



ILO EVALUATION

- **Evaluation Title:** Inclusive Growth, Social Protection and Jobs Programme: An ILO-IRISH-Aid Partnership Programme 2016-2021
- **ILO TC/SYMBOL:** GLO/16/33/IRL (Umbrella); GLO/16/63/IRL; RAF/16/54/IRL; TZA/16/51/IRL; VNM/16/54/IRL
- **Type of Evaluation:** Independent midterm evaluation
- **Country(ies) :** Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, Viet Nam and Zambia
- **Date of the evaluation:** September 2019 – February 2020
- **Name of consultant(s):** Lotta Nycander
- **ILO Administrative Office:**
 - RAF/16/54/IRL - CO-Lusaka
 - TZA/16/51/IRL – CO- Dar es Salaam
 - VIE/16/54/IRL – CO-Hanoi
 - GLO/16/63/IRL - SOCPRO
- **ILO Technical Backstopping Office:** Social Protection Department (SOCPRO) and the Development & Investment Branch (DEVINVEST)
- **Duration of project implementation:** December 2016 – December 2021
- **Donor: country and budget US\$** Irish Aid, with a planned investment of €9.35 million
- **Evaluation Manager:** Janette Murawski
- **Key Words:** social protection, employment creation, employment policy

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

Table of Contents

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1 BACKGROUND AND PROGRAMME DESCRIPTION	11
1.1 CONTEXT	11
1.2 THE PROGRAMME: INCLUSIVE GROWTH, SOCIAL PROTECTION AND JOBS	14
2 MIDTERM EVALUATION OBJECTIVES	21
2.1 PURPOSES, OBJECTIVES, USERS, SCOPE AND DELIVERABLES OF THE EVALUATION	21
3 METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS	23
3.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS	23
3.2 APPROACH	24
3.3 DATA COLLECTION METHODS, DATA SOURCES AND SAMPLING AND LIMITATIONS TO THE METHODS USED	24
3.4 EVALUATION NORMS AND STANDARDS	26
4 MIDTERM EVALUATION FINDINGS	27
4.1 OVERALL FINDINGS	27
4.2 ACHIEVEMENT AT COUNTRY LEVEL	28
4.3 RELEVANCE	31
4.4 EFFECTIVENESS	35
4.1 EFFICIENCY	40
4.2 SUSTAINABILITY AND IMPACT	41
4.3 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES	42
5 CONCLUSIONS	43
6 LESSONS LEARNT AND GOOD PRACTICES	46
6.1 LESSONS LEARNT	46
6.2 GOOD PRACTICES	46
7 RECOMMENDATIONS	48
ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCE	50
ANNEX II. DETAILED FINDINGS –COUNTRY PROJECT COMPONENTS	51
7.1 REGIONAL SOCIAL PROTECTION PROJECT FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA (RAF)	51
7.2 ZAMBIA SOCIAL PROTECTION COMPONENT	51
7.3 MALAWI SOCIAL PROTECTION COMPONENT	53
7.4 MOZAMBIQUE SOCIAL PROTECTION COMPONENT	55
7.5 VIET NAM SOCIAL PROTECTION COMPONENT	56
7.6 TANZANIA EMPLOYMENT INTENSIVE INVESTMENT (EIIP)	57
7.7 THE GLOBAL SOCIAL PROTECTION COMPONENT	59
ANNEX III. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED	61
ANNEX IV. LESSONS LEARNT TEMPLATE	63
ANNEX V. EMERGING GOOD PRACTICES TEMPLATE	69
ANNEX VI. INTERVIEWEES AND PARTICIPANTS IN FOCUS DISCUSSIONS	72
ANNEX VII. EVALUATION TOOLS	78
7.8 SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ILO FIELD STAFF	78
7.9 QUESTION MATRIX	80

Abbreviations and acronyms

ATE	Association of Tanzania Employers
CoP	Community of Practice
DEVINVEST	Development for Investment Branch
EIIP	Employment Intensive Investment programme
ENDE	Mozambique's National Development Strategy 2015 -2035
ENSSB	National Basic Social Security Strategy
EU-SPS	European-Union Social Protection Systems Programme
ILO	International Labour Organisation
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
MANEPO	Malawi Network of Older Persons' Organization
MNSSP	Malawi National Social Support Programme
MoCDSS	Ministry of Community Development and Social Services (Zambia)
MoFEP&D	Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development (Malawi)
MoGCDSW	Ministry of Gender, Children, Disability and Social Welfare (Malawi)
MoLISA	Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs (Viet Nam)
MoLSS	Ministry of Labour and Social Security (Zambia)
MoLYE&PD	Ministry of Labour, Youth, Employment and Persons with Disability (Tanzania)
NSSP	National Social Support Policy
PARDEV	Partnerships and Field Support Department
PSAP	Productive Social Action Program (Mozambique)
PSSN	Productive Social Safety Nets
PW	Public Works
SOCPRO	Social Protection Department
SPF	Social Protection Floors
SPIREWORK	Social Protection for Informal and Rural Economy Workers Sub-Project in Zambia
TANROADS	Tanzania National Roads Agency
TARURA	Tanzania Rural Roads Agency
TASAF	Tanzania Social Action Fund
ToC	Theory of Change
TUCTA	Trade Union Congress of Tanzania
UNDAP	The United Nations Development Programme
WfP	World Food Programme
ZATUC	Zanzibar Trade Union Congress

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge and thank all those who have participated in the evaluation, from the Governments, the Employers, Workers and other Civil Society Organisations for their time and generosity in sharing data and information throughout the process.

Special thanks and gratitude go to the ILO staff at Headquarters, Geneva, and in Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, Vietnam and the officials of the Decent Work Country Teams and who patiently have explaining the programme's intentions, its complexity and the challenges faced, and who have participated in the workshop of the presentation of the preliminary findings of the evaluation and provided written comments to the report.

Much appreciation is extended to Janette Murawski, Evaluation Manager who have held things together in a truly professional manner. Thanks also go to Mini Thakur, for her kind assistance in reading through and commenting on the first draft.

Lotta Nycander

Independent evaluation consultant

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the final draft report of the Independent Midterm Evaluation of the programme entitled **Inclusive Growth, Social Protection and Jobs Programme with the duration 2016-2021** (herein referred to as the programme). The International Labour Organisation (ILO) is the implementing organisation together with its partners at international and country level and the Irish Aid is the Development Partner (donor agency) to the programme. The total budget is EUR 9.35 million. The overall **goal** for the Programme is that national governments use appropriate, well designed and well managed social protection measures and employment promoting approaches in the delivery of public investments in order to promote resilience, access to services and employment opportunities for poor and vulnerable people, contributing to Inclusive Economic Growth.

The programme took off with a **six months inception phase** during which consultative meetings and workshops were organised with stakeholders within the government, workers and employers organisations, as well as CSOs, and other private sector actors. The programme set up technical working groups Technical Working Groups were established in Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique and Tanzania and plans were revised as a result of the consultations and wider participation of the key stakeholders.¹

The programme contributes to the ILO's Global Flagship Programme on Building social protection floors for all (2016-30) and to the Decent Work Agenda. The agreement with IA is to support the countries, together with the ILO constituents, in strengthening national policies, programmes/schemes on social protection to benefit the most vulnerable people in these countries. It should be seen in the light of the fact that **social security is a human right is not yet reflected in countries' policies and schemes.** It is estimated that only 45 per cent of the global population is covered by at least one social protection benefit, while 55 per cent (4 billion people) are not protected even by one. It is also estimated that only 29 per cent of the global population are part of any comprehensive social security system benefits, ranging from child and family benefits to old-age pensions which leaves 71 per cent (5.2 billion people) not protected.

The overall **purpose of this evaluation** is to support accountability and to inform project improvement and organizational learning. The specific **objectives** were to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the project's interventions; Assess issues of project design, implementation and administration; Assess the challenges affecting the achievement of the objectives, factors that hindered or facilitated achievement so far, and effectiveness of management arrangements for each component. The **scope** includes a "review and assessment of all outputs, activities and workflows carried out under the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme 2016-2021 in the five implementing countries and at the global level during the project's start date of 20 December 2016 to 30 August 2019."² Although Mozambique is part of the programme, the evaluation field visits were only made to Viet Nam, Zambia, Malawi, Tanzania and Zanzibar (and in that very same order). An in-depth interviews were conducted with the responsible ILO official in Maputo, Mozambique, to collect information on progress of implementation.

The **evaluation's approach** was to use varied methods to gather quantitative and qualitative data. Qualitative data/information has been collected from primary sources particularly during field visits in Malawi, Zambia, Tanzania and Zanzibar, and Viet Nam. Quantitative data was drawn from secondary sources only (as no separate quantitative survey was part of this evaluation), i.e. from Project Documents programme Annual and six-monthly Progress Reports, evaluation reports and other relevant documents, as well as websites. To the extent possible the evaluation has identified intended and direct positive and negative changes resulting from the project activities. The **following methods were used to gather data and information:** Comprehensive review of relevant documentation; semi-structure interviews; focused discussions; questionnaire survey; sample selection of respondents and sites and quality assurance.

¹ Source: Development Cooperation Progress Report (DCPR) for Tanzania, covering January, 2017 to June 2017, compiled by Tapera Jeffrey Muzira, 29 June 2017.
The actual scope is to November 2019, when the data collection in the field ended.

The following are the conclusions of the Mid Term Evaluation:

Relevance

Overall, it is concluded that the programme remains relevant in addressing country needs, priorities and in contributing to the development of national systems and policies. It has also been relevant in its efforts in imparting knowledge and learning through TRANSFORM and through other capacity building processes and events. The relevance and rationale of having Tanzania as the *only country among five* that is implementing employment intensive investments through public works activities within a social protection-oriented ILO programme - is assessed to be rather weak both in design and implementation.

Effectiveness

The ILO initially intended that Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique would implement *both* SP and EIIP components, and that synergies and cohesion would be created between the two which was carefully outlined in the Project Document. However this never materialised and the text of the Project Document was never changed in this respect. What did materialise is that Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique and Viet Nam all implement social protection components and Tanzania implements an EIIP component.

The programme as a whole has performed rather well at mid-way of implementation, considering a number of challenges faced. The components/countries are making contributions, among other organisations to the ILO-Irish programme goal and the ILO Global Flagship Programme on Building Social Protection Floors for All (2016-2030), through being involved in the work of developing national policies, strategic documents and plans, as well as M&EII systems for comprehensive social protection systems. It has raised awareness among stakeholders for the need to combine contributory and non-contributory schemes to cover people's and households' needs across the lifecycle.

The regional SP project (RAF) including Zambia, Mozambique and Malawi with hub in Zambia has applied a strategic approach in providing capacity-building of participants at different levels, including the sub-national level. In the process of implementing decentralisation policies (such as in Zambia) this approach is particularly important as it is the local level structures that deliver social services to the citizens and inhabitants. The majority of the programme outputs designed to reach the immediate objectives/outcomes mid-way have been produced. The programme has also engaged stakeholders in implementation of programmes, leveraging resources and promoting possibility for scaling of activities.

The regional project with support from the Global SP component is contributing to the objectives to build capacity through TRANSFORM – helping stakeholders appreciate leadership issues and management in relation to complex social protection systems. The EIIP has supported the TASAF PSSN and raised awareness and built capacity regarding employment-promoting approaches in the form of public works. However, the evaluation *has not been able to find any written evidence for linkages with TASAF's other social protection programs funded by IA (notably UNICEF's support)*– which seems to be a lost opportunity and which also was brought up but the Embassy of Ireland.

There are management issues in the programme that relate both to design and follow-up (revising Project Document and LFA) of the original intentions of the programme. The evaluation's scrutiny of the various logical frameworks has revealed a fragmentation which seems to be the result of the lack of coordination and coherence during the design stage. In the case of Tanzania it was found that some outputs in the LFA are too ambitious (outputs 3.1 and 3.2) in view of the remaining duration of the component and that the outputs 1.1 and 1.2 do not logically lead to Outcome 1.

Regarding coordination, communication and information-sharing weaknesses were also found with exceptions in relation to Transform and Webinar activities, and during times the country staff compile their annual progress reports. This is likely to improve during 2020 when a new CTA is recruited to be based in Lusaka.

No particular mechanism seems to have been put in place to structure communication, knowledge-sharing and contacts with the field from the part of the HQ level, where the responsibility for the Global

SP component lies. Another management issue is the quality of progress reports. Some reports lack analysis of problems that have occurred and challenges faced, and there are hardly any references to assumptions made at the start of the programme, or eventual risks that may be connected with certain decisions. Quality and standard of presentation of *qualitative information* in the progress report is assessed to be uneven, ranging from “good” to “not adequate”.

Efficiency

It is assessed that the majority (80-90 per cent) of the outputs *expected at mid-way* of the implementation across the programme have been produced, or nearly produced. Programme staff in the involved countries brought up – as an issue affecting implementation – the reduction of budget/fund allocations resulting from the IA requirement that projects meet annual budget delivery rates (70 per cent) which do not include commitments for staff salaries. When projects were not able to meet the requirement, the situation affected recruitment and even payments of staff salaries in field offices, but also the efficiency in producing the outputs. This was mostly mitigated through cost-sharing and collaboration with other UN agencies being part of the UNJP-SP. Lately, staff have applied for and some will receive additional UNJP-SP funds SDG funds in 2020-2021 (Viet Nam, Malawi and Tanzania).

Regarding partnership arrangements at national level the SP components cooperate mainly with the government ministries responsible for SP policies, strategic plans and or social safety net programmes in the respective countries. Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique are part of a regional set up which has its base and networks in the previous social protection programme implemented between 2013-2016. The interagency partnership arrangements are mainly with the UNJP-SP funded by various development partners, but also with bilateral donor agencies that are outside of the UN framework. In Tanzania, EIIP’s key partner is TASAF, which is a national agency implementing the PSSN III.

Impact and sustainability

As the programme is half way in implementation, the sustainability of the programme’s actions is uncertain at this point to be further considered and explored by the final evaluation. Some impact and sustainability issues can already be determined. It is clear that the programme together with stakeholders (to a varying extent in the different countries) has been involved in developing policies, strategic plans, integrated frameworks and M&EII tools/systems for basic social protection which should have lasting impact. The cost-sharing and cooperation with others are contributing to ownership and sustainability.

As for sustainability of EIIP activities, the Project’s work and support to TASAF could result in job generating public work approaches that are sustained *if the programme’s objectives are reached*, however, there is a long way to reach the set immediate objectives/outcomes.

Looking at TRANSFORM, it is clearly a tool that currently ensures that all share know-how with policy and decision-makers and how to invest in (umbrella) social protection schemes for people who are vulnerable in the informal economy. It is one of the key initiatives within the programme in Eastern and Southern Africa – and the *learning* from it can be said to be an impact in itself. The issue of sustainability of TRANSFORM is high on the agenda for the region but the conclusion is that full sustainability – i.e. a regionally-based institution taking the learning package on board as its *own* - is highly unlikely to happen in the remaining two years of the programme. As it currently stands, it is dependent on donor funds and therefore – without the continued support from development partners it is not likely to survive.

Gender issues and issues regarding people who are differently abled

Cross-cutting issues in the programme design are important, as the ultimate target group are all women and men in the countries involved with a focus on poor and vulnerable groups such as women, elderly, people who are differently abled, ethnic minorities and self-employed workers. In the case of Tanzania it is claimed that 70 per cent of the EIIP support is directed to women and the participants in TRANSFORM are to a high degree women, however, cross-cutting issues are not prominent in the programme. No particular gender analysis, or analysis of social protection coverage or inclusion of people who are differently abled seem to have been undertaken by the programme in any of the countries – or at Headquarter level. TRANSFORM learning package does not have any module

specifically addressing gender, but gender is meant to be mainstreamed (integrated) throughout the learning package and training approach.

These are the recommendations of the Mid Term Evaluation:

1. Management and leadership (SOCPRO, DEVINVEST, DWCT) – High priority

Level of resources: Medium

Time line: High

ILO should make efforts and devise ways and means to improve on coordination, communication and information-sharing in the programme with a specific mechanism for regular contacts between the project components – as well as between the components, the DWCTs, and the ILO headquarters.

2. Improvements of EIIP in Tanzania (DEVINVEST, DWCT) High priority

Level of resources: Medium - High

Time line: High

In order to increase the relevance and rationale of the EIIP activities being part of the dominantly social protection-oriented programme, some changes should be made. ILO should make provisions for strengthening the leadership and strategic direction of the EIIP component, with the assistance of its staff member/s, or through the commissioning of an external consultant.

- a) Ensure that there is only one EIIP Logical Framework Analysis matrix and that it “tallies” with the EIIP Theory of Change matrix (especially concerning the number of immediate objectives/outcomes). Outcome 1 and Outputs 1.1 and 1.2 should be carefully looked at, as the outputs do not logically lead to the Outcome 1. Outputs 3.1 and 3.2 should be revised as they seem overly ambitious in view of the fact that they should be produced before the end of 2021.
- b) Consider revising the Terms of Reference for the currently (too) large EIIP Project Steering Committee and critically review whether the committee needs to have as many duties as currently are assigned to it
- c) Consider exchanging some current EIIP committee members with technical engineering background - with representatives from TASAF’s other social protection programs (non-public works related) e.g. from TASAF’s Enhanced Livelihoods programme and/or UNICEF/World Food Programme (WfP). An alternative is to nominate them as *observers* to the committee.
- d) Ensure that the EIIP annual and *quarterly* reports are timely and more analytical and less technical in nature, for the Embassy and others to appreciate that Public Works aim at being closely connected to wider social protection needs and show the links to e.g. UNICEF’s and WfP’s social protection support to TASAF.

3. TRANSFORM and Webinars – (Regional and global social protection components, DWCT) Medium priority

Level of resources: Medium

Time line: Medium

ILO should, together with its partners and stakeholders, continue to develop TRANSFORM (and webinars) in order to spread awareness and knowledge about social protection. It should continue to involve trainees/participants in various learning events as well and increase its efforts to identify chances for a sustainable platform of TRANSFORM, e.g. through *integration* in some national or international institutional set up in the African region.

4. Gender analysis and issues regarding people who are differently abled – (SOCPRO, DEVINVEST, DWCT) High priority

Level of resources: Medium

Time line: High

In order to increase gender mainstreaming in the overall programme and in Transform learning modules, ILO should develop a Gender Analysis (backed up with the right skills and support) which also should include an analysis of the needs of people who are differently abled and who are part of the intended (ultimate) beneficiaries.

5. Annual and quarterly progress reports (Project components managers, SOCPRO, DEVINVEST) High priority

Level of resources: Medium

Time line: Medium

ILO should improve on its mechanism for management oversight and quality assurance for reports produced by the programme and submitted to the donor agency. It should ensure that annual and progress reports maintain good quality and entail more analysis of issues and challenges faced in the different countries. Reports should be improved and relate to early assumptions made, realism and status of reaching the outcomes and outputs which have been set, gender issues, as well as the political situation affecting the project's attempts to obtain outputs and outcomes.

6. IRIS – installation and access in all countries (ILO Finance (Hqs/regional offices) High priority

Level of resources: Medium

Time line: High

ILO should ensure that IRIS is urgently installed (if not done already) and accessed in all sub-project countries.

These are the evaluation's assessment on lessons learnt:

- In keeping together a programme with implementation in several countries (even if not large in terms of funding) it is important that due attention is given to structural issues, oversight and including management/leadership issues. Even though a programme is officially decentralised, it is here understood that the ultimate responsibilities for the implementation lie with the HQs. In this case this makes a lot of sense, as the implementation of the Global Component is placed at Headquarters – even though the CTA for this component is responsible for the component only, not the whole programme. Working together, as with the UNJP-SP actors has been worthwhile and has added to cost-efficiency and should be encouraged – even though this raises some difficulties in assessing and attributing achievements to the specific activities of the programme under evaluation.
- Regarding funds transfer from the donor agency, clarity in the requirements for the fund allocations should be made very clear to project managers when recruited to implement the projects – and realism has to be applied by the ILO in terms of acknowledging that poor delivery especially the first year/s is a very common feature in project environments. Communication between the budget holder (in the case of the regional SP project this is in Lusaka) and regional project staff regarding fund allocation and decisions on priorities should be clear and timely to avoid misunderstanding and frustration.
- It is fully understood and appreciated that the decision to have the new partnership have a double SOCPRO- EIP focus was taken in full consultation with the donor. However, it should be noted for the record in this evaluation report, that the previous SP programme evaluation's recommendations (the regional SP project) stated that “the ILO should recognise the achievements of the project in terms of advancing social protection floors through a regional approach, and should think carefully about diluting that focus in the next phase through the broadening of geographical coverage and the introduction of a secondary objective on EIIPs”. Despite these red flags the ILO-Irish Aid partnership included the new EIIP component in Tanzania and added a country from another continent, Vietnam, to the earlier regional

experience. The risks of going this direction (expansion) and the evaluation's recommendation could have been *mentioned or discussed in the Prodoc, or the assumptions in the LFA could have taken the risk into account.*

- The Tanzania EIIP component has been operated as a one-person project until recently. For the EIIP - with the kind of responsibility assigned to it - this was not an adequate staff set up and there should have been a minimum of two technical project staff in the team.

The following are examples of emerging good practices emanating from the Programme:

- The programme has rightly placed itself in the proximity to the social protection policy holders (national key stakeholders and line ministries) - which has been beneficial in the evolvement of social protection systems and a precondition when addressing complex social systems. Combining policy level activities with capacity building and awareness-raising both regionally and nationally has proved to be a good strategy (this applies to the countries implementing the social protection component).
- The social protection regional project (RAF) has learnt from the previous project³ and is building on the contacts, networks, and trust created among key stakeholders including the social protection policy holding government ministries and other stakeholders in the "sector".
- Using public platforms and media, for open dialogue with the public on social protection and accountability of governments, with participation of universities, is an excellent way not only to broaden and raise awareness about the issues but also to appreciate the sentiments of the younger generation as is being done in Zambia. Working with a civil society organization (*network* of CSOs/NGOs) to track how government funds are used for social protection at sub-national level is another very interesting activity supported by IA and ILO in Zambia.

³ Source: Independent End-Term Evaluation of Building National Social Protection Floors in Southern Africa: Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia, Final Evaluation Report, February 2017.

1 BACKGROUND AND PROGRAMME DESCRIPTION

This is the final draft report of the Independent Midterm Evaluation of the programme entitled **Inclusive Growth, Social Protection and Jobs Programme with the duration 2016-2021** (herein referred to as the programme). The International Labour Organisation (ILO) is the implementing organisation together with its partners at international and country level and the Irish Aid is the Development Partner (donor agency) to the programme. The total budget is EUR 9.35 million.

