing partners and ILO?
14. How has your organization used its existing institutional linkages to promote the DWCP and contribute towards resource mobilization efforts?

### **Impact Orientation and Sustainability**

15. What were the most significant achievements of the DWCP? How did these achievements contribute to the promotion of decent work in Nigeria?

16. What have been the main lessons learned regarding the implementation of the DWCP in the last five years? To what extent has knowledge gained been articulated, documented and/or shared with relevant stakeholders?

### **Cross Cutting Issues**

17. To what extent did ILO assistance for DWCP address the special needs and concerns of women? Of other vulnerable groups? What more might have been done? Should anything have been done differently to address gender concerns in ILO's support?
18. To what extent did ILO assistance for the DWCP contribute to advance ILS in Nigeria?
19. To what extent did ILO assistance for the DWCP contribute to social dialogue in Nigeria?
20. To what extent did ILO assistance for the DWCP contribute to environmental sustainability in Nigeria?

### **Sustainability**

21. To what extent are the positive outcomes of ILO's assistance for the implementation of the DWCP in Nigeria likely to be sustained in the coming years? What factors contribute to sustainability? What factors hinder sustainability?
22. How can the findings of this evaluation inform the country's strategic direction?
23. What recommendations do you have to improve ILO assistance moving forward?
24. Are there any other issues you would like to address/discuss?

## Workers Organizations

### A. Demographic Info:

1. Date:
2. Interview location:
3. Interviewer Name:
4. Respondent Name:
5. Respondent Title (during life of Activity):
6. Respondent Institution (during life of Activity):
7. Sex of respondent:

**Preface:** What has been your role in the design/implementation of ILO assistance for the DWCP? How long have you been in this role? Were there particular aspects of ILO assistance for the DWCP that you were involved in? What aspects?

### Relevance and Coherence of the DWCP

1. Was the support provided by the ILO for the Nigeria DWCP relevant to the needs of your institution?

Prompts: Were some actions more relevant than others? If so, what were some examples of actions that were particularly helpful to your institution? What were examples of less useful actions? Do you think ILO support for the design/implementation of the DWCP was fairly distributed among ILO constituents?

2. In the years since the DWCP was developed, have there been any significant developments that affected the relevance of the DWCP? To what extent did the ILO adapt its support taking into consideration developments in the country or other unanticipated opportunities/challenges during the last five years?

### Validity of Design and Evaluability

3. What mechanisms were put in place to monitor progress on the DWCP? Which institutions/constituents were involved? How effective has the mechanism been? What are the main factors that affected the efficiency of DWCP monitoring?
4. Did the log frame (including the indicators that were proposed) facilitate monitoring? Is there data available on the extent planned activities were implemented? Is there data available on what extent the activities and outputs contributed toward achieving the planned outcomes (i.e. on the indicators proposed in the DWCP document)? Are there any examples of how data from the M&E system has been used for decision-making?

### Programme Effectiveness

5. Are there examples of ILO support to your institution for the implementation of the DWCP that you consider especially effective? What was the nature of the assistance? How was it

delivered? By whom? Why do you think it was effective? What evidence is there of effectiveness?

6. Are there examples of ILO support to your institution for the implementation of the DWCP that you consider could have been improved? If so, what are they? What could have been done better/differently?
7. What external or internal factors facilitated ILO support to your institution for the implementation of the DWCP?
8. What were the main internal and external constraints/challenges that constrained/limited the success of ILO support for the implementation of the DWCP?
9. Were there any unanticipated outcomes of the ILO's support for the DWCP, either positive or negative?

### **Efficiency of Resource Use**

10. Based on your knowledge of the resources (human, financial, other material resources) available to the ILO to assist national constituents for the implementation of the DWCP, to what extent were available resources well-allocated? What if anything might have been done differently to make better use of available resources?
11. To what extent was the ILO able to leverage additional resources to support the DWCP from other strategic partners? To what extent did the ILO coordinate and collaborate with other organizations intervening in Nigeria to implement the DWCP?

### **Effectiveness of Management Arrangements**

12. Was the management and governance arrangement/ Steering Committee of the DWCP adequate to the implementation and monitoring needs? Has there been a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?
13. Has the DWCP been receiving adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners/implementing partners and ILO?
14. How has your organization used its existing institutional linkages to promote the DWCP and contribute towards resource mobilization efforts?

### **Impact Orientation and Sustainability**

15. What were the most significant achievements of the DWCP? How did these achievements contribute to the promotion of decent work in Nigeria?

16. What have been the main lessons learned regarding the implementation of the DWCP in the last five years? To what extent has knowledge gained been articulated, documented and/or shared with relevant stakeholders?