This chapter will include the overall historical context in which the programme has evolved and includes both its social protection and employment intensive investment components and themes. It also provides the key elements of the actual programme being evaluated, including the management arrangements, key stakeholders and programme participants.

1.1 CONTEXT

Social protection is a crucial aspect of inclusive development and social justice. It promotes domestic consumption and contributes to economic growth and perhaps more importantly, it is a powerful instrument to prevent and mitigate economic crises, natural disasters and conflicts. Households that receive benefits and/or protective services from social protection schemes can better contribute to greater productive activity. The fact that social security is a human right is not yet reflected in countries' policies and schemes. It is estimated that only 45 per cent of the global population is covered by *at least one* social protection benefit, while 55 per cent (4 billion people) are not protected even by one. It is also estimated that only 29 per cent of the global population are part of any comprehensive social security system benefits, ranging from child and family benefits to old-age pensions which leaves 71 per cent (5.2 billion people) not protected.⁴

The ILO sees social protection, and social security consisting of policies and programmes that include benefits for individuals and families to cushion shocks that may be faced throughout the life cycle.⁵ It covers child, family and maternity benefits, unemployment benefits, employment injury, sickness, old age, disability, survivors, as well as health protection. It can be a set of policies and programmes that are specifically designed to prevent people/families including children to fall into poverty. The social protection/security schemes and programmes are contributory schemes (social insurance) and non-contributory tax-financed benefits, including social assistance.⁶

The Irish Aid, the donor agency to the evaluated programme, is fully committed to supporting social protection and launched a new strategy for developing countries in 2017. It sees social protection as a key tool to reduce poverty and inequality while achieving inclusive growth, and in situations where humanitarian response is needed. It acknowledges that social protection e.g. can contribute to building resilience, unlock productive capacity and promoting social cohesion. IA gives priority to sustainable social protection programmes that address inequality by focusing on the very poorest households.⁷

1.1.1 Evolvement of Social Protection Programmes and global goals

The extent to which the citizens/inhabitants are covered by any social protection/social security programmes/schemes differ. The countries covered by the IA programme depend to a large extent on agriculture, producing for household consumption and for the local markets. Many rural households cannot make a living on agricultural produce alone, and can only sustain themselves and/or their families through some form of off-farm employment. In Malawi, 51 per cent of the population lives below the (national) poverty line and 73 per cent below the international extreme poverty line of US\$1.25 per day. In Mozambique and Zambia, 50 and 60 per cent, respectively, live below the poverty

⁴ Source: *World Social Protection Report 2017–19 Universal social protection to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals*, ILO 2017

⁵ ILO uses these two terms interchangeably, although social protection is more commonly used now. Source: ILO in a written comment on the draft report.

⁶ Source: *World Social Protection Report 2017–19 Universal social protection to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals*, ILO 2017

⁷ Source: Social Protection Strategy, Irish Aida, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, May 2017. See also *A Better World - Ireland's Policy for International Development*.

lines and over 70 per cent are excluded from adequate social protection.⁸ Regarding Tanzania, a report in 2015 states that although Tanzania's poorest population has benefitted from growth, approximately 70 per cent of the population continue to live with less than USD 2/day.⁹

Adequate social protection coverage in Viet Nam is still very small, as 12 million people live below the poverty line. Around 70 per cent are in the 60-79 age group do not benefit from any social transfer from the government and no social protection provisions exist for families with children. Extending social protection to rural households with informal economy earners and offering non-farming job opportunities are important means of social inclusion and to helping them sustain a decent living standard.¹⁰

The ILO has a long history of working to promote social security – around 100 years – and has provided technical support and international social protection standards that have governed the design and implementation of social protection schemes. In modern times the ILO and the World Bank have had key role as custodian agencies of the SDGs related to social protection – albeit from quite different ideological stand points and UNICEF, FAO and WFP have also been working on social protection. Regarding the EU, it has come into the arena as a development partner on the SP theme rather late – but has realised that as it is a highly technical field requiring specialized know-how, Member States also have important roles to play regarding what has worked, and not worked, in different SP systems.¹¹ Transform, the “Leadership & Transformation Curriculum on Building and Managing Social Protection Floors in Africa” is an example of an innovative capacity building initiative that Irish Aid has supported, with funding also from the European-Union Social Protection Systems Programme (EU-SPSS), with OECD and Finland as contributing partners.¹²

ILO, UNICEF and UNDP have coordinated the programme which primarily has been developed by African practitioners and experts based in Africa.¹³ Other bilateral development aid organisations such as Sida and DFID are among those who also support SP programmes in African countries.

Most of the jobs and opportunities in Sub-Saharan Africa are within the informal economy. Agriculture and agriculture-related work is the dominating sector, and the programme countries (with the exception of Viet Nam) are all within this region where one finds the *highest rate of vulnerable workers/employees*. ILO defines these as those who are own-account workers and contributing family workers who are less likely to have formal work arrangements – and consequently also lack decent working conditions and social security/social protection coverage¹⁴. The population in this region are also facing shocks due to climate change challenges and climate uncertainty. These challenges affect food security and pose real threats to peoples' lives. Jobs may be lost as a result from adjustment to climate change impact – but it's also likely that new jobs will be created that require new skills to be developed.¹⁵

⁸ Here Zambia can providing an *example of the state of affairs of the involved RAF programme countries*: Survey results show that 54.4 per cent of the population was living below the national poverty line at the time of the survey (76.6 percent in rural areas and 23.4 percent in urban areas), and 40.8 per cent of the population were extremely poor (60.8 percent in rural areas and 12.8 percent in urban areas). Over 80 per cent of the population depend on the informal economy, and contributory social protection schemes only cover those that employed in the formal economy. Thus the majority of the population in Zambia is left out of social protection coverage. Source: *2015 Living Conditions monitoring Survey*.

⁹ Source: *Tanzania Mainland Poverty Assessment: A New Picture of Growth for Tanzania Emerges*, World Bank 2015. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/tanzania/publication/tanzania-mainland-poverty-assessment-a-new-picture-of-growth-for-tanzania-emerges>.

¹⁰ Source: Programme Document

¹¹ Source: *Evaluation of EU support to social protection in external action 2007-2013*, Final Report, Volume I – Main Report, January 2018. Evaluation carried out on behalf of the European Commission.

¹² By contributing to the UNJP I for Social Protection in Zambia – the funding it provided was for Transform related activities within a broader inter-agency social protection programme for Zambia. Source: ILO.

¹³ TRANSFORM is UN inter-agency initiative supporting the development of social protection floors in African countries (source: <https://socialprotection.org/transform>). The official website for Transform is Transformsp.org.

¹⁴ ILO uses these two terms interchangeably, although social protection is more commonly used now. Source: ILO in a written comment on the draft report.

¹⁵ Source: *Mapping study: Productive Employment with Decent Working Conditions within Swedish bilateral and regional development cooperation strategies*, June 2018, FCG. Author: Lotta Nycander. in Sub-Saharan Africa

In 2012 governments, workers' and employers' organizations adopted the Social Protection Floors Recommendation No. 202, confirming the crucial role of social protection in sustainable development, and in realising human rights and social justice for all.¹⁶ At that time very few countries had spelled out social protection in their national policies.¹⁷ However, already in 2009, the United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection (UNJP-SP) programme was formulated in which it was agreed that the steps that needed to be taken were the creation of national joint social protection floors (SP/F) teams; supporting national dialogues; conducting joint assessments; integrating SP/F into national development plans; and building national statistical capacities. ILO's Recommendation No. 204 on the Transition from the Informal to the Formal Economy (2015) is also relevant here as it mainly addresses workers/employees and their families with earnings from the informal economy, often without any social protection.

ILO's dialogue over the years with other UN agencies on the necessity of ensuring social protection floors is instrumental to the fact that social protection is part of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) 2030¹⁸ adopted in 2015 - and social protection is key in achieving the SDG Agenda 2030 (SDGs 1.3, 3.8, 5.4, 8.5 and 10.4).¹⁹ SDG's target 1.3 "Implement nationally appropriate social protection systems for all, including floors"²⁰ was adopted by the UN Assembly under the ambitious Goal "1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere."²¹ Globally, there is thus an agreement that social protection policies and programmes are essential parts of national development strategies to reduce poverty and vulnerability.

In 2014, Irish Aid and ILO initiated a project entitled Building National Floors of Social Protection in Southern Africa (2014-2016) which aimed at implementing basic social protection systems in Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique, on a pilot basis, through provision of technical support to constituents.²² The programme assisted countries in implementing the building blocks of domestically owned and funded national systems of social protection, based on the ILO Recommendation R.202 (2012) on National Floors of Social Protection.

ILO's experiences and work with its constituents and partners led to the ILO Global Flagship Programme on Building Social Protection Floors for All (2016-2030). It proposes ways and means of realizing people's rights and aims to make a difference for millions of people around the world.²³ (It aims to support twenty-one countries in extending social protection to its citizens.) The Programme is based on ILO international standards and universal *rights* to social security.

In 2017, following the relative success of the previous regional programme (Building National Social Protection Floors in Southern Africa), ILO launched the current programme entitled Inclusive Growth, Social Protection and Jobs Programme, which is evaluated here, also funded by IA. The Programme will run to 2021 and involves five countries: Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique, Tanzania and Zanzibar, and Viet Nam.

1.1.2 Employment Intensive Investment programme

ILO has over forty years of experience in implementing EI Employment intensive strategies and schemes, currently through the Employment Intensive Investment Programme (herein also referred to

¹⁶ There as consensus among 185 member States, workers' and employers' representatives, UN ECOSOC and Rio+20 endorsements (source: *Leave no one behind: Social Protection for All. Expert Group Meeting. Social Development and Agenda 2030*, United Nations Headquarters, New York, 21 October 2015, Vinicius Pinheiro, Deputy Director, ILO Office for the UN (Power Point presentation).

¹⁷ Source: *Evaluation of EU support to social protection in external action 2007-2013*, Final Report, Volume I – Main Report, January 2018. Evaluation carried out on behalf of the European Commission.

¹⁸ Other information from those early days is from the in-depth key interviews and background research the evaluator carried out through SRM in connection with the comprehensive ILO report: "Unleashing rural development through productive employment and decent work: Building on 40 years of ILO work in rural areas", Governing Body 310th Session, Geneva.

¹⁹ Source: Terms of Reference.

²⁰ The indicator linked to the goal is: "Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/systems, by sex, distinguishing children, unemployed persons, older persons, persons with disabilities, pregnant women, new-borns, work-injury victims and the poor and the vulnerable".

²¹ <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/indicators-list>

²² Source: <https://www.social-protection.org/gimi/gess/ShowProject.action?id=2950>

²³ Source: *Building social protection floors for all - global flagship programme strategy (2016-20)*.

as EIIP).²⁴ The objectives of this programme component are to enhance the employment content of infrastructure investments, as well as environmental measures for the restoration and management (adaptation/mitigation) of natural resources; and (ii) encourage governments to institutionalize local resource-based employment-intensive approaches in their national investment programmes and policies.²⁵

EIIP includes public works as a safety net measure which can enable workers and household members to earn additional incomes through participating in local activities and thereby creating community assets that help to improve the quality of life of the entire community. Public works include natural resources management, reforestation, and water management, and land recovery, construction of terraces to mitigate erosion, water source protection, and small-scale irrigation schemes, among others that improve the well-being of communities -if well designed, constructed and maintained by communities.

Through combining social protection and employment intensive investment activities through public works activities, the ILO and IA initially agreed to provide technical support and advice in the involved five programme countries through an integrated approach.

1.2 THE PROGRAMME: INCLUSIVE GROWTH, SOCIAL PROTECTION AND JOBS

The ILO programme under evaluated here is entitled Inclusive Growth, Social Protection and Jobs Programme (2016-2021). Irish Aid is the funding agency and development partner for the five years of implementation (2016-2021). It started with a six months inception phase during which consultative meetings and workshops were organised with stakeholders within the government, workers and employers organisations, as well as CSOs, and other private sector actors. The programme set up technical working groups Technical Working Groups were established in Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique and Tanzania and plans were revised as a result of the consultations and wider participation of the key stakeholders.²⁶

The programme contributes to the ILO's Global Flagship Programme on Building social protection floors for all 2016-30 and to the Decent Work Agenda. The agreement with IA is to support the countries, together with the ILO constituents, in strengthening national policies, programmes/schemes on social protection to benefit the most vulnerable people in these countries.

In 2016/2017 negotiations with the donor agency resulted in the decision to have the new partnership programme combine a social protection with an employment intensive investment programme (EIIP) component was taken and in full consultation with the donor. Initially this was a 50-50 per cent split of the budget. It was agreed that all involved countries would implement both components, starting with Mozambique. The idea was to focus on ILO's strengths in fostering sustainable institutional changes that can impact people's lives. Institutional changes would be achieved by supporting the formulation of national social protection and EIIP strategies based on national dialogue involving government representatives from ministries of health, labour, agriculture, social welfare, finance and other relevant ministries; trade unions; employer organizations and the civil society.²⁷ However, very early this idea was dropped and the EIIP components for Zambia, Malawi Mozambique were removed, i.e. implementation in these countries and in Viet Nam has focused on SP component only, while Tanzania implements only the EIIP component without the SP component.

The overall **goal** is that national governments use appropriate, well designed and well managed social protection measures and employment promoting approaches in the delivery of public investments in order to promote resilience, access to services and employment opportunities for poor and vulnerable people, contributing to Inclusive Economic Growth.²⁸ The programme builds capacities and knowledge

²⁴ Earlier ILO implemented related activities through the Special Public Works Programme (SPWP).

²⁵ Source: [https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/employment-intensive-investment/publications/WCMS_619821/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/employment-intensive-investment/publications/WCMS_619821/lang-en/index.htm)

²⁶ Source: Development Cooperation Progress Report (DCPR) for Tanzania, covering January, 2017 to June 2017, compiled by Tapera Jeffrey Muzira, 29 June 2017.

²⁷ Much of the information on EIIP has been provided by ILO EIIP programme staff in the Inception report (V1).

²⁸ Source: Project Document. It is noted that there isn't any overall objective stated in the body of this document.

of national stakeholders in selected countries; the programme builds and shares knowledge on how to develop policies, systems and schemes on social protection and employment-intensive investment programs.

The programme has both a regional and a national scope. It is designed to benefit the *ultimate programme participants* (“beneficiaries”) – in fact all the women and men in the countries involved, with a focus on people living in poverty and vulnerable groups such as women, the elderly, people with disabilities, ethnic minorities and self-employed workers. However, the *direct beneficiaries* are the government ministries and agencies active in the area of social protection, such as employer and worker representatives, and civil society organisations (CSO) and academia.

The reasoning was that institutional changes could be achieved by supporting the formulation of national social protection and EIPP strategies based on national dialogue involving government representatives from ministries of health, labour, agriculture, social welfare, finance and other relevant ministries; trade unions; employer organizations and the civil society.²⁹

The following show the original **Immediate objectives** (which in the ILO documentation is a term used interchangeably with **Outcomes**) and **Outputs** for the five countries **as they are stated in the only approved version of the PRODOC**. Known changes made to these original, approved LFA elements are clearly stated below the ones from the PPRODOC.

They are followed by the revisions made as they have been presented by the respective project teams (Viet Nam and Tanzania have made revisions. Tanzania’s Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) is not part of the overall programme’s LFA, but has its own LFA matrix which has alterations both in outcomes, and outputs). Changes made are also shown below.

Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia have the same four immediate objectives, as stated in the programme’s LFA, as follows³⁰:

3. **A well informed political and public debate on social protection**

Outputs

- 1.1. Increased involvement of key social protection stakeholders (media, academic/research institutions, members of parliament) in awareness raising and advocacy initiatives to promote their active engagement in debates around social protection reform.
- 1.2. Debates and communication campaigns involving the general public as well as key stakeholders (e.g. from academia, cooperating partners, civil society, private sector, organizations of beneficiaries, government implementers at various levels) enhance public understanding and engagement with social protection issues.
- 1.3. Increased capacity of civil society organizations, worker and employer organizations to engage and shape the debate on reform of social protection systems.

2. **Institutional coordination and rights-based approaches for effective delivery of social protection floors**

Outputs

- 2.1. Critical knowledge of institutional/governance/legal frameworks gaps in the social protection sector at national and district levels available to stakeholders.
- 2.2. Approaches to a) improve institutional coordination, governance and programme integration and b) adopt right-based approaches in the delivery of social protection at central, district and community level have been developed.
- 2.3. Increased technical, leadership and transformation capacity of implementers of non-contributory social protection programmes to manage and implement non-contributory social

²⁹ Much of the information on EIPP has been provided by ILO EIPP programme staff in the Inception report (V1).

³⁰ The evaluator was informed that not all programme staff had access to the LFA and it was not circulated to all at the time of the evaluation (all staff should have easy access to the LFA including modifications done in countries).

protection programs through exposure to TRANSFORM training curriculum and other ITC-ILO training opportunities.

2.4. Findings from assessments/reviews/analyses of public works programmes and their role within social protection systems contribute to clarify/enhance synergies and articulation with other social protection interventions (jointly with EIIP).

3. A comprehensive national social protection policy and a prioritised implementation plan³¹

Outputs

3.1. Successors to existing national social protection policies/strategies developed/evaluated/updated based on social protection floor principles and national dialogue process.

3.2. Prioritized implementation plans and planning tools for social protection policies/strategies have been developed and progress is monitored through administrative and survey data.

4. A sustainable and progressively domestically funded social protection financing framework

Outputs

4.1. Key social protection stakeholders have increased knowledge base around budgeting/costing, cost-benefit analysis and the social and economic impact of social protection spending.

4.2. Appropriate financing modalities, approaches and plans are developed in relation to the expansion of social protection floors.

The immediate objectives and outputs for Viet Nam:

- 3. The Master Plan for Social Assistance Reform (2017-2025) and Action Plan for Implementation of MPSAR (2016-2020) are implemented, in line with fiscal context.**

Outputs

1.1. Assessments, recommendations and dialogues to support the development of social assistance policies and schemes, including on emergency assistance, through reviewing international experiences, legal, institutional, and financial assessments. These assessments will include gender considerations.

1.2. Recommendations and policy options aimed at improving linkages between contributory and tax-funded systems, to ensure universal coverage at an adequate level, are developed in dialogue with national stakeholders.

1.3. Capacity building and advocacy programme for stakeholders (Government, National Assembly deputies, social partners, civil society, academics) to take informed decisions on social protection policy is designed and implemented.

1.4. Communication materials to raise public awareness and support for social protection and to ensure understanding of available schemes are developed and disseminated; the communication material will be developed taking into consideration gender sensitivities.

2 An adequate legal framework is in place reflecting the MPSAR's objectives, with special attention given to social assistance for older persons, pregnant women, children, emergency relief and social assistance services.

Outputs

- 2.1. Draft Social Assistance Law and sub-legal documents are developed and existing legislation is revised to enhance the rights-based approach to social protection.
- 2.2. Capacity building trainings for drafting teams and technical staff at MOLISA on social protection law drafting are designed and delivered.

3. Implementation of social protection programmes is more effective and efficient through improved administration, coordination and monitoring and evaluation.

Outputs

- 3.1. Capacity building programme for national constituents on key aspects of social protection administration and implementation is designed, referring to TRANSFORM and pursuing collaboration with other UN agencies and the MOLISA Cadre Academy

Below are the revisions made to the immediate objectives/outcomes in the Project Document for Viet Nam:

3. The Master Plan for Social Assistance Reform (2017-2025), and the Master Plan for Social Insurance Reform and their Action Plans are implemented for an integrated SP system, in line with fiscal context.
2. An adequate legal framework is in place reflecting MPSAR & MPSIR objectives, with special attention given to social assistance for older persons, pregnant women, children, emergency relief and social assistance services.
3. Implementation of social protection programmes is more effective and efficient through improved administration, coordination and monitoring and evaluation.

Immediate objectives for EIIP Tanzania – (from the Project document)

Project objective: Pro-poor investment policy, strategy and programmes address rampant unemployment and social protection deficits in target areas and contribute towards poverty reduction, social welfare and wealth creation

Outcome 1: Pro-employment Investment strategies mainstreamed in the national Productive Social Safety Net Programme

Outputs

- 1.1: Employment-intensive investment in public infrastructure promoted through national dialogues, public debates as well as south-south collaboration
- 1.2: A multi-pronged strategy or action plan that promotes decent jobs and SPF developed or based on recent ISPA-PW assessment tool

Outcome 2: Sustainable public procurement policies and legal frameworks reformed and adopted that increase participation of small scale enterprises and communities in infrastructure delivery

Outputs

- 2.1: Awareness and knowledge about equitable procurement system increased through public dialogue
- 2.2: Procurement systems and tools for services and works executed by emerging small scale enterprises and community contractors developed and disseminated.
- 2.3: Capacity of local authorities, emerging enterprises and community contractors for the use of improved procurement procedures and documents enhanced
- 2.4: Project design and packaging by local authorities involved in TASAF programme improved

Outcome 3: Capacity for an effective coordination and implementation of public works and beneficiary targeting system developed for the TASAF Productive Social Safety Nets (PSSN)

Outputs

3.1: Planning, implementation and monitoring systems and procedures at the local authorities streamlined and enhanced to ensure quality and productivity of public works component of PSSN

3.2: Local employment intensive training institutions enabled to support TASAF programme

3.3: Capacities of regional and local stakeholders developed in the area of governance and administration of PW programmes

Outcome 4: Employment-intensive investment programme operations are efficient, productive and provide quality infrastructure works and documented through impact evaluations.

Outputs

4.1: Supervision and quality assurance systems for contract works developed and disseminated

4.2: Community participation in the planning, monitoring and delivery of public infrastructure development increased

4.3: Project impact and lessons captured for knowledge sharing, up-scaling/ replication

Revision of the EIIP LFA provided by the project manager in Tanzania:³²

Outcome 1: Inclusive and transparent pro-employment investment strategies mainstreamed in national employment policies and programmes, with implementation guidelines

Outputs

1.1: Country-level knowledge on the impact of sectorial and trade policies on productive and decent employment strengthened through Employment Impact Assessments (EmpIA) and ISPA PW Tool Assessments

1.2: Employment-intensive investment in public infrastructure promoted through national dialogues, public debates as well as south-south collaboration.

Outcome 2: Sustainable public procurement policies and legal frameworks reformed and adopted that increase participation of small scale enterprises and communities in the infrastructure delivery.

Outputs

2.1: Awareness and knowledge about equitable procurement system increased through public dialogue as well as south-south corporation

2.2: Procurement systems and tools for services and works executed by emerging small scale enterprises and community contractors developed and disseminated

2.3: Community participation in the planning, design, implementation and monitoring of public infrastructure development increased

Outcome 3: Employment-intensive investment planning and technical capacity of institutional partners strengthened

Outputs

3.1: Innovative EI technology options for rural and urban infrastructure development mainstreamed in the TEVET colleges and sector-based technical training institutions

3.2: Local employment intensive training institutions enabled to support TASAF programme

³² These are the revised LFA elements of the EIIP component in Tanzania, presented by the EIIP project team as *inserted text* in the first draft evaluation report.

3.3: Capacities of regional and local stakeholders developed in the area of governance and administration of PW programmes

Outcome 4: Employment-intensive investment programme operations are efficient, productive and provide quality infrastructure works and documented through impact evaluations.

Outputs

4.1: Supervision and quality assurance systems for contract works developed and disseminated

4.2: Community participation in the planning, monitoring and delivery of public infrastructure development increased

4.3: Project impact and lessons captured for knowledge sharing, up-scaling/ replication

Immediate objectives/ outcomes, Global (SP component) (GLO)

Outcome 1. Cross-country technical assistance in specific areas

Outputs

1.1. Reviews of legal frameworks in the social protection sector at national and district levels are carried out in Malawi (ref: Output 2.1)

1.2. Draft Social Assistance Law and sub-legal documents are developed and existing legislation is revised to enhance the rights-based approach to social protection in Viet Nam (ref: Output 2.1)

1.3. Capacity building trainings for drafting teams and technical staff at MOLISA on social protection law drafting are designed and delivered in Viet Nam (ref: Output 2.2)

1.4. Successors to existing national social protection policies/strategies are developed/evaluated/updated based on social protection floor principles and national dialogue process in Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia (ref: Output 3.1)

1.5. Prioritized implementation plans for social protection policies/strategies are developed and progress is monitored on a regular basis in Malawi and Zambia (ref: Output 3.2)

Outcome 2. Documentation of information and expertise and development of training resources

Outputs

2.1. Best practices on building and managing SPFs in Africa and Viet Nam are documented.

2.2. The TRANSFORM Training Package on Building Social Protection Floors is made available and accessed through multiple channels (e.g. online, embedded in regular national and regional trainings, on-demand training via roster of regional trainers).

2.3. The content of this training package is enriched with additional case studies and modules (e.g. linkages between social protection and agriculture; shock-responsive social protection; extension of coverage to workers in the informal economy; specific modules on leadership and transformation).

Outcome 3. Capacity building of practitioners and national trainers in Southern and Eastern Africa as well as in Viet Nam and knowledge sharing

Outputs

3.1. Capacities of staff from national governments, employer and worker organizations, civil society organizations are developed

- 3.2. Capacities of national trainers are developed so that they are able to deliver the TRANSFORM trainings in their respective countries
- 3.3. Regional Community of Practice established
- 3.4. Labour minister-level sub-regional meetings address key issues related to social protection policy
- 3.5. Regional knowledge sharing events on rights-based universal social protection organized in collaboration with SASPEN

1.2.1 Management arrangements

The Programme is decentralised and managed by ILO Office in Lusaka for Zambia, Malawi, and Mozambique. In Tanzania, the ILO Dar es Salaam office manages the components. The ILO office in Hanoi manages the Viet Nam component. ILO provides technical backstopping through the Flagship programme on “Building Social Protection Floors for All”, Social Protection Department (SOCPRO); the Development and Investment Branch (DEVINVEST), Employment Department, and the Decent Work Country Teams (DWCT) in Bangkok and Pretoria, respectively.

Staff members at Partnering for Development Department (PARDEV) are involved in the Programme through its interactions with the donor agency.

1.2.2 Key stakeholders and programme participants

The stakeholders are the ILO tripartite constituents: the respective governments and ministries responsible for social protection/social security policies and programmes; the Employers Federations/Chamber of Commerce (as in Viet Nam) and the Workers Unions in the respective countries (direct beneficiaries).

Other Partner organisations that the programme has established cooperation or contacts with, are also stakeholders, such as other UN and international agencies (UNICEF, UNDP et. al), World Bank, Bilateral aid agencies, and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and other Civil Society Organisations (CSOs). Women, elderly, people with disabilities, ethnic minorities and self-employed workers are the designated “ultimate beneficiaries”.

2 MIDTERM EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

This chapter includes the purposes and objectives of the Midterm evaluation, as well as the users, scope and deliverables.

2.1 PURPOSES, OBJECTIVES, USERS, SCOPE AND DELIVERABLES OF THE EVALUATION

The overall **purpose** of this evaluation is to support accountability and to inform project improvement and organizational learning. The specific **objectives** were to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the project's interventions; Assess issues of project design, implementation and administration; Assess the challenges affecting the achievement of the objectives, factors that hindered or facilitated achievement so far, and effectiveness of management arrangements for each component.

The Midterm evaluation report was intended to improve the design, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and overall sustainability of the programme and facilitate the final independent evaluation. The purpose is thus also to document lessons learned and good practices that will help to inform the reminding cycle of the project implementation as well as informing similar projects in the future;³³ Other purposes of the evaluation are to provide stakeholders and national partners with the necessary information, analysis and vision to learn from the evaluation and, on this basis, to adjust programme planning and implementation so that maximum use is made of the remaining resources until its completion in December 2021. The evaluation was intended to provide concrete recommendations that can strengthen strategic and operational planning, management processes, ways of working and analytical capacities of the project teams and partners at all levels.

The **intended users** (stakeholders, clients) of the evaluation are the following:

- Irish Aid, the donor agency/development partner within the framework of its new Strategy for Development countries launched in 2017;
- ILO units: Social Protection (SOCPRO), Development for Investment (DEVINVEST) and Partnering for Development (PARDEV) departments at the ILO Headquarters in Geneva; ILO offices in Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania and Viet Nam and the staff of the Decent Work Country Teams (DWCT) involved in the Program in Pretoria, South Africa and Bangkok, Thailand.
- Relevant ILO constituents (Government ministries, Employer Federations and Workers Unions); and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs);
- UN agencies working with social protection and employment themes in the (UNJP-SPP) programmes e.g. UNICEF, UNDP and bilateral development organisations also supporting social protection.

The **scope** of the independent evaluation includes a “review and assessment of all outputs, activities and workflows carried out under the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme 2016-2021 in the five implementing countries and at the global level during the project's start date of 20 December 2016 to 30 August 2019.”³⁴ Although Mozambique is part of the programme, the evaluation field visits were only made to Viet Nam, Zambia, Malawi, Tanzania and Zanzibar (and in that very same order). An in-depth interviews were conducted with the responsible ILO official in Maputo, Mozambique, to collect information on progress of implementation.

The following are the **five deliverables** of the Mid Term Evaluation: A final Inception report; a (virtual) Stakeholder Workshop presenting the preliminary findings, following field visits to Viet Nam, Zambia, Malawi and Tanzania. The main purpose was to solicit clarification on the findings or receive comments and more information from the stakeholders; A (draft) Evaluation report with annexes; a Final

³³ According to the ToR, the *focus* of the evaluation is to provide lessons learned that can be applied to the project during its remaining duration, in addition to good practices that may possibly could be replicated in other countries. The actual scope is to November 2019, when the data collection in the field ended.

Evaluation report including an Executive summary and annexes; a (separate) Evaluation Summary; and a PowerPoint presentation based on the Executive summary of the final evaluation report.

3 METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS

This chapter lists the **evaluation criteria** that the evaluation is applying, and the **evaluation questions** that have been agreed upon in the final Inception Report. The approach, data collection methods and their limitations and evaluation norms to be adhered to throughout the process are also part of this chapter.

3.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Five standard **evaluation criteria** are applied in the evaluation: Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability³⁵. The following **evaluation questions** have guided the data gathering and evaluation process:³⁶

Relevance

1. Has the Programme design duly addressed the national development priorities, the UNDAFs, the DWCP, the donor's priorities and concerns, and is it aligned with ILO's Global Policy Outcomes, the SDGs and relevant targets (especially those identified as priority in the national development strategies), and has it adequately considered the specific context of each country?
2. How does the programme design fit with ongoing national (or other) trends in social protection and does anything need to be changed to align better – and how does the project interface/cooperate with other partners in the respective countries?
3. To what extent are the Programme's strategic elements in the design (objectives, outputs, implementation strategies, targets and indicators) and risks/assumptions based on a Theory of Change (ToC) and SMART³⁷ and effectively integrating the interests of different stakeholders and ultimate programme participants ("beneficiaries") of social protection and labour intensive programmes (and were the risk factors/assumptions updated after the start of the Programme)?
4. How has synergy between the two major components (social protection and employment intensive investment activities) been explained and does the implementation strategy ensure synergies between the two?
5. How has the programme advanced the ILO's flagship programme Social Protection Floors for All?

Effectiveness

6. To what extent have the overall Programme objectives/outcomes and expected outputs, qualitatively and quantitatively been achieved – and what are the areas for further reinforcement of the project achievements?
7. Is the project likely to achieve its medium and long-term outcomes by the end of the programme, and if not, what are the key factors that constrain/potentially constrain achieving the programme's intended results? Were there any unplanned effects (negative or positive)?
8. In which areas has tripartism (Governments', Employers' and Workers Unions') been integrated successfully and to what extent have the social partners been involved and participated in the planning and implementation of the Programme? To what level is the

³⁵ These are the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria for evaluating development assistance. Source: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>. This midterm evaluation report is intended to improve the design, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and overall sustainability of the programme. It is also intended to help inform the final independent evaluation.

³⁶ As the original list of questions had as many 30 evaluation questions, the evaluation has combined questions to make the data/ information analysis and processing more manageable, and more reader-friendly presentation – without losing any important issue or question along the way (source: Final Inception report).

³⁷ Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timebound.

implementation duly coordinated with other ILO, UN and government initiatives in social protection and public works?

Effectiveness of management arrangements

9. How effective are the project management arrangements in practice, in view of the fact that the programme is decentralised and managed by ILO Office in Lusaka for Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique program; in Tanzania managed by the ILO Dar es Salaam office and that ILO Hanoi manages the Viet Nam component?
10. Is the project able to leverage expertise in the field and at headquarters? Are administrative modalities adequate to facilitate good results and efficient delivery of the programme? Are there areas where management processes could be improved? How is the project's management approach perceived by ILO technical units, implementing partners and others (could include collaborators and Irish Aid in country)?
11. How effectively does the programme management monitor performance and results? Is relevant information and data regularly collected and analysed to feed into management decisions?
12. Does this programme receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners, the ILO, and the donor?

Efficiency

13. What evidence is there of cost-effectiveness in the Programme's implementation and management?
14. Have project's funds and outputs been used and delivered in a timely manner? If not – what are the reasons?
15. What are the partnership arrangements in the implementation of the Programme at various levels (national, regional and interagency)? What are the challenges in the formulation of these partnerships and the results – and how could this be improved?

Sustainability and impact

16. What actions/interventions by the ILO and the donor have been undertaken to ensure that the achievements of the programme can be met and sustained and to what extent is the project focusing on results/impact?
17. To what extent do the ILO Constituents express ownership of the Programme and its results and is there any signs/evidence that the programme activities will be integrated into their respective structures?

3.2 APPROACH

The Terms of Reference (ToR) called for the evaluation to be mainly qualitative, participatory and constructive in its approach. The evaluation used varied methods to gather quantitative and qualitative data. Qualitative data/information has been collected from primary sources particularly during field visits in Malawi, Zambia, Tanzania and Zanzibar, and Viet Nam. Quantitative data was drawn from secondary sources only (as no separate quantitative survey was part of this evaluation), i.e. from Project Documents (here also referred to as PRODOCs), programme Annual and six-monthly Progress Reports, evaluation reports and other relevant documents, as well as websites. To the extent possible the evaluation has identified intended and direct positive and negative changes resulting from the project activities. It has also attempted to identify any unintended (not planned) and indirect changes resulting from the programme implementation.

3.3 DATA COLLECTION METHODS, DATA SOURCES AND SAMPLING AND LIMITATIONS TO THE METHODS USED

Below the methods and sources used to gather qualitative and quantitative information and data are listed:

3.3.1 Comprehensive review of relevant documentation

The documentation review was comprehensive and involved a great number of documents. Reviewing documents has been continuous as more documents (apart from those provided initially) surfaced during the course of the work. The key documents are policy documents, ILO Minutes on ILO-Irish funding agreements and Memoranda of Understanding (MoU), Programme Documents and LFA matrices, Annual and six-monthly progress reports; Work plans and activity plans; Guidelines and Manuals; Training materials; Key programme studies/research, Evaluation reports, and other technical reports and publications that the programme has carried out (Annex III). *A limitation in terms of access to documentation was that the LFAs was not annexed to the PPRODOC, but was provided separately* and some of the ILO staff claimed (in their response to the first draft report) that they themselves had not have access to a PPRODOC with the LFA annexed to it.

3.3.2 Semi-structured in-depth interviews

In-depth semi-structured interviews of about 45 minutes to more than an hour were held with ILO staff and key stakeholders at international, regional and national level including ILO staff based at Headquarters in Geneva, ILO regional offices (Bangkok and Pretoria offices), ILO programme staff and former programme staff, representatives of national government ministries, government agencies in all countries visited (decision-makers/policy-makers, technical officers and administrative staff); Employers Federations and Workers organisations, UN organisations and bilateral donor representatives (IA in Dublin and Embassies in the countries visited), private sector actors, and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs).

Altogether eighty-seven persons participated in interviews and (eight) focus discussions were conducted (Annex VI). Semi-structured interviews (face-to-face) were used for both factual/content-related and sensitive subjects to be addressed, allowing for clarification of the information collected. In-depth interviews were important as a data-collection evaluation method as they allow for clarification, and are used to rectify and/or up-date quantitative data obtained from the documentation review. They provided information about internal arrangements, distribution of roles and tasks among staff within the consulted organisations. They also allowed for better appreciation of various challenges faced in implementing the programme within the respective organisation. The topics that the interviews addressed related to perception and knowledge; processes, content of the program under evaluation; achievements and impact (and lack thereof); systems; work environment; challenges limitations; as well as visions. A limitation to the use of semi-structured interviews is that there is a risk of bias. This was mitigated by posing the same key questions to as many interviewees as possible before, during and after the field visits in the four countries, and through triangulation.

3.3.3 Focused discussions

Seven focus group discussions (FGD) were held. It was initially anticipated that the limitation of this method could be that the presence of an authority (informal or formal), among the persons attending the discussion, could inhibit some to express their opinions or provide information freely. This was mitigated through ensuring homogenous groupings as much as possible and applying triangulation to i.e. collecting the sane/similar data and information from more than one source.

3.3.4 Questionnaire survey

The evaluator sent a questionnaire survey to ILO programme staff in the field attached to through an email. The questionnaire composed mainly open-ended questions (Annex VII, section 6.9). A limitation to the use of this method is that it was only used to generate responses from ILO staff, not from other stakeholders.

3.3.5 Sample selection of respondents and sites

The programme countries that were visited were pre-determined by the client. The sample selection of respondents (interviews, focused discussions and questionnaire survey) was *purposive sampling*³⁸, in consultation with the ILO. The main goal was to capture stakeholders that had interacted with the

³⁸ Also named *selective* or *subjective sampling*.

programme in order to collect first-hand information on experiences, successes and lessons learnt from programme implementation. Purposive sampling in the selection of interviewees has a risk of bias, which was mitigated by triangulation.

3.3.6 Quality Assurance

The methods described above were considered appropriate to acquire answers to the questions in section 3.1 including analysing gender equality, disability inclusion and other non-discrimination issues as cross-cutting concerns. Attention was paid to ensure data quality – including evidence that could support the reliability and validity of the data collection tools. The evaluator took hand written notes which were transcribed to her computer file via voice-recorder. In-country debriefing sessions were held with ILO project staff member(s) at the end of the country visits. Methodological triangulation and cross-checking were applied in analysing the responses and information received, to ensure credibility and validity of the results. It is assessed that the good use of the methods have outweighed their limitations.

3.4 EVALUATION NORMS AND STANDARDS

The evaluator have adhered to the ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines and relevant Guidance Notes, specifically Checklist No. 3. Writing the inception report, Checklist No. 5 Preparing the evaluation report (including the templates for lessons and good practices).

Regarding gender issues other ILO documents have guided the analysis: Guidance 1.1 Integrating Gender Equality in Monitoring and Evaluation; Illustrated Guidelines for Gender-Responsive Employment Intensive Investment Programmes (2013), and ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality (2018-2021). UN Norms and Standards for Evaluations have been adhered to, including the UN ethical guidelines which addresses confidentiality issues³⁹ and UNEG’s Code of Conduct for evaluations in the UN system.⁴⁰

³⁹ UNEG’s Ethical Guidelines (2007) states “Evaluators shall respect people’s right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality. Evaluators must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source so that the relevant individuals are protected from reprisals.” In the UN Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2017) it is referred to as follows: “...interactions with participants: engaging appropriately and respectfully with participants in evaluation processes, upholding the principles of confidentiality and anonymity and their limitations; dignity and diversity; human rights; gender equality; and the avoidance of harm” (p. 21).

⁴⁰ UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System, UNEG, March 2008.

4 MIDTERM EVALUATION FINDINGS

The overall key findings and achievement of the Mid Term evaluation are summarised in this chapter. They are in response to the evaluation questions listed in each of the evaluation criteria. It ends with a brief account of how the programme has been able to address cross-cutting issues.

4.1 OVERALL FINDINGS

In November 2013, ILO and Irish Aid initiated a partnership programme based on objectives and principles shared between Ireland and the ILO. Support for increased effectiveness and results-based management was an important feature as was the rights-based approach in program implementation. It was agreed to support Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique, through their governments, in strengthening national policies, programmes/schemes on social protection to benefit the most vulnerable people in these countries. The duration of this first technical assistance programme on social protection floors was 2013- 2016, and a budget of EUR 1.2 million was allocated for implementation.

The current programme, entitled Inclusive Growth, Social Protection and Jobs, was officially launched in 2016 and included a 6-months inception period. It started effectively in 2017 and will be completed in December 2021. The programme covers five countries namely: Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zanzibar and Viet Nam. The total budget of EUR 9.35 million that was to be divided between the five country components and a global social protection component implemented at ILO headquarters. Thus, in comparison to the former regional SP programme, the new has added an employment intensive investment component, namely public works in Tanzania – and one new country, namely Viet Nam.

The reasons for these additions are not completely clear, but it is understood that ILO has worked earlier with TASAF in Tanzania and assessed that public works in the country would well compliment the SP themes in the other countries. Public works is a safety net intervention that enables enrolled households to earn a seasonal income. All households enrolled under Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) of TASAF can participate in labor intensive public works and earn an income during hunger season and protect their productive assets.

The reason for adding Viet Nam under the new umbrella programme, being a country with higher level of economic development than the others, and being geographically “off”, is explained in the Prodoc as presenting opportunities to further develop its social protection system.⁴¹ Despite the differences, some similar challenges were seen as those faced by the Southern African countries and having Viet Nam involved could open an opportunity for other countries ASEAN, and vice versa: The work done on social protection in ASEAN countries could inspire the involved African countries.

Thus, apart from Social Protection Department (SOCPRO), now the Development and Investment Branch (DEVINVEST) became involved, through its EIIP programme and the intention was that it would provide technical support from the Decent Work Team (DWT) in Pretoria. The Development and Investment Branch is, among other, promoting employment-intensive investment strategies and economic diversification to enhance employment and productivity growth. It views public employment programmes, as part and parcel of Social Protection Floors, offering integrated employment and income security to un- and under-employed people *and in particular disadvantaged and vulnerable groups*.⁴²

The intention was that the new program not only would add two countries to the ones that had existed in the earlier SP regional project but that each of them would implement social protection and employment intensive (public works) themes, i.e. that the two themes would go hand-in-hand. Thus, in the Project Document (the steering document for the program), each of the countries would have a social protection and an employment intensive investment component. Part of the rationale is that poverty and vulnerability are caused by inadequate levels of income and persistent irregular employment – thus, providing regular, adequate incomes can *build resilience and inclusive economic growth* to people who are living in poverty and have little access to public services, market and goods.

⁴¹ Prodoc, p. 51.

⁴² Source: <https://www.ilo.org/employment/lang--en/index.htm>.

The target group/beneficiaries are those who are vulnerable i.e. women, youth, landless, children, and people with disabilities.⁴³

This evaluation's scope includes the activities undertaken and the achievement generated since 2016-up to November 2019. The key actors in Malawi and Zambia typically perceive the evaluated program as an extension of the previous ILO implemented program entitled *Building National Social Protection Floors in Southern Africa Programme* which ended in 2016. This was also funded by Irish Aid. Thus, many actors do not perceive it as a new or different project. The majority of the interviewees are not aware that Viet Nam and Tanzania are part of the current Program.

Further, very few project staff and former staff, and very few national stakeholders and ILO staff have expressed that they perceive the different projects in the five countries (Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania and Viet Nam) as constituting *one* programme. Most SP partners are not aware of the EIIP component in Tanzania, and vice versa: most program partners in Tanzania and Zanzibar are not aware that there are four countries implementing only SP activities under the same overall umbrella programme.⁴⁴ This evaluation has also found that the links and coordination between the project activities are not strong and particularly so after the CTA (for the social protection component in Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique based in Lusaka) left his post in January 2019.⁴⁵

The Prodoc mentions a number of conventions that the programme, in its design and implementation, relate to: Employment Policy Convention, 1964 (No. 122), the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102), and the Recommendation concerning National Floors of Social Protection, 2012 (No. 202), which among other states that social security is a human right. The R.202 is the one most often referred to by the ILO staff and stakeholders, recommending that countries should have at least the below-mentioned social security guarantees, defined at the national level:

- 1) Access to essential health care, including maternity care;
- 2) Basic income security for children, providing access to nutrition, education, care and any other necessary goods and services; and
- 3) Basic income security for persons in active age who are unable to earn sufficient income, in particular in cases of sickness, unemployment, maternity and disability; and 4) Basic income security for older persons.⁴⁶

4.2 ACHIEVEMENT AT COUNTRY LEVEL

The key findings of the country projects are summarised here, while Annex II of this report gives a more detailed account, including challenges faced by the individual projects.