### **Cross Cutting Issues**

17. To what extent did ILO assistance for DWCP address the special needs and concerns of women? Of other vulnerable groups? What more might have been done? Should anything have been done differently to address gender concerns in ILO's support?
18. To what extent did ILO assistance for the DWCP contribute to advance ILS in Nigeria?
19. To what extent did ILO assistance for the DWCP contribute to social dialogue in Nigeria?
20. To what extent did ILO assistance for the DWCP contribute to environmental sustainability in Nigeria?

### **Sustainability**

21. To what extent are the positive outcomes of ILO's assistance for the implementation of the DWCP in Nigeria likely to be sustained in the coming years? What factors contribute to sustainability? What factors hinder sustainability?
22. How can the findings of this evaluation inform the country's strategic direction?
23. What recommendations do you have to improve ILO assistance moving forward?
24. Are there any other issues you would like to address/discuss?



## Employers Organizations

### A. Demographic Info:

1. Date:
2. Interview location:
3. Interviewer Name:
4. Respondent Name:
5. Respondent Title (during life of Activity):
6. Respondent Institution (during life of Activity):
7. Sex of respondent:

**Preface:** What has been your role in the design/implementation of ILO assistance for the DWCP? How long have you been in this role? Were there particular aspects of ILO assistance for the DWCP that you were involved in? What aspects?

### Relevance and Coherence of the DWCP

1. Was the support provided by the ILO for the Nigeria DWCP relevant to the needs of your institution?

Prompts: Were some actions more relevant than others? If so, what were some examples of actions that were particularly helpful to your institution? What were examples of less useful actions? Do you think ILO support for the design/implementation of the DWCP was fairly distributed among ILO constituents?

2. In the years since the DWCP was developed, have there been any significant developments that affected the relevance of the DWCP? To what extent did the ILO adapt its support taking into consideration developments in the country or other unanticipated opportunities/challenges during the last five years?

### Validity of Design and Evaluability

3. What mechanisms were put in place to monitor progress on the DWCP? Which institutions/constituents were involved? How effective has the mechanism been? What are the main factors that affected the efficiency of DWCP monitoring?
4. Did the log frame (including the indicators that were proposed) facilitate monitoring? Is there data available on the extent planned activities were implemented? Is there data available on what extent the activities and outputs contributed toward achieving the planned outcomes (i.e. on the indicators proposed in the DWCP document)? Are there any examples of how data from the M&E system has been used for decision-making?

### Programme Effectiveness

5. Are there examples of ILO support to your institution for the implementation of the DWCP that you consider especially effective? What was the nature of the assistance? How was it

delivered? By whom? Why do you think it was effective? What evidence is there of effectiveness?

6. Are there examples of ILO support to your institution for the implementation of the DWCP that you consider could have been improved? If so, what are they? What could have been done better/differently?
7. What external or internal factors facilitated ILO support to your institution for the implementation of the DWCP?
8. What were the main internal and external constraints/challenges that constrained/limited the success of ILO support for the implementation of the DWCP?
9. Were there any unanticipated outcomes of the ILO's support for the DWCP, either positive or negative?

### **Efficiency of Resource Use**

10. Based on your knowledge of the resources (human, financial, other material resources) available to the ILO to assist national constituents for the implementation of the DWCP, to what extent were available resources well-allocated? What if anything might have been done differently to make better use of available resources?
11. To what extent was the ILO able to leverage additional resources to support the DWCP from other strategic partners? To what extent did the ILO coordinate and collaborate with other organizations intervening in Nigeria to implement the DWCP?

### **Effectiveness of Management Arrangements**

12. Was the management and governance arrangement/ Steering Committee of the DWCP adequate to the implementation and monitoring needs? Has there been a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?
13. Has the DWCP been receiving adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners/implementing partners and ILO?
14. How has your organization used its existing institutional linkages to promote the DWCP and contribute towards resource mobilization efforts?

### **Impact Orientation and Sustainability**

15. What were the most significant achievements of the DWCP? How did these achievements contribute to the promotion of decent work in Nigeria?
16. What have been the main lessons learned regarding the implementation of the DWCP in the last five years? To what extent has knowledge gained been articulated, documented and/or shared with relevant stakeholders?

### **Cross Cutting Issues**

17. To what extent did ILO assistance for DWCP address the special needs and concerns of women? Of other vulnerable groups? What more might have been done? Should anything have been done differently to address gender concerns in ILO's support?
18. To what extent did ILO assistance for the DWCP contribute to advance ILS in Nigeria?
19. To what extent did ILO assistance for the DWCP contribute to social dialogue in Nigeria?
20. To what extent did ILO assistance for the DWCP contribute to environmental sustainability in Nigeria?

### **Sustainability**

21. To what extent are the positive outcomes of ILO's assistance for the implementation of the DWCP in Nigeria likely to be sustained in the coming years? What factors contribute to sustainability? What factors hinder sustainability?
22. How can the findings of this evaluation inform the country's strategic direction?
23. What recommendations do you have to improve ILO assistance moving forward?
24. Are there any other issues you would like to address/discuss?