4.2.1 Social protection components in Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique (RAF) and Viet Nam

The work in Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique builds on experiences made and networks established in the previously implemented SP regional project which ended in 2016. The SP component has achieved good progress and is on track with most of the planned outputs both at country and regional level.

Zambia

In Zambia the Integrated Framework for Basic Social Protection is referenced in the 7th NDP to guide programming and implementation of future social protection programmes e.g through introduction of a

⁴³ Source: Project Document.

⁴⁴ One example is the fact that the ToR for the Project Steering Committee for EIIP component in Tanzania and Zanzibar does mention the structure of programme – however, it only mentions the outcomes of the Tanzania EIIP which all are employment oriented.

⁴⁵ Source: In-depth interviews, FGDs and Questionnaire Survey results. NB: This finding has been contradicted by a project staff member who has claimed that the three countries have collaborated through regional knowledge –sharing meetings in person and by webinars.

⁴⁶ Source: https://www.ilo.org/secsoc/areas-of-work/legal-advice/WCMS_205341/lang--en/index.htm.

“single windows” initiatives implemented in collaboration with UNICEF and WFP under UNJP- SP.⁴⁷ Technical inputs have been made in reviewing national social protection policy documents including the framework. The strategy promotes the approach to *combine* different social protection interventions in the country – and move away from the “silo” situation with the purpose of harmonizing planning, budgeting, targeting and delivery.

The country level activities contribute to the need of building robust delivery systems and sustainable capacity to lead and manage complexity and scale of social protection systems. They have also increased the realisation for the need to devise comprehensive social protection systems that *combine* contributory and non-contributory elements and that can enhance coverage across the lifecycle. The programme is actively involving the key stakeholders and holds weekly meetings with the planning team of the Ministry of Community Development Social Services (MoCDSS). It is also active within the current UN Joint Program on SP (UNJP-SP) and UNICEF, WFP and has contributed to the Social Protection Joint Annual Reviews. CSOs (through Civil Society for Poverty Reduction. CSPR) are engaged in issues related to social accountability, participation, and transparency issues related to social protection.

The ILO provides the secretariat and coordination Hub for the TRANSFORM training package. This role includes coordination of all development of new materials, modules and coordination of trainings in the region. The Hub is funded by the Irish Aid – Inclusive Growth social protection and Jobs programme.⁴⁸ The project team has engaged stakeholders and social partners through capacity building on non-contributory social protection programs: Technical and financial support have been given through TRANSFORM learning package on building and managing national social protection floors. This learning package targets practitioners interested in increasing their leadership capacities and stakeholders both at national and sub-national levels (provinces, districts). These are found at political decision making level, technical mid management/technical level as well as operational (lower) level.⁴⁹

The evaluation found that this training and the concepts it promotes on social protection is quite well-known and appreciated amongst the majority of the key stakeholders interviewed. An exception was the representative of the Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MoLSS) who opined that the training was not relevant for this ministry and its officials as he understood that it addressed the informal economy and was not appropriate for higher level officials. Other capacity-building examples are the workshops undertaken with the Zambia Institute for Policy Analysis and Research on micro-simulation models (“SOUTHMOD”) to build capacity within the government and the work through Learning and practice Lab / Community of Practice (CoP) on extension of SP coverage to the informal economy in Zambia and region - with the purpose of generating of new evidence and learning on practices.

Malawi

The evaluation has assessed that the ILO team has selected a “niche” where it can make meaningful contributions. Overall it had good working relations with the government partners and stakeholders, and the international organisations involved in this field, namely the Embassy of Ireland, UNICEF, WFP, and GIZ. In 2016 the ILO social protection component assumed a lead role and has been instrumental in the review of the national policy MNSSP I - which involved basic issues e.g. coverage, benefits, regularity of payment, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), selection of beneficiaries, finance management and coordination. Consultations were held in 3 regions with representatives of all districts, which was the basis for the design of the national policy and the development of the MNSSP II (an operational plan has been finalised and is in use). It has also developed an M&E Framework of the new policy (finalized in October 2019). The project has supported to the 3-days Social Protection Week in June 2018; held seminars and workshops for political leaders, provided of TRANSFORM training at national level for Government officials, and for CSOs. GIZ and UNICEF⁵⁰ are also involved in the Transform activities (GIZ provide funds directly to the ILO for implementation).

⁴⁷ Source: Programme staff (in writing).

⁴⁸ Source: Programme staff.

⁴⁹ Source: <https://www.social-protection.org/gimi/RessourcePDF.action?id=54383>

⁵⁰ UNICEF is involved in Transform activities in all countries.

Mozambique

The ILO is aligned to Mozambique's institutional framework for the promotion of a social protection and works in cooperation with the national SP policy holder, namely the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Action, and other international actors involved in the UNJP-SPs. Only a *few social protection activities receive funds (small amounts)* from the ILO-Irish programme under evaluation⁵¹. The relevant policies are the National Strategy for Basic Social Security and a Social Protection Act. The first Training of Trainers (ToT) in Portuguese on TRANSFORM took place in 2018 and again for INAS in 2019 (in Portuguese language). The project launched MOZMOD (the equivalent of SOUTHMOD in Zambia) and training on microsimulation modelling on financing and impact of social protection programmes in July 2019.

Viet Nam

For the Viet Nam components, the program managers had to build up trust and a social protection network in the introduction of “new projects”. The component works with the Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Assistance and the country's reform process. The component addresses two national Master reforms: on social security and social assistance, although only one of them was to be addressed originally. Developing a social protection system that brings together the different forms existing in the country is now in focus, as well as making contributions to the government on how it could implement such a system (including maternity protection). The ILO social protection project team in Viet Nam had to build working relationships and a network on social protection from scratch with the key partners and stakeholder – and work relations are strategically established directly with policy- and decision makers.

The work has include various studies on social pensions; child benefits; tax-financed social protection and extension of social security coverage and formalisation of enterprises, social assistance benefits and spending. Other achievements are reviews on different methods to establish and index benefit amounts and social assistance spending in cooperation with UNICEF. The Project was granted additional funds from the UN Joint SDG Fund for the social protection activities. Although some outputs could not be met – it was assessed that the Project has done well at midway in having a dialogue with decision-makers in two departments, cost-sharing with other ILO projects (Japanese funded) and to some extent UNICEF, and the World Bank. It has contributed to raising awareness among stakeholders about the need for a more consolidated social protection system in the country.

4.2.2 EIPP component in Tanzania

ILO has earlier contributed to the work on developing a National Social Protection Framework (NSPF) in Tanzania aiming at setting the guidance for coordination of social protection initiatives in Tanzania.⁵² The social component supports the Productive Social Safety Net (PSSN) Programme II, implemented through Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF). An Interagency Social Protection Assessment (ISPA) of the Public Works element of the PSSN was carried out early in the Project. It pointed issues/challenges at the level of TASAF that ILO could play a role in helping to solve. The result of the assessment is the basis for introducing the EIPP technical support to TASAF. The achievement of the EIPP component includes technical inputs to the revision of an earlier version of a technical manual on Public Work Programs, October 2019 – with the purpose of adapting it to the PSSN II. A study on employment impact assessment of the public works component under (a value-chain oriented study) TASAF was carried out analysing cashew nut, cotton and grapes which are the three major crops promoted by the PW component under the PSSN/TASAF. The draft report was available in November 2019 and workshop planned for the purpose of stakeholders' “validation”. A study was also carried out on procurement (a draft exists from November 2019).

A number of training events have been carried out in different areas, such as in Public Works, Labour Based Technology approaches, Entrepreneurship and Business development services, New technology in infrastructure development such as Low Volume Sealed Road. The component has organised and

⁵¹ So far USD 50,000 has been received from IA (two years).

⁵² Source: Prodoc, p. 45.

funded a two-weeks participatory training event for stakeholders in building a 100 m road with the purpose of raising awareness among partners on the essentials of PWs including environmental issues.

4.3 RELEVANCE

1. Has the Programme design duly addressed the national development priorities, the UNDAFs, the DWCP, the donor's priorities and concerns, and is it aligned with ILO's Global Policy Outcomes, the SDGs and relevant targets (especially those identified as priority in the national development strategies), and has it adequately considered the specific context of each country?

The programme *design* has generally addressed the national development priorities such as social protection policies, strategies and plans. It is also aligned with the UNDAF/UNDAP, the UNJP/SP and the relevant SDGs –as well as DWCPs and ILO's global policy outcomes.

Regarding the EIIP component, the plan to hire an EIIP staff member in Tanzania, at NPO level was postponed in 2018 as that was the beginning of the programme and the role of this person was not yet determined. During the field visit in the NPC informed the evaluator that the intention was to recruit an Engineer for the EIIP component and that a job description had been drafted for the purpose. In a discussion that followed the debriefing session in Dar es Salaam with the NPC and the Specialist on Public Works from DWT Pretoria office, the evaluator questioned the relevance of this. The Specialist suggested that instead of an Engineer, the profile of a new team member could be an environmentalist, which is assessed to be more relevant, and in particular a female staff member, as there is a clear gender imbalance in the current and former programme.

In *implementation* - all the involved programme countries are committed, to a varying extent, to achieve, or strive to achieve, the global SDGs, and have in cooperation with UN partners developed strategic partnerships and plans through the UNJP-SP programmes.⁵³ The countries also have committed to the Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) in which the extension of social protection is one of the four pillars of the decent work agenda.⁵⁴ The extent to which the stakeholders in the selected countries actively participate to work towards these goals and ILO-Irish Aid programme's objectives and outcomes is, among other, assessed by the evaluation.

2. How does the programme design fit with ongoing national (or other) trends in social protection and does anything need to be changed to align better – and how does the project interface/cooperate with other partners in the respective countries?

The programme countries (Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia, Tanzania, Viet Nam) involved in the ILO-IA programme, have national policies and trends that include social protection in some form or other. For social protection systems and schemes to function, a number of factors are to be considered such as the existence of: i) evidence on delivery and impact of social protection; ii) public awareness; iii) institutional capacity; iv) national social protection policy and plan; v) sustainable finance; and finally, vi) policies and programmes across economic and social sectors that address the needs of the people to receive social protection.⁵⁵

It was found that the ILO social protection components fits well within the ongoing trends in social protection and its cooperation with the relevant stakeholders is good overall - including the key national government agencies that are social protection policy holders in the different countries. This assessment relates also to the relevant UN agencies involved in the UNJP-SPs and civil society to the extent they are engaged. Contacts and cooperation with Government agencies exist in all countries and also with the other ILO traditional constituents (employers and workers organisations) but to a lesser extent. The Embassies are generally well informed and have good contacts with the project teams. In Zambia, the Embassy stated that the contacts with the Lusaka SP team used to be more frequent the first years. A

⁵³ Malawi has United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2019-2023; Zambia has United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (2016-2021); Tanzania has United Nations Development Assistance Programme (UNDAP); Mozambique has UNDAF 2017-2020, and Viet Nam has One Strategic Plan 2017-2021.

⁵⁴ Only the DWCPs of Viet Nam and Tanzania are available online (the DWCP for Zambia post-2016 is still under discussion.)

⁵⁵ Source: Summarised from the Programme Document, p. 6.

reason for fewer contacts with the SP team seems to be the Embassy's cessation of cooperation with the MoCDSS (due to the misappropriation of cash transfer funds in mid 2018) which is the key government partner for the SP project in Zambia. The Embassy stated that it keeps itself informed about (government) developments through the discussions within the UN group. In Tanzania, the Embassy representative stated in an interview that he has requested for more informative contacts with the EIIP component but had not received information since the Progress Report covering April to June 2019 was presented in the last PSC meeting in June the same year.⁵⁶

3. To what extent are the Programme's strategic elements in the design (objectives, outputs, implementation strategies, targets and indicators) and risks/assumptions based on a Theory of Change (ToC) and to what extent are they SMART⁵⁷? To what extent does the programme effectively integrate the interests of different stakeholders and ultimate programme participants ("beneficiaries") of social protection and labour intensive programmes (and were the risk factors/assumptions updated after the start of the Programme)?

The goal for the programme is that national governments use appropriate, well designed and well managed social protection measures and employment promoting approaches to enhance the delivery of public investments in order to promote resilience, access to services and employment opportunities for poor and vulnerable people, contributing to Inclusive Economic Growth.

The evaluation has analysed the logical structure of the programme and its strategic elements as presented in the Prodoc, the ToR; a separate LFA Matrix document⁵⁸; and (in the case of Tanzania), a separate ToC matrix for Tanzania; and text presented as *inserted parts* in the evaluation's first draft report. This situation has complicated the review and appreciation of what was actually intended for Tanzania and is addressed in section 4.4.

It was found that the Prodoc overall has a logical build-up of the different elements for most of its parts, and includes a ToC which explains in a narrative and a diagram where outputs/outcomes are placed at three different levels; i.e. community level participation is placed at the lowest level; administrative and financial solutions are at the middle level; and legal and institutional design are at the highest level – and these three levels apply to both EIIP and SP components.⁵⁹

When analysing the logic of the program structure more closely some issues were noted: The separate Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) Matrix provided to this evaluation, covers all project SP countries and the Global SP component - but does not include Tanzania (a separate LFAs exists for Tanzania). As no explanation has been provided, it is assumed that this simply a "miss". The immediate objectives/outcomes and outputs of the current program in Tanzania are different from the ones in the Prodoc (they have been revised).

Further, two *different* Development Objectives exist:

- More people have access to adequate social protection benefits delivered by more efficient and effective systems - for Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique and Viet Nam (SP component)⁶⁰; and
- Poverty reduction through improved incomes and sustainable livelihoods - for Tanzania (EIIP component).⁶¹

As it is supposed to be *one* programme, *there can only be one development objective* according to any results-based strategic framework, as this is a very high level objective toward which many stakeholders

⁵⁶ To the knowledge of the evaluation, Tanzania is the only country in which PSC has been established.

⁵⁷ Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timebound.

⁵⁸ This LFA does not include Tanzania's EIIP component structure.

⁵⁹ Prodoc, p. 62.

⁶⁰ Source: Prodoc. In Viet Nam this overall DO is referred to as the "project objective" (source: Viet Nam Work Plan).

⁶¹ Source: LFA

and actions are expected to contribute. This situation points to a lack of understanding/attention at the design stage.

Finally, in the assumptions part of SP LFA it was found that many (but not all) of the assumptions are clearly within the influence of the ILO-Irish programme and its stakeholders, thus they cannot qualify as assumptions as these should all be completely outside the control of the programme. These are examples from the LFA matrix:

“There will be *adequate consultation* and engagement of different stakeholders (especially employers, workers and civil society) in policy making processes”; “There will be *good coordination* among the large number of social protection stakeholders, including development partners, to reduce duplications and strengthen national influence”; and “*Capacity building exercises are effective* in instilling a good degree of knowledge and expertise on social protection among national staff”.

The findings above have added to the challenge in clearly determining the intention of the programme under evaluation. It is assessed that the fragmentation in the logical set up is a result of the lack of coordination and coherence during the design stage.

4. How has synergy between the two major components (social protection and employment/public works) been explained and does the implementation strategy ensure synergies between the two?

The ILO and Irish-Aid agreed that the link between income security and employment policies is fundamental to help people to access productive and decent work. At the time of this evaluation, one country (Tanzania) implements an employment intensive investment component (public works) under EIIP while the other countries only implement the SP component under SOCPRO Global programme. However, the decision not to implement the two components in all five countries was abolished very early.

Regarding funds to be spent on SP and EIIP activities, respectively, the original idea was that all countries would have *both* a SP and an EIIP component, and that there would be equal shares of the total program budget, i.e. 50 per cent for SP component and 50 per cent for the employment component. This arrangement was made for the first year, while in the second year SP was allocated 70 per cent and EIIP was allocated 30 per cent of the total budget after “dropping” Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique for EIIP activities. The EMP/INVEST had developed doubts about being involved in the program and after discussions at Headquarters, the decision was made that this particular program would implement EIIP only in Tanzania and carry on with SP in Zambia, and regionally in Malawi and Mozambique.⁶²

Technical assistance, backstopping, and regional and global knowledge development/sharing are intended to lead to the overall goal of the programme (national governments use appropriate, well designed and well managed social protection measures and employment promoting approaches). The key elements of the programme are i) improved operations, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems; ii) capacities of public institutions (private institutions, small and medium enterprises for EIIP) to design or implement SP schemes; and iii) legal frameworks, design or reform of public procurement systems/processes (regarding EIIP) and legal frameworks that concern social protection. Programme actions, *reinforced through synergies were thus intended to lead to the achievements* with high impact on job creation and social protection coverage.⁶³

Regarding the regional SP project (Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia) – the stakeholders including some of the staff in the region, generally see the programme as an extension of the earlier programme on social protection. The ILO partners, including the key constituents, more often than not perceive the projects as country projects not as part of one overall programme including both social protection, and employment activities.

The views within the programme regarding the combination of SP and EIIP activities among staff at headquarter level, field level, including social protection specialists, are surprisingly contradictory.

⁶² Source: In-dept interview with ILO Headquarter staff.

⁶³ Source: PRODOC pp. 61 and 62.

They range from “the best thing ILO has ever done”; to “public works is also social protection”, to “it makes a lot of sense, but should not be imposed on a program” to “it makes *no* sense” because public works (Public Works /Cash for Works) is not social protection which has been expressed by several SOCPRO officials at HQs.

The majority of the stakeholders, including ILO staff, hold the view that policies and schemes that provide social protection and employment generation (public works and livelihoods in this case) are closely *inter-related*. The EIIP representatives in the programme however opined that Public Works *is* social protection, and points out that this is also how the Government in Tanzania views it. It was also stated that Public Works is a form of “Food for Work” (as WFP’s FFW) and that it is more dignified/respectful to give people work than just “dishing out money” referring to social cash transfer schemes being considerable parts of social assistance/social protection interventions - stating “you have to do something to get something”.

Regarding the understanding of synergies between SP and EIIP activities in the programme evaluated, no evidence has been identified that any particular strategy or mechanisms was put in place at the onset to ensure that there would be links between the two components. A number of key ILO staff and former staff have expressed doubts as to whether the programme would *have been able* to establish the necessary synergies even if implemented together in all countries. The document review has revealed that the Final Evaluation of the “Building National Social Protection Floors in Southern Africa programme” (2017) clearly expressed doubts regarding the inclusion of EIIP component in the design under the same programme, referring to “limited apparent synergy” between the two.⁶⁴ However, as the idea of SP and EIIP to be implemented in the same countries did not materialize but was mainly a theoretical construction outlined in the Prodoc and LFA - there is no point in speculating about it.

As for Tanzania and the issue of synergy, EIIP project team has stated that the synergy between the two components lies in ensuring that employment investment activities, including public works, is part of the PSSN social protection pillars through the Ministries of Labour, Employment, Empowerment, Women and Children and to ensure that a 5-years strategic plan is developed. Public Works, which EIIP supports in Tanzania, is one of the pillars of TASAF that implements the Productive Social Safety Net (PSSN) Programme. The EIIP component focuses on investment in applying labour intensive approaches including public works – being part of the design and rationale (and outcomes) of the component.⁶⁵ The UN in Tanzania is implementing the UN Development Assistance Plan II (UNDAP II) 2017-2021 where more than twelve outcomes are to be implemented including social protection.⁶⁶

UNICEF has assumed the lead role for UN’s support to social protection in the country and provides support to TASAF PSSN program – which is EIIP’s key stakeholder - entitled Livelihoods Enhancement Program which contributes to building the foundation for graduation of beneficiaries out of poverty targeting children, youth and families⁶⁷ *However synergies in EIIP and UNICEF’s support to TASAF could not be identified during the field visit.* The ILO-EIIP annual progress reports (2018, 2019) mainly mentions UNICEF in connection with ILO’s contributions to the National Social Protection Policy 2018; participating in the same Joint Review in April 2018 and the joint support to the government of Zanzibar.

This is perhaps not surprising as the Prodoc directs the EIIP component to work with any sectoral ministries, departments and agencies that *potentially promotes and applies employment intensive approaches*. At institutional and programme level, it mentions TASAF only and at delivery level it mentions regions, districts, wards and village authorities and beneficiaries.⁶⁸ The EIIP component participates in the coordination meetings with other development partners related to the TASAF PSSN

⁶⁴ Source: Independent End-Term Evaluation of Building National Social Protection Floors in Southern Africa: Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia, Final Evaluation Report, February 2017. The fact that Viet Nam also was brought into the same programme was also questioned by that evaluation.

⁶⁵ Source: Annual Progress report 2018

⁶⁶ Source: NPC, Tanzania

⁶⁷ Source: UNDAP II 2016-2021 and written comments from the NPC Tanzania, and Cash + livelihoods within Tanzania’s Productive Social Safety Net (PSSN) Programme Experience and next steps. Transfer Project Workshop. A Power Point presentation by Mishael Fariji (TASAF) and Beatrice Targa (UNICEF).

⁶⁸ Source: Section 3.4.4 Synergies, p. 46, Project Document.

programme and the NPC coordinates ILO's technical assistance to the PSSN. It appears, however, that while a cooperation allegedly exists with other UN agencies, such as WFP (which also supports TASAF's public works), a stronger cooperation in practice with UNICEF would have been very relevant.⁶⁹ The Embassy of Ireland confirmed that it also perceives that there is a lack of visible synergy between the ILO and UNICEF activities *in direct relation* to TASAF programme (both supported through IA funds).⁷⁰

5. How has the programme advanced the ILO's flagship programme Social Protection Floors for All?

The Flagship programme aims at supporting implementation of social protection floors and providing policy advice across countries. Despite fragmentation referred to above, the evaluation has found that the programme has been able to advance the Flagship programme in a number of ways. It has supported the development of policies and strategic documents such as the Zambia National Social Protection Policy; the Malawi National Social Support Policy (NSSP) (which is operationalised by the Malawi National Social Support Programme (MNSSP II); and the Productive Social Safety Net (PSSN) Programme II. Other examples of advancing the Flagship programme are webinars, analytic studies, reviews, engagement with CSO. (More details are found under section 4.4. and Annex II.)

The regional TRANSFORM Learning activities are very important means of increasing appreciation and learning on social protection systems mainly focused on non-contributory systems.

Through expanding the ILO-Irish Partnership programme activities on social protection to include Viet Nam in another part of the world - some cross-country experience may have been transferred from the Africa region however this may be too early to determine at this stage of the programme.⁷¹

4.4 EFFECTIVENESS

6. To what extent have the overall Programme objectives/outcomes and expected outputs, qualitatively and quantitatively been achieved – and what are the areas for further reinforcement of the project achievements?

The ILO intended that the countries would implement *both* SP and EIIP components, but this has not materialized. Synergies and cohesion were to be created between the two themes, carefully worked out in the Project Document. Secondly, the evaluation found that the country components are implemented more as separate projects rather than as a unified program – and only one country implements EIIP with little inter-connection with the SP components in the other countries, with the exception of TRANSFORM and the Learning Practice Lab which reportedly has been implemented collaboratively. The ILO provides the secretariat and coordination hub for TRANSFORM learning package. This role includes coordination of all development of new materials, modules and coordination of trainings in the region. The Hub is funded by the programme under evaluation. The evaluation has assessed that Transform has been an eye-opener and an excellent participatory tool for practitioners including policy makers, civil servants/technical government staff and civil society organisations.

The TRANSFORM outputs are a network of excellent master trainers and a quality training package with an innovative leadership approach. Over 1000 persons in total, beyond the three countries, including through the online version, participated in TRANSFORM training regionally (Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique) during 2018-2019.

The evaluation has assessed that the programme as a whole has performed rather well considering the number of challenges it has faced (Annex II). The components/countries *are* making contributions,

⁶⁹ It was not proposed to the evaluation to include UNICEF among the stakeholders to visit and in the end, it was (unfortunately) evident that the schedule was much too tight to insert an appointment.

⁷⁰ Source: in an in-depth interview.

⁷¹ The ILO Global programme, with the help of ROAP, is exploring the opportunities to “spread a culture of SP”, using the Transform learning package as an instrument also in Asian countries and make policy and decision-makers aware of what it takes to design policies and plans, and include schemes under one umbrella (combined non-contributory with contributory systems). It is clear that adaptation means much more than translation into languages spoken in Asia (source: In-depth interview with ILO HQ staff).

among other organisations, to the overall ILO-Irish programme goal of governments using appropriate, well designed and well managed social protection measures and employment intensive promotion approaches. The programme as a whole has clearly contributed to building capacity to lead and manage complexity and scale of social protection systems in the countries that have social protection as part of their outcomes.

It has raised awareness about the need for devising comprehensive social protection that combine contributory and non-contributory schemes in order to cover people's (especially those who are vulnerable and live in poverty) and households' needs across the lifecycle. It has actively taken part in developing social protection policies and worked alongside its stakeholders to work on plans (mainly non-contributory SP systems) and worked on M&E systems. The programme has also worked through partnerships with national stakeholders such as UN agencies, government ministries civil society organisations to leverage resources and enhance institutional capacity building, reach and sustainability of programmes.

The country components have matured at a different pace and scale because their starting off point varied; in **Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique** the previous regional project had already laid a ground for social protection with Irish Aid support. Taking into considering that the programme is implemented only half-way, all outputs to lead to the outcomes are not yet produced. Still a lot of progress may be happening before its completion in 2021. The fact that the outcomes/outputs generally are quite ambitious should also be considered. The revised Tanzania LFA (provided by the project manager) include some outputs which seem too ambitious in view of them being produced by the end of 2021, namely outputs 3.1 and 3.2. Further, the outputs 1.1 and 1.2 need to be revised as they do not logically lead to Outcome 1.

TRANSFORM has been, and still is, an important means to promote and build capacity and appreciation for the need of having social protection within this region in Africa which is within the scope of this evaluation. It is a learning model and package that has been promoted by the Socialprotection.org website (donor funded)⁷² and the ILO, UNICEF and UNDP. The development partners that have funded TRANSFORM are the European Union Social Protection Systems Programme (EU-SPS), launched in January 2015. Irish Aid has also provided funds and ILO staff in the region has played an important role to drive it forward. A number of certified Master Trainers exist, and the demand to participate in the training in many countries is allegedly high and cannot be met with the existing resources (noted in Zambia).

In **Tanzania**, these elements should be looked into with “realistic eyes”, considering the time that remains and the less-than-favourable policy climate: “Sustainable public procurement policies and legal frameworks reformed and adopted that increase participation of small scale enterprises and communities in the infrastructure delivery (outcome 2); and “Planning, implementation and monitoring systems and procedures at the local authorities streamlined and enhanced to ensure quality and productivity of public works component of PSSN” (output 3.1).

Furthermore, the plan to produce a “strategy or action plan” (output 1.2) intended to promote decent jobs and social protection floors (SPF) based on the ISPA-PW assessment tool was supposed to have been produced already but had to be postponed to 2020, due to the reduced amount of funds transferred in 2019. This assessment has shown some challenges related to public works component including lack of capacity of participating regions and districts in the planning, implementation and monitoring of public works. It was also found that there exists “substandard quality of assets created, lack of regular maintenance of the infrastructures/assets created, sustainability plans and lack of local governments (PAA) sense of ownerships as well as lack of access for training.”⁷³

Outcome 4 (Employment-intensive investment programme operations are efficient, productive and provide quality infrastructure works and documented through impact evaluations) also seems overly ambitious, taking the above considerations into account. Considering the slowness in the Government's

⁷² This is a global member-based platform that facilitates knowledge-sharing and capacity-building on the field of social protection.

⁷³ Source: Prodoc.

endorsement of the PSSN II (endorsed in September 2019) and the absence of clarity and lack of a common vision in the government regarding procurement procedures that give opportunities to informal actors and vulnerable people to take on public works on terms adapted to them in their own localities – these immediate outcomes and outputs may need to be modified to be more realistic.

In **Viet Nam**, having an adequate legal framework in place within the remaining time (outcome 2) is ambitious, taking into consideration that the component will address two Master reforms, instead of one originally planned in the Prodoc (social assistance and the social security reform). Output 3.1 on capacity building programme for national constituents which refers to *Transform* have been “lifted out” from the responsibility of the component’s management in Hanoi and is now taken care of in Bangkok (ROAP). It was considered overambitious as the material is not yet adapted to Vietnamese, or Asian context yet, and the very adaption is a huge undertaking and there are insufficient funds.

7. Is the project likely to achieve its medium and long-term outcomes by the end of the programme, and if not, what are the key factors that constrain/potentially constrain achieving the programme’s intended results? Were there any unplanned effects (negative or positive)?

Regarding the objective that national governments combine employment-intensive investment programs with social protection – this is for obvious reasons not going to be achieved, as the synergies and cohesion that originally were to be created between SP and EIIP, and which is explained in the steering documents, have not materialized in practice.

Regarding unplanned positive effects –The production of outcomes and outputs of the SP in this particular programme, as part of the regional component, seem not to have been necessary in Mozambique as the ILO for the time being has adequate funding to work on social protection. The funding from the IA programme under evaluation has only been in the small amount of USD 50,000 for two years in Mozambique.

8. In which areas has tripartism (Governments’, Employers’ and Workers Unions’) been integrated successfully and to what extent have the social partners been involved and participated in the planning and implementation of the Programme? To what level is the implementation duly coordinated with other ILO, UN and government initiatives in social protection and public works?

All traditional constituents (Governments’, Employers’ and Workers Unions) had been informed about the programme from the inception and have participated to a varying degree in the programme, however, their involvement has not been strong with a few exceptions, the main reason being that Employers and Workers organisations deal more with contributory social protection schemes and the formal economy. However, most have participated at the inception and many are generally quite well acquainted with the ILO-Irish Partnership programme.

Effectiveness of management arrangements

9. How effective are the project management arrangements in practice, in view of the fact that the programme is decentralised and managed by ILO Office in Lusaka for Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique program; in Tanzania managed by the ILO Dar es Salaam office and that ILO Hanoi manages the Viet Nam component?

a) The evaluation has found that there are some weaknesses that are limiting management effectiveness in the programme that relate to both structural and operational capacities. These issues are pointing to the need for more structural leadership skills i.e. greater analytical and design skills to enable diagnosis of certain needs and capacity to develop structural solutions. These are:

A rather weak communication and information-sharing (and to some extent coordination) between the country projects (exceptions are in relation to Transform and Webinar activities, and the annual progress reporting).⁷⁴ One example raised by one of the component managers is a case when funds (USD 40,000) that were earmarked for a study in one programme country was used by the regional component *without communicating with the country manager and team* (there is no formal separation of the budgets of

⁷⁴ Source: In-depth interviews; FGDs and questionnaire survey.

Malawi, Zambia, Mozambique and the regional component) – an issue that should have been solved in a different way. Weakness in communication and information-sharing, limiting management effectiveness, was also found to be the case regarding the projects and the ILO Headquarters – except in issues related to rolling out Transform. No particular mechanism has been put in place to structure communication, knowledge-sharing and contacts with the field at the HQ level, a reason for which seem to be the fact that the Programme is decentralised (it is noted however that field offices use resources, guidelines developed by SOCPRO e.g. guidelines on extension of SP coverage); and

a) Inadequacy in developing one coherent programme design, and integration of EIIP (example: two development objectives exist). Analysing the structure of the EIIP in Tanzania has presented a major problem in this evaluation. The evaluator has been provided four sets of LFA elements (outcomes/immediate objectives, outputs, activities) in which the elements differ, not just in formulation but in content/meaning:

- The logframe elements (outcomes, outputs, activities) version in the Prodoc, which is said to be the “only approved version;”
- The version in the ToR which clearly shows that there are two different Development Objectives for the programme, one for SP and one for EIIP);
- The version presented by the Project Manager in inserted text in the first draft evaluation report;
- The Theory of Change version for Tanzania, which is a separate Matrix document with the same title (together with the EIIP Outcome based budget).

c) EIIP reporting to has not been adequate in terms of quality. It has also been assessed that there is a lack of appreciation for the necessity for public works activities to be linked closer to other types of social protection activities in particular that which is provided to TASAF, including UNICEF’s support to TASAF – which also was the Embassy’s assessment.

d) In Tanzania, the EIIP has been a one-person project until recently which has not been adequate. The component now has three staff (NPC, FAA and a Driver) and another technical person in the capacity of NPO is being hired, to join the team by March 2020.

The ILO-Irish Aid programme is in line with the ILO’s decentralisation policy in which is prescribed that overall engagement with the Irish Aid counterparts does take place through PARDEV. It is thus customary that projects are in contact with the Embassies in the respective countries – and not the donor agency in Ireland. In the context of decentralisation, some former ILO staff who have worked both in the previous regional SP (RAF) component and the current one opined that the advantage in the earlier programme was management and reporting procedures were smoother and more direct. For instance, the project manager could be in direct contact with the donor agency in Ireland – and could clarify issues directly with the donor if there was a need, which in this programme was not the situation.

10. Is the project able to leverage expertise in the field and at headquarters? Are administrative modalities adequate to facilitate good results and efficient delivery of the programme? Are there areas where management processes could be improved? How is the project’s management approach perceived by ILO technical units, implementing partners and others (could include collaborators and Irish Aid in country)?

The program has been able, for the most part, to leverage expertise both at field and headquarter level and technical know-how is good – which was confirmed by many stakeholders in the field. The administration *modalities* to facilitate good results and efficient delivery are not really adequate, in the field. In the case of Malawi for instance, the project contributes to the work months for an FAA in the Malawi office who renders on the ground assistance for immediate project needs that can be handled directly. However, the component does not have access to IRIS, and the SP budget for the southern African component is entirely in the hands of Lusaka office, which is the budget controller for the RAS/17/53/IRL sub-project (Southern Africa Social Protection component).⁷⁵ Only recently is the HQs

⁷⁵ The Global component, the Viet Nam component and the Tanzania component all have control over their components’ budgets. Source: ILO.

considering an installation of IRIS in Malawi (a cost/ benefit analysis was undertaken) and requests are processed from Lusaka as and when requested by the Malawi team.

As regards the donor's priorities and concerns, some were brought to the attention of this evaluation. The relevance of having a large Project Steering Committee (PSC) in Tanzania, with as many as 15 members for a small project, meeting quarterly, is believed to be "inflated" as it also involves cost of flight tickets for the Zanzibar stakeholders to attend the meetings in Dar es Salaam.⁷⁶

11. How effectively does the programme management monitor performance and results? Is relevant information and data regularly collected and analysed to feed into management decisions?

The effectiveness of monitoring performance and results is uneven in the programme. The tools used by staff for monitoring progress performance and results are PSC committee meetings and protocols/minutes, annual progress reports, weekly project catch up meetings, and compiling project work plans.⁷⁷ Data and information is regularly collected by the staff and used for the annual reports and when developing the annual work plans once it is known from Irish Aid how the yearly instalments should be allocated across the four sub-projects. PARDEV implements this guidance through corrigendum minutes.⁷⁸

Some progress reports lack analysis of problems that have occurred and challenges faced and there are few references to assumptions made in the LFA, or eventual risks that may be connected with certain decisions – thus quality and standard of *presentation* of data and information in the progress report is also uneven, ranging from good to not adequate.

12. Does this programme receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners, the ILO, and the donor?

In the majority of the countries the programme has received support and cooperation from national counterparts, primarily from the key stakeholders such as social protection policy holders and civil society organisations in Viet Nam, Malawi, Zambia and Mozambique.

In Tanzania, good cooperation is extended from TASAF. Several stakeholders/interviewees mentioned that political support for social protection had not been forthcoming from the part of the national government in the country. However the PSSN II was endorsed approved during the second half of 2019 and will receive – which is believed to be of vital importance for EIIP's continued work.⁷⁹ The lack of a national public procurement policy will make the project's plans to ensure contracts for small scale entrepreneurs and other informal economy actors in public works very challenging and is likely to jeopardize reaching the EIIP objectives. A Procurement Act *does* exist that stipulates setting aside 30 per cent of the annual national public procurement budget for special (vulnerable) groups - but there is no common vision in the Government on how to interpret this Act and to "make it work" in favour of the intended beneficiaries of TASAF. Reportedly, this is something that EIIP has started to address.

Regarding support from its national partners in Tanzania, some constituents raised concerns about some elements of the programme including the great number of members in the PSC; the lack of quality and timely reporting; the choice of key stakeholder (TASAF) and not having been adequately involved in the design of EIIP. The latter concern is strongly contradicted by the EIIP project team, stating that "the stakeholder consultations during the design stage involved all tripartite plus partners".

The SP and EIIP components have received technical backstopping from ILO DWCT Specialists in Pretoria⁸⁰ and (for Viet Nam) within the ILO DWCT in Bangkok. The current Social Protection Officer based in Lusaka has been in charge of the administrative responsibilities for the regional project since the departure of the SP CTA (RAF). Programming and finance management of the country components were the responsibility of the officials in the respective countries in the RAF component. Regarding

⁷⁶ The information was received that there are 15 regular members of the Project Steering Committee, however the ToR mentions 12.

⁷⁷ Source: Questionnaire survey for ILO field staff.

⁷⁸ Source: PARDEV, ILO HQs.

⁷⁹ It will receive \$450 million IDA credit from the World Bank. Source: ILO project staff and <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2019/09/12/five-million-tanzanians-to-benefit-from-improved-safety-nets>.

⁸⁰ The SP Specialist in Pretoria left in August/September 2019.

administrative support from ILO, the programme country staff have, with a few exceptions, stated that the administrative support provided to them has been “adequate”.⁸¹

4.1 EFFICIENCY

13. What evidence is there of cost-effectiveness in the Programme’s implementation and management?

The use of resources resulting from UNJP-SP collaboration for the most part, for instance in Zambia and Mozambique – which have been beneficial in terms of cost-effectiveness. The programme staff’s view is that cost-sharing should be encouraged as a good practice to ensure sustainability and ownership by all partners involved. Due to budget reductions, as have been explained here, cost-sharing has been done in all country components mainly with other UN agencies being part of the UNJP-SP (the answer to question 14 below explains *why this became a very important mitigation measure* for the country components).

14. Have project’s funds and outputs been used and delivered in a timely manner? If not - what are the reasons?

As mentioned briefly in section 4.3 (Relevance) the initial agreement between ILO and Irish Aid was that EUR 2,000,000 be transferred as annual instalments to the programme. The donor’s requirement was that the program’s budget delivery should be 70 per cent by the 10th month of receiving funds, i.e. actual expenditures *excluding* commitments for staff salary costs. The budget could only be opened one year at a time. At the time of the evaluation’s data collection phase, IA had (on 15 December 2017) transferred an instalment in the amount of EUR 2,000,000⁸²; and on 8 November 2018 the amount of EUR 1,600,000⁸³ was transferred with a total reduction of EUR 400,000. The 2019 funds instalment had not yet been made. The explanation by Irish Aid for reducing the EUR 2 million to EUR 1.6 million was low delivery, or “absorption challenges” in the programme’s implementation (i.e. not reaching the required 70 per cent mark). This is related to Irish Aids’ requirements and internal rules in order to trigger the next instalment which should be in line with reality.

The field staffs’ efforts to reach the expenditure target meant that they had to congest activities within a few months i.e. 5-7 months (instead of a year) to meet the deadline for progress reporting and accounting for funds spent in June/July. In the wait for the second round (tranche) of funds, little or no money was available for activities which could be a period of 3-4 months in the case of Viet Nam for instance.⁸⁴ In the example of both Viet Nam and Tanzania⁸⁵, it became impossible to implement a whole year’s activities during this short time especially with the stakeholders being on board and appreciating the reasons for the “lack” of funds for implementation. In Viet Nam, the Christmas and Vietnamese New Year are big events when not much could be done with the involvement of the Government officials (the same issues more or less apply for all countries). In this situation, it was difficult to plan for new tranches since amounts were not confirmed until very late. The projects have reported that they were similarly affected.

In some countries the situation also resulted in postponement in recruiting staff (Zambia, Viet Nam, Malawi, Tanzania) and in some cases an inability to extend program staff members’ contracts by more than a few months instead of a longer period as ILO stipulates for its staff (e.g. Viet Nam). The field staff mitigated the situation by availing resources and cost-sharing activities with e.g. UNJP-SP for capacity development, studies and even salaries, and applying for SDG funds – which some will receive in 2020-2021 (e.g. Viet Nam, Malawi).

Despite the challenges described above, it is assessed that the majority (80-90 per cent) of the outputs *expected at mid way* of the implementation across the programme have been produced, or nearly produced. Some have been postponed mainly for reasons of challenges faced; such as lack of available

⁸¹ Source: Questionnaire Survey and in-depth interviews.

⁸² USD 2,369,668 at the exchange rate of the time.

⁸³ USD 1,818,181.82 at the exchange rate of the time. Sources: Financial Agreement Minute Sheets, dated 15/12/2017 and 8/11/2018 PARDEV, ILO.

⁸⁴ Source: In-depth interview.

⁸⁵ The Tanzania team reported (in written comments) that the EIIP budget allocation was reduced due to not reaching 70 per cent budget delivery rate and that in 2019 this resulted in receipt of only 19 per cent of the total funds i.e. only USD 272,000.

funds at the time an activity was planned to be undertaken (e.g. a study), or even insufficient staff members in place in time for activities to be implemented - to lead to the planned outputs. There have also been factors outside the programme's "control" impacting on implementation such as lack of full policy support from key stakeholders.

15. What are the partnership arrangements in the implementation of the Programme at various levels (national, regional and interagency)? What are the challenges in the formulation of these partnerships and the results - and how could this be improved?

At national level the SP components cooperate mainly with the government ministries responsible for SP policies, strategic plans and or social safety net programmes in the respective countries. Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique are part of a regional set up which has its base and networks in the previous social protection programme implemented between 2013-2016. The interagency partnership arrangements are mainly with the UNJP-SP funded by various development partners, but also with bilateral donor agencies that are outside of the UN framework.

4.2 SUSTAINABILITY AND IMPACT

18. What actions/interventions by the ILO and the donor have been undertaken to ensure that the achievements of the programme can be met and sustained and to what extent is the project focusing on results/impact?

At mid-way in implementation, impact of the programme is not fully known, and is an issue that will be further assessed in the final programme evaluation. In the case of the regional SP project, the background work and networks strengthened from *previous* projects are expected to contribute to the final impact of this programme as well, and to sustainability of programme results.

It is clear that the programme together with stakeholders (to a varying extent in the different countries) has been involved in developing policies, strategic plans, integrated frameworks and M&E tools/systems for basic social protection which should have lasting impact. Whether or not the work on the micro-simulation modelling on financing of social protection programmes in Zambia (and Mozambique) will be sustained is *too early to determine* because at the time of the evaluation in the country, ZIPAR in Zambia expressed quite some disappointment to the fact that the high levels of the government had not taken interest and had not encouraged government officers to start using the models. Also, whether or not the work done with CSOs network (such as in Zambia) is actually going to sustain the programme benefits is also too early to determine. These are important issues to be analysed in the final evaluation, as this point is only mid-way in the life of the programme.

Some impact can already be determined. Looking at TRANSFORM, which is one of the key initiatives within the programme in Eastern and Southern Africa, the *learning* from it can be said to have had an impact. Participating in the innovative learning process has helped convince and educate stakeholders and has entailed networking and partnering with institutions and individuals. As for sustainability of the *Zambia* team has claimed it is high on the agenda for the region but the conclusion is that full sustainability – i.e. a regionally-based institution taking the learning package on board as its own - is highly unlikely to happen in the remaining two years of the programme under evaluation.

The Global programme at ILO Headquarters also claimed that sustainability is very much on the agenda and it was learnt that also the DWT in Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) is involved in supporting sustainability and even expansion of TRANSFORM (with other resources than IA resources). The Global Programme manages a dedicated Transform website, which also should also be mentioned here, namely Transformsp.org. – while the Socialprotection.org is a global knowledge-exchange platform - but the programme does staff do not perceive it as a future "institutional home". As it currently stands, it is dependent on donor funds and therefore – without the continued support from development partners it is not likely to survive.⁸⁶

⁸⁶ Programme staff have provided the following information in writing: In Zambia, Mozambique and Malawi, Transform related activities are supported by the country-level UNJP as well as by other entities like GIZ, UNICEF UNDP. It is the regional component managed by the coordination hub based in Lusaka which is currently only funded by Irish Aid, although in the past received funding from EU-SPSS as well.

The cost-sharing and cooperation that has taken place with other external actors in *other* areas is a good practice that encourages ownership by all partners and one which should enhance the chances of sustainability.

19. To what extent do the ILO Constituents express ownership of the Programme and its results and is there any signs/evidence that the programme activities will be integrated into their respective structures?

As shown in this report, the project implementation is based on partnerships with government (mainly the ministries that hold the social protection policies), non-government actors and national stakeholders in the social protection sector. Few of the traditional ILO constituents (Ministries of Labour, Employers and Workers organisations) have expressed any sense of ownership of the programme, with some the exceptions such as in Viet Nam, where the Ministry of *Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs* in fact is a traditional ILO constituent, and also the policy holder of social protection in the country.

4.3 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

The evaluation inception report raised the questions: To what extent has the programme considered gender, non-discrimination and inclusion, (especially of persons with disabilities) in a) concept and design and b) has it been effective in addressing these concerns in its implementation?

In exploring the answers to these questions, the evaluation found that women, men and children are part of the ultimate “beneficiaries” of social protection policies and programmes, and so are people who are vulnerable because they are elderly and or differently abled (people with disabilities) or for other reasons. For instance it is claimed that 70 per cent of the EIIP support to TASAF in Tanzania is directed to women and that 1.1 m women are beneficiaries of TASAF. The following is an attempt to answer the above-mentioned questions (a) and b)):

- a) The Prodoc (concept) mentions that attention will be given to principles of non-discrimination, gender equality, and responsiveness to special needs in the development of *social protection policies and strategies*. Respect for the rights and dignity of people and inclusion of women and vulnerable groups in the informal economy will be attended to. In the *LFA* (design) it is clear that these cross-cutting issues in the programme design are important, as the ultimate target group are “all women and men in the countries, with a focus on poor and vulnerable groups such as women, elderly, people with disabilities, ethnic minorities and self-employed workers”.
- b) These concerns have been addressed in the policies that the Programme have worked on in the countries (components). However, *outside* of the actual policies, the cross-cutting issues are not prominent and no particular gender analysis seem to have been made. Transform learning have had good participation of women as trainees and as master trainers, but the actual training package does not devote any particular module specifically to gender. The idea has been that they should be integrated/mainstreamed in the overall package. A staff have has stated that gender issues have not been adequately addressed in the project *as there are no specific outputs and immediate objectives relating to gender in the prodoc*. Issues related to vulnerability (e.g. people with disabilities, or those differently abled) are also not much focused on with a few exceptions.⁸⁷

⁸⁷ The findings are based on the documentation review, and triangulation of statements in in-depth interviews with Headquarter and field staff, national stakeholders and written statements in the questionnaire survey.

5 CONCLUSIONS

This chapter includes the conclusions of the mid-term evaluation, which are based on the findings in chapter 4.

Relevance

Overall it is concluded that the programme remains relevant in addressing country needs, priorities and in contributing to the development of national systems and policies. It has also been relevant in its efforts in imparting knowledge and learning through TRANSFORM and through other capacity building processes and events. The rationale and relevance of having Tanzania as the *only country among five* that is implementing employment intensive investments through public works activities within a social protection-oriented ILO programme - is rather weak both in design and implementation.

Effectiveness

The ILO initially intended that Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique would implement *both* SP and EIIP components, and that synergies and cohesion would be created between the two which was carefully outlined in the Prodoc. However this never materialised and the text of the Prodoc was never changed in this respect. What did materialise is that Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique and Viet Nam all implement social protection components and Tanzania implements an EIIP component.

The programme as a whole has performed rather well at mid-way of implementation especially considering a number of challenges faced. The components/countries are making contributions, among other organisations to the ILO-Irish programme goal and the ILO Global Flagship Programme on Building Social Protection Floors for All (2016-2030), through being involved in the work of developing national policies, strategic documents and plans, as well as M&E systems for comprehensive social protection systems. It has raised awareness among stakeholders for the need to combine contributory and non-contributory schemes to cover people's and households' needs across the lifecycle.

The regional SP project (RAF) including Zambia, Mozambique and Malawi with hub in Zambia has applied a strategic approach in providing capacity-building of participants at different levels, including the sub-national level. In the process of implementing decentralisation policies (such as in Zambia) this approach is particularly important as it is the local level structures that deliver social services to the citizens and inhabitants. The majority of the programme outputs designed to reach the immediate objectives/outcomes mid-way have been produced. The programme has also engaged stakeholders in implementation of programmes, leveraging resources and promoting possibility for scaling of activities.

The regional project with support from the Global SP component is contributing to the objectives to build capacity through TRANSFORM - helping stakeholders appreciate leadership issues and management in relation to complex social protection systems. The EIIP has supported the TASAF PSSN and raised awareness and built capacity regarding employment-promoting approaches in the form of public works. However, the evaluation *has not been able to find any written evidence for linkages with TASAF's other social protection programs, notably UNICEF's support (under IA) - which seems as a lost opportunity and which also was brought up but the Embassy of Ireland.*

There are management issues in the programme that relate both to design and follow-up (revising Project Document and LFA) of the original intentions of the programme. The evaluation's scrutiny of the various logical frameworks has revealed a fragmentation which seems to be the result of the lack of coordination and coherence during the design stage. In the case of Tanzania it was found that some outputs in the LFA are too ambitious (outputs 3.1 and 3.2) in view of the remaining duration of the component and that the outputs 1.1 and 1.2 do not logically lead to Outcome 1.

Regarding coordination, communication and information-sharing weaknesses were also found with exceptions in relation to Transform and Webinar activities, and during times the country staff compile their annual progress reports. This is likely to improve during 2020 when a new CTA is recruited to be based in Lusaka.

No particular mechanism seems to have been put in place to structure communication, knowledge-sharing and contacts with the field from the part of the HQ level, where the responsibility for the Global SP component lies. Another management issue is the quality of progress reports. Some reports lack analysis of problems that have occurred and challenges faced, and there are hardly any references to assumptions made at the start of the programme, or eventual risks that may be connected with certain decisions. Quality and standard of presentation of *qualitative information* in the progress report is assessed to be uneven, ranging from “good” to “not adequate”.

Efficiency

It is assessed that the majority (80-90 per cent) of the outputs *expected at mid-way* of the implementation across the programme have been produced, or nearly produced. Programme staff in the involved countries brought up - as an issue affecting implementation - the reduction of budget/fund allocations resulting from the IA requirement that projects meet annual budget delivery rates (70 per cent) which do not include commitments for staff salaries. When projects were not able to meet the requirement, the situation affected recruitment and even payments of staff salaries in field offices, but also the efficiency in producing the outputs. This was mostly mitigated through cost-sharing and collaboration with other UN agencies being part of the UNJP-SP. Lately, staff have applied for and some will receive additional UNJP-SP funds SDG funds in 2020-2021 (Viet Nam, Malawi and Tanzania).

Regarding partnership arrangements at national level the SP components cooperate mainly with the government ministries responsible for SP policies, strategic plans and or social safety net programmes in the respective countries. Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique are part of a regional set up which has its base and networks in the previous social protection programme implemented between 2013-2016. The interagency partnership arrangements are mainly with the UNJP-SP funded by various development partners, but also with bilateral donor agencies that are outside of the UN framework. In Tanzania, EIIP’s key partner is TASAF, which is a national agency implementing the PSSN III.

Impact and sustainability

As the programme is half way in implementation, the sustainability of the programme’s actions is uncertain at this point to be further considered and explored by the final evaluation. Some impact and sustainability issues can already be determined. It is clear that the programme together with stakeholders (to a varying extent in the different countries) has been involved in developing policies, strategic plans, integrated frameworks and M&E tools/systems for basic social protection which should have lasting impact. The cost-sharing and cooperation with others are contributing to ownership and sustainability.

As for sustainability of EIIP activities, the Project’s work and support to TASAF could result in job generating public work approaches that are sustained *if the programme’s objectives are reached*, however, there is a long way to reach the set immediate objectives/outcomes.

Looking at TRANSFORM, it is clearly a tool that currently ensures that all share know-how with policy and decision-makers and how to invest in (umbrella) social protection schemes for people who are vulnerable in the informal economy. It is one of the key initiatives within the programme in Eastern and Southern Africa – and the *learning* from it can be said to be an impact in itself. The issue of sustainability of TRANSFORM is high on the agenda for the region but the conclusion is that full sustainability – i.e. a regionally-based institution taking the learning package on board as its *own* - is highly unlikely to happen in the remaining two years of the programme. As it currently stands, it is dependent on donor funds and therefore – without the continued support from development partners it is not likely to survive.

Gender issues and issues regarding people who are differently abled

Cross-cutting issues in the programme design are important, as the ultimate target group are all women and men in the countries involved with a focus on poor and vulnerable groups such as women, elderly, people who are differently abled, ethnic minorities and self-employed workers. In the case of Tanzania it is claimed that 70 per cent of the EIIP support is directed to women and the participants in TRANSFORM are to a high degree women, however, cross-cutting issues are not prominent in the programme. No particular gender analysis, or analysis of social protection coverage or inclusion of

people who are differently abled seem to have been undertaken by the programme in any of the countries – or at Headquarter level. TRANSFORM learning package does not have any module specifically addressing gender but gender is meant to be mainstreamed (integrated) throughout the learning package and training approach.

6 LESSONS LEARNT AND GOOD PRACTICES

6.1 LESSONS LEARNT

These are the evaluation's assessment on lessons learnt:

- In keeping together a programme with implementation in several countries (even if not large in terms of funding) it is important that due attention is given to structural issues, oversight and including management/leadership issues. Even though a programme is officially decentralised, it is here understood that the ultimate responsibilities for the implementation lie with the HQs. In this case this makes a lot of sense, as the implementation of the Global Component is placed at Headquarters – even though the CTA for this component is responsible for the component only, not the whole programme. Working together, as with the UNJP-SP actors has been worthwhile and has added to cost-efficiency and should be encouraged – even though this raises some difficulties in assessing and attributing achievements to the specific activities of the programme under evaluation.
- Regarding funds transfer from the donor agency, clarity in the requirements for the fund allocations should be made very clear to project managers when recruited to implement the projects – and realism has to be applied by the ILO in terms of acknowledging that poor delivery especially the first year/s is a very common feature in project environments. Communication between the budget holder (in the case of the regional SP project this is in Lusaka) and regional project staff regarding fund allocation and decisions on priorities should be clear and timely to avoid misunderstanding and frustration.
- It is fully understood and appreciated that the decision to have the new partnership have a double SOCPRO- EIP focus was taken in full consultation with the donor. However, it should be noted for the record in this evaluation report, that the previous SP programme evaluation's recommendations (the regional SP project) stated that “the ILO should recognise the achievements of the project in terms of advancing social protection floors through a regional approach, and should think carefully about diluting that focus in the next phase through the broadening of geographical coverage and the introduction of a secondary objective on EIIPs”. Despite these red flags the ILO-Irish Aid partnership included the new EIIP component in Tanzania and added a country from another continent, Vietnam, to the earlier regional experience. The risks of going this direction (expansion) and the evaluation's recommendation could have been *mentioned or discussed in the Prodoc, or the assumptions in the LFA could have taken the risk into account.*
- The Tanzania EIIP component has been operated as a one-person project until recently. For the EIIP - with the kind of responsibility assigned to it - this was not an adequate staff set up and there should have been a minimum of two technical project staff in the team.

6.2 EMERGING GOOD PRACTICES

These are some emerging good practices identified by the evaluation:

- The programme has rightly placed itself in the proximity to the social protection policy holders (national key stakeholders and line ministries) - which has been beneficial in the involvement of social protection systems and a precondition when addressing complex social systems. Combining policy level activities with capacity building and awareness-raising both regionally and nationally has proved to be a good strategy (this applies to the countries implementing the social protection component).

- The social protection regional project (RAF) has learnt from the previous project⁸⁸ and is building on the contacts, networks, and trust created among key stakeholders including the social protection policy holding government ministries and other stakeholders in the “sector”.
- Using public platforms and media, for open dialogue with the public on social protection and accountability of governments, with participation of universities, is an excellent way not only to broaden and raise awareness about the issues but also to appreciate the sentiments of the younger generation as is being done in Zambia. Working with a civil society organization (*network* of CSOs/NGOs) to track how government funds are used for social protection at sub-national level is another very interesting activity supported by IA and ILO in Zambia.

⁸⁸ Source: Independent End-Term Evaluation of Building National Social Protection Floors in Southern Africa: Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia, Final Evaluation Report, February 2017.

7 RECOMMENDATIONS

These are the recommendations of the Mid Term Evaluation that build on the conclusions in chapter 5.

7. **Management and leadership** (SOCPRO, DEVINVEST, DWCT) – High priority

Level of resources: Medium

Time line: High

ILO should make efforts and devise ways and means to improve on coordination, communication and information-sharing in the programme with a specific mechanism for regular contacts between the project components – as well as between the components, the DWCTs, and the ILO headquarters.

8. **Improvements of EIIP in Tanzania** (DEVINVEST, DWCT) High priority

Level of resources: Medium - High

Time line: High

In order to increase the relevance and rationale of the EIIP activities being part of the dominantly social protection-oriented programme, some changes should be made. ILO should make provisions for strengthening the leadership and strategic direction of the EIIP component, with the assistance of its staff member/s, or through the commissioning of an external consultant.

- e) Ensure that there is only one EIIP Logical Framework Analysis matrix and that it “tallies” with the EIIP Theory of Change matrix (especially concerning the number of immediate objectives/outcomes). Outcome 1 and Outputs 1.1 and 1.2 should be carefully looked at, as the outputs do not logically lead to the Outcome 1. Outputs 3.1 and 3.2 should be revised as they seem overly ambitious in view of the fact that they should be produced before the end of 2021.
- f) Consider revising the Terms of Reference for the currently (too) large EIIP Project Steering Committee and critically review whether the committee needs to have as many duties as currently are assigned to it
- g) Consider exchanging some current EIIP committee members with technical engineering background - with representatives from TASAF’s other social protection programs (non-public works related) e.g. from the enhanced livelihoods programme and/or UNICEF/WFP. An alternative is to nominate them as *observers* to the committee.
- h) Ensure that the EIIP annual and *quarterly* reports are timely and more analytical and less technical in nature, for the Embassy and others to appreciate that Public Works aim at being closely connected to wider social protection needs and show the links to e.g. UNICEF’s and WFP’s social protection support to TASAF.

9. **TRANSFORM and Webinars** – (Regional and global social protection components, DWCT) Medium priority

Level of resources: Medium

Time line: Medium

ILO should, together with its partners and stakeholders, continue to develop TRANSFORM (and webinars) in order to spread awareness and knowledge about social protection. It should continue to involve trainees/participants in various learning events as well and increase its efforts to identify chances for a sustainable platform of TRANSFORM, e.g. through *integration* in some national or international institutional set up in the African region.

10. **Gender analysis and issues regarding people who are differently abled** – (SOCPRO, DEVINVEST, DWCT) High priority

Level of resources: Medium

Time line: High

In order to increase gender mainstreaming in the overall programme and in Transform learning modules, ILO should develop a Gender Analysis (backed up with the right skills and support) which also should include an analysis of the needs of people who are differently abled and who are part of the intended (ultimate) beneficiaries.

11. Annual and quarterly progress reports (Project components managers, SOCPRO, DEVINVEST) High priority

Level of resources: Medium

Time line: Medium

ILO should improve on its mechanism for management oversight and quality assurance for reports produced by the programme and submitted to the donor agency. It should ensure that annual and progress reports maintain good quality and entail more analysis of issues and challenges faced in the different countries. Reports should be improved and relate to early assumptions made, realism and status of reaching the outcomes and outputs which have been set, gender issues, as well as the political situation affecting the project's attempts to obtain outputs and outcomes.

12. IRIS – installation and access in all countries (ILO Finance (Hqs/regional offices) High priority

Level of resources: Medium

Time line: High

ILO should ensure that IRIS is urgently installed (if not done already) and accessed in all sub-project countries.

ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCE

ANNEX II. DETAILED FINDINGS –COUNTRY PROJECT COMPONENTS

7.1 REGIONAL SOCIAL PROTECTION PROJECT FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA (RAF)

ILO is the Secretariat for Transform in Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique and the SP programme team in the ILO office in Lusaka is the hub for the regional activities. The regional project provides cross-country exchanges, sharing of best practices and collaboration in design and implementation of social protection systems. Over 1000 persons in total, beyond the three countries, including through the online version, participated in TRANSFORM training regionally (Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique) during 2018-2019. Modules for East Africa were produced first, followed by Francophone countries. There is a pool of Master Trainers, and following the Training of Trainers/Cascade principles.

A regional Learning and Practice Lab / Community of Practice (CoP) on extension of SP coverage to the informal economy has been held. The Lab has participation from five countries each constituting country teams that comprise representatives from institutions involved in extension of SP to informal economy.

Among the challenges faced in Zambia is the high turnover of staff in the office. The current lack of a coordinator for the regional activities during the whole of 2019 has placed quite some burden on the technical officers and the team even though good efforts were made to maintain earlier status of implementation. The limited information sharing and communication in the SP regional project has been felt in particular in Malawi – while in Mozambique the situation is quite different, as is explained below.

7.2 ZAMBIA SOCIAL PROTECTION COMPONENT

The **outcomes** for Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique are 1) A well informed political and public debate on social protection; 2) Institutional coordination and rights-based approaches for effective delivery of social protection floors; 3) A comprehensive national social protection policy and a prioritised implementation plan; 4) A sustainable and progressively domestically funded social protection financing framework.

The **project team** consists of one externally recruited Social Protection Specialist (Jan 2019), one NPC, one externally recruited Technical Officer (Nov 2019) who is coordinating TRANSFORM and one Finance and Administrative Assistant (FAA) providing support for the three country components. There has been a high turnover of project staff. The Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) for the regional project is vacant since January 2019 but has been temporarily filled by the social protection specialist, and the post will be filled in December 2019. Technical backstopping last 2-3 years provided by the Decent Work Country Team, ILO office, Pretoria.

The key **stakeholders** are: Ministry of Community Development and Social Services (MoCDSS) (*key government partner*), Ministry of Labour and Social Security, Zambia Institute for Policy Analysis and Research (ZIPRI), Workers Compensation Fund Control Board (WCFCB), National Pension Scheme Authority (NAPSA), Zambia Federation of Employers (ZFE), Zambia Congress of Trade Unions (ZCTU), and Civil Society for Poverty Reduction (CSPR) – an umbrella Network for other CSO organisations.

Policy alignment: The component fits in with the 7th National Development Plan specifying developmental outcomes to be attained. It fits with Pillar 2 on poverty and vulnerability reduction, contribute to the achievement of medium term development objectives that, in turn, are expected to contribute to the Vision 2030⁸⁹. It also contributes to the National Social Protection Policy which is designed to ensure quality and efficiency in service delivery through a comprehensive and effective social protection system.

Strategies and achievement: The work in Zambia builds on earlier network, contacts and achievements made in the previous SP programme implemented 2013-2016. The project team has

⁸⁹ Source: Zambia *National Long-Term Vision 2030*.

achieved good progress and is on track with most programme outputs both at country and regional level. It is active in its cooperation with its stakeholders and holds weekly meetings with the planning team of the MoCDSS. It is also within the current UN Joint Program on SP (UNJP-SP) (UNICEF, WFP) and has contributed to the Social Protection Joint Annual Reviews (August 2018, June 2019). The project has been able to support the organisation of the Social Protection Week in 2017 and 2018, and joint field monitoring visits. The visits involved key stakeholders, including Government officials, civil society organisations and cooperating partners involved in implementation of the SP project. The objective was to enhance appreciation for service delivery of schemes and monitoring issues, and make the stakeholders aware of how beneficiaries' lives are affected by e.g. the *current non-functioning cash transfer system* in several parts of the country.

Technical inputs have been made in reviewing national social protection policy documents including the Integrated Framework for Basic Social Protection Programmes. The integrated framework is aimed at promoting an integration and complementarity in the design and implementation of social protection programmes. The strategy promotes an integrated approach of *combining* different social protection interventions in the country – and move away from the “silo” situation to with the purpose of harmonizing planning, budgeting, targeting and delivery.

The Integrated framework (referenced in the 7th NDP) is expected to inform policy discussions at intra and inter-ministerial levels. Once operationalized, the framework will contribute to facilitating complementarities between specific interventions in the national social protection policy. Inherent in this integrated framework is the coordination of initiatives such as the Single Windows initiative in delivery of SP programmes.

The team has reached out to civil society, social partners, academia and the media to engage them in issues related to social accountability, participation, and transparency, and to enlighten them about the fact that social protection systems are right-based. Thus partnerships have been strengthened through the cooperation with civil society organizations such as the Civil Society for Poverty Reduction. CSPR). This has allowed the project to bring social protection issues, including holding a dialogue about its financing to the public, and has held open dialogues with lively debates at the University of Zambia during three occasions – including the purpose of improve the public's appreciation of social protection. The CSPR has assumed a role in the country to monitor social accountability and tracking the use of resources from the Government allocated to districts - and this cooperation will continue.

The project team has engaged stakeholders and social partners through capacity building on non-contributory social protection programs: Technical and financial support have been given through TRANSFORM capacity building programme on building and managing national social protection floors. The evaluation found that this training and the concepts it promotes on social protection is quite well-known and appreciated amongst the majority of the key stakeholders interviewed. An exception was the representative of the MoLSS who opined that the training was not relevant for this ministry and its officials as he understood that it addressed the informal economy and was not appropriate for higher level officials. Nineteen training sessions were held at national and district levels. One of the Transform Master Trainer, expressed that the Secretariat should play a stronger role, stating that one person should not constitute the Transform Secretariat, but it should be an office that plays role. Considering that the Lusaka team in November 2019 was strengthened by a new staff member (Transform Coordinator), and that the CTA post will be filled, this should change during the remaining time of the programme.

The TRANSFORM programme in Zambia is being considered by government as a critical programme to build capacity on SP systems at national and district level. It has been used in districts implementation of the single windows initiative since 2018 and the MoCDSS is keen to roll out the TRANSFORM training to the districts. (In a discussion with a TRANSFORM Master trainer working in the World Bank, this is premature and should not be supported from the project as yet).

The Project supported capacity of the 7th national development plan (NDP), pillar 2, poverty and vulnerability cluster technical working group and capacity on micro simulation on impact and financing of social protection programmes. At the time of the evaluation field visit, two capacity-building workshops had been undertaken with Zambia Institute for Policy Analysis and Research on micro-simulation models (“SOUTHMOD”) to build capacity within the government through simulating

impacts of alternative tax and social protection policy proposals on household welfare, and the public budget. The research, was initiated by Finland. Unfortunately, at the time of the field visit, the outcome of the research had not yet attracted the interest or engagement of high level officials in the Ministry of Finance which would be necessary in order for other officials to actually start using the method and the results.⁹⁰ The training was followed by a research paper produced by government officials and academia and was presented for debate during the 2018 social protection week. It was submitted to the MCDSS for the purpose of advocacy. On 3-5 December 2019 (after the evaluation visit) a third training workshop on micro-simulation models (“SOUTHMOD”) was organised⁹¹

The component has also worked on the Learning and practice Lab / Community of Practice (CoP) on extension of SP coverage to the informal economy in Zambia (and also in the region with the purpose of generating of new evidence and learning on practices. The platform has linked practitioners and experts with similar practices in the field of extension of social protection to the informal economy and has had participation from six countries. The focus is on creating social protection systems that *combine contributory and non-contributory elements* to enhance coverage across the lifecycle.

Regarding the engagement of the traditional ILO constituents (Ministry of Labour, and the Employers and Workers organisations) there has been minimal involvement and interest, which is explained by the fact that the programme focuses mainly on non-contributory SP strategies and schemes in the informal economy – although the Project has invited them to various capacity building programs.

Challenges:

Zambia faced a challenge due to the fact that the financial instalments from the donor agency was lower than planned due to poor delivery from the part of the ILO. The 70 per cent expenditure, had not been reached. Thus lack of adequate funds has been an obstacle in implementation - to some extent mitigated through cost-sharing with other ILO and UN projects. Earlier revelation of large sums earmarked for Cash Transfer schemes “disappearing” in the MoCDSS – resulted in some development partners in the country completely withdrawing from cooperating with the Government – including the Embassy of Ireland in Lusaka. However, IA Ireland decided not to withdraw its funds to the programme.

7.3 MALAWI SOCIAL PROTECTION COMPONENT

The **outcomes for Malawi** are the same as for the other regional SP components.

The **Project team** consists of one internationally recruited Junior Technical Officer, and one National Technical Officer. There is no FAA in the country specifically working for the Malawi component but support is provided by the Lusaka office. Technical backstopping has not been adequate (the regional CTA left in Jan 2019).

The **key stakeholders** are Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development is the policy holder for the Malawi Social Support Policy and the Malawi National Social Support Programme II (2018 - 2023) (following MNSSP I - 2013 to 2017). It is built on a mix of social cash transfer, labour-intensive public works; Targeted school meals; Village savings and loans programmes; and Microfinance. Other key stakeholders: UNICEF, WFP (the most “likeminded” to ILO’s approach). Other DPs in the SP sector: GIZ, KfW, World Bank, EU, NGOs. There has been little involvement of ILO traditional constituents: Ministry of Labour (with the exception of the Workers Compensation Department); Workers and Employers organisations.

Policy alignment: The Programme is aligned with the National Social Support Policy (NSSP) which is operationalized by the Malawi National Social Support Programme (MNSSP II).

The SP component in Malawi is well aligned with the Malawi National Social Support Programme MNSSP II and was involved in the design of this programme, and it’s first phase (MNSSP I), and the current implementation plan, which currently is in use.

⁹⁰ Source: Interview of MoF officials.

⁹¹ Source: ILO Zambia staff.

Strategies and achievement: The program has had a lead role and been instrumental in the review (in 2016) of the national policy MNSSP I which involved basic issues e.g. coverage, benefits, regularity of payment, M&E, selection of beneficiaries, finance management and coordination. It informed the design of the national policy and the development of the MNSSP II which took almost 12 months. It involved improving programme administration and relevance for beneficiaries - and also providing costed plans for extension of coverage.

- Organized, with MoF, the 3-days Malawi Social Protection Week, held in June 2018. (The event was structured around the launch of the MNSSP II, and held discussion sessions and showcased research papers. Around 250 participants attended the event, including government officials, development partners, media, CSOs and academia).
- On August 2018, in partnership with GIZ, organized a seminar on coordination issues of the social protection sector, based on a commissioned study. Around 30 participants
- Held seminar discussing the role of social protection and financing - for 30 leaders of Political Parties in August 2018.
- Supported the development of the MNSSP II Implementation plan, which is finalized and in use.

Project has selected a “niche” where it can make meaningful contributions:

- Supported the development of the M&E Framework of the MNSSP II, finalized in October 2019. Consultations were made in 3 regions with representatives of all districts. The implementation will be nationwide. For the 2020 workplan, the project will support the implementation of the framework.
- Management Information System (MIS) – the Project provided punctual inputs to the procurement process of the service provider operating the SCTP MIS. This opened the door for the project to explore this area. Project received a grant from the local Irish Embassy to conduct an assessment on this. In the last few months support was provided to the Ministry of Gender on the review of the PMT mechanism for targeting cash transfers, and the review of the transfer levels.
- Project takes part in SP committee advising the government – with WFP, UNICEF and others, and is a member of the technical working groups – to avoid that DPs work in “silos” on SP.
- Technical assistance is provided to civil society and Parliament on the preparation of a Universal Social Pension Bill.
- All stakeholders interviewed expressed satisfaction with the ILO collaboration and contributions to SP in the country (MoF, IA, UNICEF, WFP, GIZ among them). To quote one large DP: “For ILO to be so small, they have done a lot in Malawi”.

Transform:

- As in all countries involved, ILO is the secretariat for the TRANSFORM in Malawi. GIZ and UNICEF⁹² are also involved (GIZ provide funds directly to the ILO for implementation). Training was provided at national level for Government officials, and for CSOs.
- The management of Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Gender have participated either in the national/senior policymaker trainings, or in the e-Transform. MoF pointed out that it wants to use local trainers - not trainers from outside of Malawi.
- Discussions with the MoF official revealed that it hopes that in 2020 “training in the districts will be finalised to be followed by an assessment to see how (they) implement the knowledge”. Training was done in four districts – and a Training of Trainers just for Malawi is planned for the first quarter of 2020, followed by applications in additional 12 districts. UNICEF and WFP Malawi have approached the ILO for the development of a “shock-responsive module”. Efforts are made to initially develop the Base Document for the module and a 3-day in-depth application (financing from WFP). After the piloting the course, the issue of how to best integrate this module into the normal 5-day curriculum will be made.

Challenges:

- In 2018-2019 less funds than planned were available related to the fact that ILO had not reached 70 per cent expenditure (delivery). This resulted in the donor reducing the total

⁹² UNICEF is involved in Transform activities in all countries.

instalment for the three countries (RAF) from EUR 2 million to EUR 1.6 million. In 2019-2020, there was a “global split” of the total budget – and the RAF component received around USD 300,000 less than the year before. There was budget earmarked for Malawi in the workplan which was spent by other components of RAF in an attempt to reach the 70 per cent expenditure rate in the prescribed time.

- The NPC officer was first recruited for EIIP, but when it did not take off, he instead works for SP in a team with the current technical officer. There had been a gap in implementation after the previous technical officer had left Malawi and the team had to start building trust with the government and other stakeholders.
- The technical backstopping has not been adequate - however, the current team has managed to work well in the niche identified for SP among a “sea” of DPs in this sector.

7.4 MOZAMBIQUE SOCIAL PROTECTION COMPONENT

The **outcomes** are the same as for the other SP regional countries.

The Project team working on SP at the ILO office in Maputo consists of an international expert, a national officer and a FAA officer. *Their salaries are not paid* from the ILO-Irish project under evaluation.

The **key stakeholders** are Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Action – key government ministry for SP. It leads the Social Action Working Group which includes line ministries, the National Institute for Social Action (INAS) – and IA, USAID, Dfid, Netherlands, Sida, and EU, as well as INGOs: Humanitarian Inclusion, HelpAge.

Policy alignment: The ILO, including the few activities funded through the evaluated ILO-Irish programme are well aligned to Mozambique’s institutional frameworks for the promotion of a social protection are made up of the National Strategy for Basic Social Security and a Social Protection Act. There are two UNJP-SP in the country: One is financially supported by the Netherlands, Dfid and Sida for 4 years, implemented by ILO and UNICEF. The other UNJP-SPs is small, and for 3 years - funds provided by IA (Embassy of Ireland), and implemented by ILO and UNICEF with the purpose of supplementing other funding to the sector. In addition, Mozambique is part of the ACTION/Portugal project aiming at strengthening social protection systems in Portuguese-speaking African (PALOP) countries.

Strategies and achievement: A *very small sum* from the ILO-Irish IGSP&J program is allocated to the Mozambique social protection component, (approximately this has been USD 50,000 to date (in 2018 and 2019). These funds have been used for technical assistance for MOZMOD and Transform training only (source: Project Manager). Training on MOZMOD (equivalent to SOUTHMOD in Zambia) was carried out for 2 ½ days (3-5 July 2019), and also, previously, a first training in 2018. Government officials (finance and statistics officers) participated using a statistical model to simulate impacts of alternative tax and social protection policy proposals on household welfare, and the public budget. Reports produced with IA funding: for the MOZMOD launch and training, organized in July, and the TRANSFORM training in Portuguese for INAS Delegates, both events organized with Irish Aid Regional program support in 2019 (TRANSFORM was co-funded with resources from UNJP on SP in Mozambique). The first ToT in Portuguese for the TRANSFORM curriculum took place in 2018 in Mozambique.

ILO has a budget of USD 3M up to 2021 for social protection in Mozambique (Sida, Dfid and The Netherlands Government) - this is the main source of funding. In addition, there are limited funds from the Ireland Embassy in Maputo (350,000 and 200,000 respectively) which also is used by UNICEF and which will run out in April 2020. ACTION/Portugal project (2019-2021), and the whole Social Protection portfolio are managed by the same project manager and his team members.

In addition there are funds amounting to (350,000 and 200,000) which also involves implementation by UNICEF and are managed by the same project manager and his team members.

7.5 VIET NAM SOCIAL PROTECTION COMPONENT

The **outcomes for Viet Nam** are: 1) The Master Plan for Social Assistance Reform (2017-2025), Master Plan for Social Insurance Reform and their Action Plans are implemented for an integrated SP system, in line with fiscal context; 2) An adequate legal framework is in place reflecting MPSAR & MPSIR objectives, with special attention given to social assistance for older persons, pregnant women, children, emergency relief and social assistance services; and 3) Implementation of social protection programmes is more effective and efficient through improved administration, coordination and monitoring and evaluation.

The **Project team** consists of one international Project Manager (May 2018); a part-time NPC, and a part time FAA. Technical backstopping is provided by a member of the DWCT, in the Regional Office for Asia and Pacific (ROAP) in Bangkok, who conducts frequent visits to Viet Nam.

The **key stakeholders** are the Ministry of Labour (MOLISA) (key government partner) with its two departments Social Assistance Department (DSA) and Social Security Department (DSS). Other key partners are the Ministry of Finance, UNICEF (and World Bank to some extent). ILO's other traditional constituents representing the Employers, the VCCI, and the Workers (VGCL) – are not much involved.

Policy alignment:

The Viet Nam team was originally supposed to focus its work on the Master Plan for Social Assistance Reform (2017-2025) and Action Plan for Implementation of the same (2016-2020) *but decided to broaden its scope and also focus on the Master Plan for Social Insurance Reform and the related Action Plan*. On request from the Embassy of Ireland in Hanoi this was communicated Hanoi through a brief progress report in 2018.

Strategies and achievement: The component team has placed itself strategically in terms of having direct contact with high level policy and decision-makers in the Government regarding SP systems design issues, including the Deputy Prime Minister. The team maintains dialogue with the key ministry, Ministry of Labour, in addressing the two above-mentioned Master reforms. The dialogue and activities are focused on developing a system for social protection that brings together the various forms and on how the government could implement such a system including maternity protection.

The following reports (studies) have been published, funded by the component:

Potential impacts of social pensions in Viet Nam (April 2019) Assessing the potential for multi-tiered child benefits in Viet Nam (May 2019); Assessing the adequacy of tax-financed social protection in Viet Nam (June 2019); A focus on families: a short-term benefit package for the extension of multi-tiered social security coverage in Viet Nam (November 2019); A focus on employers: incentives to extend social insurance coverage (upcoming December 2019); and Long-term formalization dynamics in enterprises: social security and formality in enterprises from 2004 to 2017 (upcoming December 2019). Other achievements are:

- Carried out reviews (studies): Adequacy of social assistance benefits (proposing different methods to establish and index benefit amount), and Social assistance spending (cooperation with DSA and UNICEF).
- TRANSFORM training– much appreciated but only one small training event. Has applied for and was granted additional funds from the UN Joint SDG Fund for the ILO activities (B.R. is focal point for project proposal entitled “Viet Nam’s Inclusive Social Protection”)
- Although some outputs could not be met - so far the Project has done well in having a dialogue with decision-makers in two departments, and cost-sharing with other ILO project (Japanese funded) - and to some extent UNICEF, and World Bank).

Challenges:

- Government counterpart requested TRANSFORM to be rolled out in the country funded by ILO-Irish project; and project funds to be channelled through the Government. Mitigation: clarifying ILO’s TA role.

- The requirement that projects must reach 70% budget delivery: The problems for the project that this created was the short time for implementation as funds (for actual activities, not commitments) were received in late November and had to be spent by June/July the following year (excluding commitments). The Project could not secure salary expenses beyond that date. Also, it created problems in terms of planning as the amounts to be allocated were not confirmed in time. The issue for Viet Nam has not been as much the loss of funds since there was a small cut. The problems were more related to the shortened time for implementation that reaching 70% expenditure means (7 months in the last tranche and thus “5 months of dead time with no budget” (funds), the way this 70% is calculated, which in a small project does not give room to secure salary expenses beyond that date, and the inability to plan for new tranches since amounts are not confirmed until very late given that all components were subjected to reduction in amounts *based on other countries failure to meet the expenditure target* (source: Progress report).⁹³
- The project team is small and the outcomes are ambitious.

7.6 TANZANIA EMPLOYMENT INTENSIVE INVESTMENT (EIIP)

Development objective and Outcomes:

The **development objective** for the EIIP component Tanzania is *different* from the DOs of the SP components and reads: “Poverty reduction through improved incomes and sustainable livelihoods - for Tanzania.

The **outcomes** are the following:

1) Inclusive and transparent pro-employment investment strategies mainstreamed in national employment policies and programmes, with implementation guidelines; 2) Procurement systems, procedures and legal frameworks at national and local level reformed and adopted to increase the participation of small scale enterprises, contractors and local communities in infrastructure delivery; 3) Employment-intensive investment planning and technical capacity of institutional partners strengthened; and 4) Enhanced capacity of stakeholders and institutions to apply tools, methodologies and strategies developed under the programme.

The **Project team** consists of one National Project Coordinator; one Admin/Finance assistant, and one Driver (who also carries out administrative tasks). A member of the DWCT in the ILO office in Pretoria, South Africa, is backstopping the Project.

The key **Stakeholders** in Tanzania mainland are: Social Action Fund (TASAF) (the key government partner). Others are TARURA; TANROADS; Ministry of Labour, Youth, Employment and Persons with Disability (MoLYE&PD) Directorate of Public procurement and Development, Ministry of Finance and Planning, Ministry of Finance; Association of Tanzania Employers (ATE); Trade Union Congress of Tanzania (TUCTA). The stakeholders in Zanzibar are: Zanzibar’s Employers Association; Zanzibar Trade Union Congress (ZATUC). Steering Committee has as many as 15 members as reported by the NPC (however the ToR received shows only 10 members.(both mainland and Zanzibar) The Project supports the Public Works and livelihoods components.

Policy alignment:

The component is aligned to the Productive Social Safety Net (PSSN) Programme II.

Achievements and status of implementation:

The UNDP refers to Tanzania as being “behind” its neighbours in the region in terms of social protection and also in terms of labour programmes - and that the six social security schemes in Tanzania that are mandatory cover less than 1 per cent of the population (who mostly work in the informal

⁹³ Source: This is the perception of the programme manager and staff in Viet Nam, which was conveyed both in writing and in in-depth interviews.

economy) and only 6.5 per cent of the total formal working population. TASAF, the national agency which receives support through the ILO-Irish component is currently covering 10 per cent of the population. The deficiencies in term of providing social assistance/protection are worse for people who are differently abled and people with albinism.

The EIIP component in Tanzania is adding themes/issues to the Programme that specifically address job creation and inclusive growth – as means to alleviate poverty, promote small and medium enterprise development and ultimately improvement of living and working standards.⁹⁴ The strategies and activities include reviewing relevant national policy and institutional issues; raising awareness and building capacity; providing technical assistance to the national stakeholders regarding the formulation and integration of social protection strategies into specific national frameworks.

The component supports the Productive Social Safety Net (PSSN) Programme II – a Government’s initiative for operationalizing social protection. The work on the EIIP component has been through ministries and institutions: TASAF (the key stakeholder/Partner organisation), TARURA, TANROADS and training institutions that promote EIIP approaches such as Appropriate Technical Training Institute (ATTI).⁹⁵

These are some of the achievements:

- The EIIP component has participated in the Joint Review and Implementation Support Mission (JRIS), with a special focus on the TASAF PSSN Public Works and Livelihood Enhancement Programs, conducted from 16 to 27 April, 2018.
- It has provided technical assistance to the revision of an earlier version of a technical manual on Public Work Programs, October 2019 – with the purpose of adapting it to the PSSN II.
- A study was undertaken on Employment impact assessment of the public works component under TASAF - a value-chain oriented study - analysing cashew nut, cotton and grapes (three major crops that are promoted by the PW component under the PSSN/TASAF). Draft report in November 2019 (workshop planned for “validation”). A study was also carried out on procurement (a draft exists from November 2019). (There is no policy on procurement – but a Procurement Act exists).
- A number of Trainers are supported in different areas, such as Public Works, Labour Based Technology approaches, Entrepreneurship and Business development services, New technology in infrastructure development such as Low Volume Sealed Road.
- It organised and funded a two-weeks participatory Training event for stakeholders in building a 100 m road with the purpose of raising awareness among partners on the essentials of PWs including environmental issues.

TRANSFORM: The NPC has been trained as a Master TRANSFORM Trainer. There are a few are accredited Master trainers in Tanzania.

Challenges:

- Limited funds available for TA (public works and the livelihood components) in 2019.
- Delayed approval of the National Social Policy (2018) and PSSN II (it was approved in September 2019)
- Some ILO constituents (Mainland and Zanzibar) expressed that they were not completely involved at the design stage of the project and some are not pleased with ILO’s choice to work with TASAF as a key stakeholder. Some also stated that they have no clear role, although they are members in the PSC (and the Zanzibar’s Employer representative in Zanzibar is Chairman of the PSC).
- These statements are contradicted by the NPC who confirms that they participated in the Morogoro workshop in February 2017 where the project early sought consultation and ideas from the ILO partners and by the fact that their roles are described in the ToR for the PSC.

⁹⁴ Source: PRODOC, p. 6.

⁹⁵ Source: NPC, Tanzania.

- The NPC has operated much on his own. Technical support has mainly been provided by the Senior Specialist for P. The HQ based EIIP team has also provided some support. Recently a finance/admin officer (FAA) has been recruited. The evaluation has appreciated that the NPC is active as ILO’s social protection representative in the UN and DP groups. However, it is still assessed that the component should have been provided more strategic direction support - in particularly demonstrating of cohesion and synergies between Public Works and SP components especially as implemented through TASAF for instance by UNICEF, that are *not* public works but livelihood issues, legal and regulatory frameworks for the benefit of children, youth, families, elderly, and people who are differently abled.

7.7 THE GLOBAL SOCIAL PROTECTION COMPONENT

The **outcomes** of the global component are 1) Cross-country technical assistance in specific areas; 2) Documentation of information and expertise and development of training resources; and 3) Capacity building of practitioners and national trainers in Southern and Eastern Africa as well as in Viet Nam and knowledge sharing.

There have been changes in programme staff working with the project under evaluation. The **Project team** consists of one Technical Officer (CTA for the component) who started on his post in May 2019 and a Social Protection Policy Specialist who is handling issues related to Transform. Technical backstopping is provided to the Technical offices by colleagues including the Head of the Programming, Partnerships and Knowledge-Sharing Unit and Social Policy Unit, SOCPRO Department.

The key **stakeholders** are the staff members of the SOCPRO department, as well as DEVINVEST (EIIP) and PARDEV departments at the HQs and the donor agency, Irish Aid in Ireland – as well as the program staff posted in five countries. It should be noted that the global component staff at HQs are not in direct contact with Irish Aid, as it is the responsibility of PARDEV to be in contacts with the development partners.

Strategies and achievement:

SOCPRO sees it as an important role to identify and spread lessons learnt (financed from the global component). GLO is working on a guide on social protection culture and a Guide on drafting social protection legislation which is being finalized. A good practice guide has been developed also on the informal economy (launched during the Global Social Protection Week in Geneva (<http://informaleconomy.social-protection.org>)). GLO has also contributed to the development and launch of an ILO Results Measurement Tool - an online resource that provides information on past, current and planned projects related to social protection, and their results achieved.

Recently, in late November 2019, the ILO (SOCPRO) organised the Global Social Protection week in Geneva. There are plans to organise a workshop in 2020 – in which the country briefs will be important material. The evaluation found that the communication between the Headquarters and the countries involved is weak and the CTA asks for a more intense/strengthened communication for the purpose of appreciating (understanding) what goes on in the countries – but also to spread knowledge /information between from Hqs to the field.

Global component’s contribution to Transform

The Global component has worked on setting up and maintaining the TRANSFORM web page and technical support to the development and implementation of e-Transform, an online course of 10 weeks (5 hours of activity per week) for 10 modules aimed at strengthening skills and leadership capacities to engage in the transformation towards national social protection systems. It works on quality assurance of TRANSFORM materials, a continuous and intensive peer review process that has accompanied the production of the modules until now. Currently shock responsive module is being developed. The Global team is informed of this development but as mentioned above this is being managed under the initiative of UNICEF and WFP Malawi with support from the Coordination hub and ILO Malawi.⁹⁶ Regarding gender responsiveness in relation to Transform, there was initially an idea to have a gender-

⁹⁶ Source: Written comment from ILO on the draft evaluation report.

specific module/learning package but eventually this did not happen – instead gender should be mainstreamed (integrated) in the modules.

Other information on Transform: It was fully developed “in the field”, and has “African ownership” – but it is a “global product” and synergies across countries should be emphasised. ILO has received funding from IA, and IA has been a close partners in relation to Transform. Two ILO staff members (who have moved to new posts) very much took the lead in promoting/implementing Transform training. A Transform Advisory Group exists - which works far beyond the program under evaluation. 8-9 modules are developed.

The good practices guides are the guide on social protection culture (currently under development), the guide on drafting social protection legislation (currently being finalized) and the good practice guide on the informal economy “Extending social security to workers in the informal economy: lessons from international experience good practices guide” launched in 2019.⁹⁷ The ILO Results Measurement Tool which has been developed and launched with support of the global component. The tool is an online resource that provides information on past, current and planned projects related to social protection, and their results achieved. The tool also provides data on the number of people impacted by ILO social protection activities. Users can search impact according to branch, different vulnerable groups, topics, sources of funding, country and other parameters. The Tool provides information on 506 projects and programmes carried out by the ILO in the area of social protection since 2008.⁹⁸

⁹⁷ Source: <http://informaleconomy.social-protection.org>.

⁹⁸ Interviews with staff at headquarters and written information in emails.

ANNEX III. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

Viet Nam

Progress reports:

- September, 2018 to January 2019 (6-months)
- November, 2017 to August, 2018 (10 months)
- 2nd Annual Progress report September, 2018 to August, 2019 (12 months)

Two status reports (PPTs): March 2018 and August 2019

Progress implementation matrix, March 2018

Viet Nam Social Security Social Assessment for Viet Nam Social Security Modernization Project, FINAL March 2017

Joint Programme Document, SDG Joint UN fund

Zambia

- INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK OF BASIC SOCIAL PROTECTION PROGRAMMES, November 2018
- Zambia–United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (2016-2021)
- Annual progress report 2018-2019
- Financing the Zambia social cash transfer scale-up. A tax benefit microsimulation analysis based on MicroZAMOD by Remmy Kampamba, Luca Pellerano, Charles Banda, and Obbie Musama, March 2019.
- Extension of social protection to the informal economy, Zambia

Tanzania

Progress reports:

- Inception phase Progress Report Jan- June 2017 (6 months)
- Progress report, January to June 2017 (6 months)
- Annual Progress report, Jan - July 2018 (7 months)
- Annual Progress report, October 2018 to August 2019 (11 months)
- Progress report, Oct to Dec 2018 (3 months)
- Progress report, Jan-March 2018) (3 months)
- United Nations Development Assistance Plan, 2016–2021 (UNDAP II), Tanzania
- Tanzania Youth Study of the Productive Social Safety Net (PSSN) Impact Evaluation: Endline Report Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF) UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti Policy Research for Development (REPOA).
- Inclusiveness Assessment of Public Procurement Legal Framework and Environment. (Draft) report on main findings and recommendations. ILO 9/18/2019

Malawi

- Strengthening institutional coordination of social protection in Malawi. An analysis of coordination structures and options. By Rebecca Holmes, Lucy Scott, Nathalie Both and Blessings Chinsinga, Report June 2018.

- Rapid Social Registry Assessment: Malawi's Unified Beneficiary Registry (UBR), by Kathy Lindert, Colin Andrews, Chipso Msowoya, Boban Varghese Paul, Elijah Chirwa, and Anita Mittal. Social Protection and Jobs: DISCUSSION PAPER NO.1803, November 2018.
- Realizing Income Security in Old Age:
- The Feasibility of a Universal Old Age Pension in Malawi. Brochure. Source: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---africa/---ro-addis_ababa/---ilo-lusaka/documents/publication/wcms_544232.pdf

Mozambique

- United Nations Mozambique, UNDAF 2017-2020. 2017 Progress Report.
- SASPRI Report on the MOZMOD launch and training event: July 2019
- Relatório da Formação dos Delegados do INAS em Liderança e Transformação sobre a Construção e Gestão de Pisos de Protecção Social em África - TRANSFORM - Ponta do Ouro – Moçambique 22 a 26 de jul hode 2019, André Felipe Bongestabs, Cesaltina Abreu, Ivan Oscar, Mavlinda Cabral, Tomás Fuel.

SOCPRO-GLO

100 years of social protection: The road to universal social protection systems and floors, Volume I: 50 country cases, Edited by Isabel Ortiz, Valérie Schmitt, Loveleen De, ILO 2019) – part of a Country Brief Series.

Not country specific

- Extending social security to workers in the informal economy: lessons from international experience good practices guide (Geneva: International Labour Office): Policy Resource Package: Extending social security and facilitating transition from the informal to the formal economy: Lessons from international experience, Issue Brief No. 1/2019
- Tackling Vulnerability in the Informal Economy (Paris: OECD Development Centre), OECD and ILO, 2019.
- Evaluation of EU support to social protection in external action 2007-2013, Final Report, Volume I – Main Report, January 2018. Evaluation carried out on behalf of the European Commission.
- Independent evaluation of the ILO's strategy and actions for creating and extending social protection floors, 2012–2017, September 2017.
- IPC- IG Activity Report, 2018 (online: https://ipcig.org/pub/eng/IPC_IG_Activity_Report_2018.pdf)
- Independent End-Term Evaluation of Building National Social Protection Floors in Southern Africa: Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia, Final Evaluation Report
- World Social Protection Report, Universal social protection to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, 2017-2019, ILO, 2017.
- Leave no one behind: Social Protection for All. Expert Group Meeting “Social Development and Agenda 2030”, United Nations Headquarters, New York, 21 October 2015, Vinicius Pinheiro, Deputy Director, ILO Office for the UN (Power Point presentation).
- A Better World Ireland's Policy for International Development, Irish Aid.
- Social Protection Strategy, Irish Aida, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, May 2017

ANNEX IV. LESSONS LEARNT TEMPLATE

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Inclusive Growth, Social Protection and Jobs Programme with the duration 2016-2021

Project TC/SYMBOL:

GLO/16/33/IRL (Umbrella) GLO/16/63/IRL RAF/16/54/IRL TZA/16/51/IRL
VNM/16/54/IRL

Name of Evaluator: Lotta Nycander

Date: 06/02/2020

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<p>In keeping together a programme with implementation in several countries (even if not large in terms of funding) it is important that due attention is given to structural issues, oversight and including management/leadership issues. Even though a programme is officially decentralised, it is here understood that the ultimate responsibilities for the implementation lie with the HQs.</p> <p>In the case of this programme, it makes a lot of sense as the implementation of the Global Component (a sub-component to the programme) is placed at Headquarters – even though the CTA for this component is responsible for the component only, not the whole programme. Working together, as with the UNJP-SP actors has been worthwhile and has added to cost-efficiency and should be encouraged – even though this raises some difficulties in assessing and attributing achievements to the specific activities of the programme under evaluation.</p>
Context and any related preconditions	<p>Structural issues, oversight and including management/leadership issues of a multi-country programme which is decentralised but where there is a clear link to a sub-programme and programme implemented from HQ, Geneva.</p>
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irish Aid, the donor agency/development partner within the framework of its new Strategy for Development countries launched in 2017; • ILO units: Social Protection (SOCPRO), Development for Investment (DEVINVEST) and Partnering for Development (PARDEV) departments at the ILO Headquarters in Geneva; ILO offices in Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania and Viet Nam and the staff of the Decent Work Country Teams (DWCT) involved in the Program in Pretoria, South Africa and Bangkok, Thailand. • Relevant ILO constituents (Government ministries, Employer Federations and Workers Unions); and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs); • UN agencies working with social protection and employment themes in the (UNJP-SPP) programmes e.g. UNICEF, UNDP and bilateral development organisations also supporting social protection.

Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	The challenges in this programme was the lack of adequate HQ level oversight (and communication/contacts) with the subprojects in 5 countries which was manifested in the Project Document and the LFAs and Theory of Change matrices not being up-dated and communicated among the sub-components and with HQ level (this created a big problem for the independent evaluation.).
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Inclusive Growth, Social Protection and Jobs Programme with the duration 2016-2021

Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/16/33/IRL (Umbrella) GLO/16/63/IRL RAF/16/54/IRL TZA/16/51/IRL VNM/16/54/IRL

Name of Evaluator: Lotta Nycander

Date: 06/02/2020

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<p>Regarding funds transfer from the donor agency, clarity in the requirements for the fund allocations should be made very clear to project managers when recruited to implement the projects – and realism has to be applied by the ILO in terms of acknowledging that poor delivery - especially the first year/s - is a very common feature in project environments.</p> <p>During the implementation, communication between the budget holder (in the case of the regional SP project this is in Lusaka) and regional project staff regarding fund allocation to the other sub-projects and decisions on priorities should be clear and timely to avoid misunderstanding and frustration.</p>

Context and any related preconditions	The context is funds transfer to/ sub-projects and among sub-projects in a multi-country, multi-component programme, especially one where all sub-projects do not have access to IRIS.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irish Aid, the donor agency/development partner within the framework of its new Strategy for Development countries launched in 2017; • ILO units: Social Protection (SOCPRO), Development for Investment (DEVINVEST) and Partnering for Development (PARDEV) departments at the ILO Headquarters in Geneva; ILO offices in Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania and Viet Nam and the staff of the Decent Work Country Teams (DWCT) involved in the Program in Pretoria, South Africa and Bangkok, Thailand. • Relevant ILO constituents (Government ministries, Employer Federations and Workers Unions); and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs); • UN agencies working with social protection and employment themes in the (UNJP-SPP) programmes e.g. UNICEF, UNDP and bilateral development organisations also supporting social protection.
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	The negative lessons is that unclarity regarding the use of funds, and decisions about funds when made away from the actual country implementation, creates unnecessary frustration which may affect the performance and motivation among project staff.
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Lack of direct access to IRIS increases difficulties for ILO admin and technical staff.

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Inclusive Growth, Social Protection and Jobs Programme with the duration 2016-2021

Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/16/33/IRL (Umbrella) GLO/16/63/IRL RAF/16/54/IRL TZA/16/51/IRL VNM/16/54/IRL

Name of Evaluator: Lotta Nycander

Date: 06/02/2020

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<p>It is fully understood and appreciated that the decision to have the new partnership have a double SOCPRO-EIP focus was taken in full consultation with the donor. However, it should be noted for the record in this evaluation report, that the previous SP programme evaluation’s recommendations (the regional SP project) stated that “the ILO should recognise the achievements of the project in terms of advancing social protection floors through a regional approach, and should think carefully about diluting that focus in the next phase through the broadening of geographical coverage and the introduction of a secondary objective on EIIPs”.</p> <p>Despite these “red flags” the ILO-Irish Aid partnership included the new EIIP component in Tanzania and added a country from another continent, Vietnam, to the earlier regional experience. The risks of going this direction (expansion) and the evaluation’s recommendation could have been <i>mentioned or discussed in the new Prodoc.</i></p>
Context and any related preconditions	<p>The context is that ILO should be attentive to earlier evaluation’s conclusions and recommendations and preferably make a note of earlier recommendations when designing a new, very similar project. Such information could be part of assumptions/risks that ILO is aware of, and which will be part of the LFA matrices for the new programme.</p>
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irish Aid, the donor agency/development partner within the framework of its new Strategy for Development countries launched in 2017; • ILO units: Social Protection (SOCPRO), Development for Investment (DEVINVEST) and Partnering for Development (PARDEV) departments at the ILO Headquarters in Geneva; ILO offices in Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania and Viet Nam and the staff of the Decent Work Country Teams (DWCT) involved in the Program in Pretoria, South Africa and Bangkok, Thailand. • Relevant ILO constituents (Government ministries, Employer Federations and Workers Unions); and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs); • UN agencies working with social protection and employment themes in the (UNJP-SPP) programmes e.g. UNICEF, UNDP and bilateral development organisations also supporting social protection.

Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	The challenges of taking on three major new elements to a previously quite successful programme are Tanzania and Vietnam brought in as new countries, and EIIP as a new element altogether. Originally EIIP was to be implemented in more than one country but it ended up to be only in Tanzania. The ILO did not seem to be prepared to take on everything new and the risks should have been acknowledged.
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Inclusive Growth, Social Protection and Jobs Programme with the duration 2016-2021

Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/16/33/IRL (Umbrella) GLO/16/63/IRL RAF/16/54/IRL TZA/16/51/IRL VNM/16/54/IRL

Name of Evaluator: Lotta Nycander

Date: 06/02/2020

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	The Tanzania EIIP component has been operated as a one-person project until recently. For the EIIP - with the kind of responsibility assigned to it - this was not an adequate staff set up and there should have been a minimum of two technical project staff in the team.
Context and any related preconditions	The EIIP component was implemented as the only one of its kind in a 5 country programme dominated by a social protection theme.

Targeted users / Beneficiaries	<p>Irish Aid, the donor agency/development partner within the framework of its new Strategy for Development countries launched in 2017;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILO units: Social Protection (SOCPRO), Development for Investment (DEVINVEST) and Partnering for Development (PARDEV) departments at the ILO Headquarters in Geneva; ILO offices in Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania and Viet Nam and the staff of the Decent Work Country Teams (DWCT) involved in the Program in Pretoria, South Africa and Bangkok, Thailand. • Relevant ILO constituents (Government ministries, Employer Federations and Workers Unions); and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs); • UN agencies working with social protection and employment themes in the (UNJP-SPP) programmes e.g. UNICEF, UNDP and bilateral development organisations also supporting social protection.
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	<p>Lesson is described above</p>
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	

ANNEX V. EMERGING GOOD PRACTICES TEMPLATE

Project Title: Inclusive Growth, Social Protection and Jobs Programme with the duration 2016-2021

Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/16/33/IRL (Umbrella) GLO/16/63/IRL RAF/16/54/IRL TZA/16/51/IRL VNM/16/54/IRL

Name of Evaluator: Lotta Nycander

Date: 06/02/2020

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

GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	The programme has rightly placed itself in the proximity to the social protection policy holders (national key stakeholders and line ministries) - which has been beneficial in the evolvement of social protection systems and a precondition when addressing complex social systems. Combining policy level activities with the implementation of awareness-raising activities and capacity building both regionally and nationally has proved to be a good strategy. (this applies to the countries implementing the social protection component).
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	The mix of high level policy activities and implementation on the “ground” is relevant for the vast majority of ILO technical assistance projects in developing countries.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	Social protection policies in many countries currently are being either revised or developed and ILO’s influence and technical inputs are very relevant – but to be effective, policy and practice should go hand in hand.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	
Potential for replication and by whom	This emerging good practice apply to the vast majority of international agencies involved in technical assistance in developing countries.
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO’s Strategic Programme Framework)	Social protection is key in achieving the SDG Agenda 2030 (SDGs 1.3, 3.8, 5.4, 8.5 and 10.4). SDG’s target 1.3 “Implement nationally appropriate social protection systems for all, including floors” (adopted by the UN Assembly under the ambitious Goal “1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere).
Other documents or relevant comments	

Project Title: Inclusive Growth, Social Protection and Jobs Programme with the duration 2016-2021

Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/16/33/IRL (Umbrella) GLO/16/63/IRL RAF/16/54/IRL TZA/16/51/IRL VNM/16/54/IRL

Name of Evaluator: Lotta Nycander

Date: 06/02/2020

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

GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	The social protection regional project (RAF) has learnt from the previous project and is building on the contacts, networks, and trust created among key stakeholders including the social protection policy holding government ministries and other stakeholders in the “sector”.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	The good practice is applicable for all technical cooperation/assistance programmes that have implemented programmes earlier in the same field.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	
Potential for replication and by whom	Same as above: The good practice is applicable for all technical cooperation/assistance programmes that have implemented programmes earlier in the same field.
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO’s Strategic Programme Framework)	
Other documents or relevant comments	

Project Title: Inclusive Growth, Social Protection and Jobs Programme with the duration 2016-2021

Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/16/33/IRL (Umbrella) GLO/16/63/IRL RAF/16/54/IRL TZA/16/51/IRL VNM/16/54/IRL

Name of Evaluator: Lotta Nycander

Date: 06/02/2020

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

GP Element	Text
-------------------	-------------

Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	<p>a) Using public platforms and media, for open dialogue with the public on social protection and accountability of governments, with participation of universities, is an excellent way not only to broaden and raise awareness about the issues but also to appreciate the sentiments of the younger generation as is being done in Zambia.</p> <p>b) Related to a) is working with a civil society organization (network of CSOs/NGOs) to track how government funds are used for social protection at sub-national level is another very interesting activity supported by IA and ILO in Zambia.</p>
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	<p>The precondition for this practice is that there exists a civil society platform that allows for, and has some experience in, bringing to light issues of government funding to the public. In Zambia this has been possible to some extent.</p>
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	<p>Involving young people, especially, in discussions on good governance issues may in the long run contribute to transparency and accountability regarding the national social protection system. Tracking government spending of resources allocated for social protection schemes is proving to be very important.</p>
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	
Potential for replication and by whom	<p>The good practice (a) and b)) is replicable to all international agencies involved in providing support to social protection systems/schemes in developing countries.</p>
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	
Other documents or relevant comments	

ANNEX VI. INTERVIEWEES AND PARTICIPANTS IN FOCUS DISCUSSIONS

Below is a list of the interviewees and participated in FGDs (the latter marked with an X):

No.	Name	Position	Organisation	Country	FGD
1.	Ms. Aileen O'Donovan	Livelihoods and Social Protection	Irish Aid	Dublin, Ireland	
2.	Mr. Aidan Fitzpatrick	Senior Development Specialist	Irish Aid	Dublin, Ireland	
3.	Ms. Janette Murawski	Evaluation Manager	IVAL ILO	Geneva	
4.	Mr. Peter Rademaker	ILO Coordinator Development Partner Relations.	Department of Partnerships and Field Support (PARDEV), ILO	Geneva	
5.	Mr. Parth Karnitkar	Resource Mobilisation Officer	PARDEV ILO	Geneva	
6.	Ms. Valerie Schmitt	Deputy Director, Department of Social Protection (OIC)	GLOBAL, SOCPRO ILO	Geneva	
7.	Mr. Chris Donnges	Senior Specialist on Employment Intensive Investments	Development and Investment Branch (DEVINVEST), Employment Policy Department, ILO	Geneva	
8.	Ms. Veronica Wodsak	Social Protection Policy Specialist	GLOBAL, SOCPRO ILO	Geneva	
9.	Mr. Jean-Louis Lambeau	Technical Officer	GLOBAL, SOCPRO ILO	Geneva	
10.	Mr. Karuna Pal	Head, Programming, Partnerships & Knowledge-Sharing Unit	GLOBAL, SOCPRO ILO	Geneva	
11.	Mr. Luiz Frota	Social Protection Specialist/Project Manager; Beijing	ILO Country Office for China and Mongolia	China	
12.	Mr. Nuno Cunha	Senior Social Protection Specialist, Bangkok	ILO, DWCT, Regional Office for Asia and Pacific (ROAP)	Thailand	
13.	Ms. Valentina Barucci	Labour Economist, OIC	ILO Country Office in Hanoi	Viet Nam	
14.	Ms. Betina Ramirez Lopez	Social Protection Specialist	ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme, ILO Country Office	Viet Nam	
15.	Ms. Dung, Doan Thuy	National Project Coordinator	ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme	Viet Nam	
16.	Ms. Huyen	(former) Finance/Admin	ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme	Viet Nam	
17.	Ms. Dang Thi Hanh	(current) Finance/Admin	ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme	Viet Nam	

No.	Name	Position	Organisation	Country	FGD
18.	Ms. Mizuho Okimoto-Kaewtathip	Chief	Social Policy and Governance Programme, UNICEF	Viet Nam	X
19.	Ms. Nguyen Thi Van Anh	Special Policy Specialist	UNICEF	Viet Nam	X
20.	Ms. Lan Anh	Interpreter		Viet Nam	
21.	Mr. Pham Truong Giang	Director General	Social Security Department, Ministry of Labour – Invalids and Social Affairs (MOLISA)	Viet Nam	X
22.	Mr. Nam	Deputy Director General	Social Security Department, Ministry of Labour – Invalids and Social Affairs (MOLISA)	Viet Nam	X
23.	Mr. Nguyen Thi Le Thu	Vice Director	Public Finance Policy Department, National Institute for Finance, Ministry of Finance	Viet Nam	
24.	Ms. Nguyen Thi Thu Thanh	Vice Head, Division, Social Policy Desk,	Department of Social Assistance, MOLISA	Viet Nam	
25.	Mr. Tham Dai Dong	Head of Division, Social Policy Desk,	Department of Social Assistance, MOLISA	Viet Nam	
26.	Ms. Tran Thi Lan Anh	Deputy Secretary General, Director General of Bureau for Employers' Activities	Viet Nam Chamber of Commerce (VCCI)	Viet Nam	
27.	Ph.D Nguyen Thu Hang	Senior Officer, Policy Unit, Industrial Relations Department	Viet Nam Chamber of Commerce VCCI	Viet Nam	
28.	Mr. Phan Nghiem Long	Official, Policy Unit, Industrial Relations Department,	Viet Nam Chamber of Commerce (VCCI)	Viet Nam	
29.	Mr. Le Dinh Quang	Deputy Director, Industrial Relations Department	Viet Nam General Confederation of Labour (VGCL)	Viet Nam	
30.	Ms. Nguyen Nguyet Nga	Senior Economist, Social Protection and Jobs	World Bank	Viet Nam	
31.	Mr. George Okutho	Director	ILO Regional Office for Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique, in Lusaka	Zambia	
32.	Mr. Luca Pellerano	<i>Former</i> Technical Advisor on Social Protection	ILO regional office for the Middle East, Beirut	Lebanon	

No.	Name	Position	Organisation	Country	FGD
		(currently Regional Social Protection Specialist)			
33.	Mr. James Canonge	Social Protection Specialist	ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme, ILO Country Office	Zambia	X
34.	Ms. Patience Matandiko	National Project Coordinator	ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme, ILO Country Office	Zambia	X
35.	Ms. Marialaura Ena	Technical Officer, Social Protection Knowledge Management and TRANSFORM	ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme, ILO Country Office	Zambia	
36.	Mr. Pronch Murray	Head of Development	Embassy of Ireland	Zambia	
37.	Ms. Milimo Mwiba	Programme Coordinator, Development Coordination	Embassy of Ireland	Zambia	
38.	Mr. Ebby Sichembe	Chief Planner	Ministry of Community Development Social Services	Zambia	X
39.	Ms. Marian Tempo	Chief Planner, Policy	Ministry of Community Development Social Services	Zambia	X
40.	Ms. Susan Musonda	Planner, Policy Coordination	Ministry of Community Development Social Services	Zambia	X
41.	Mr. Mestone Malungo	Senior Planner, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)	Ministry of Community Development Social Services	Zambia	X
42.	Mr. Eusebias Manza	Senior Planner, Statistics	Ministry of Community Development Social Services	Zambia	X
43.	Mr. Anthony Dumingo	Director, Social Security Department	Ministry of Labour and Social Security	Zambia	
44.	Ms. Juliet Ilunga	Programmes Manager	Civil Society for Poverty Reduction (CCPR)	Zambia	X
45.	Chimuka Nachibunga	Resource Governance Coordinator	Civil Society for Poverty Reduction (CCPR)	Zambia	X
46.	Mr. Shebo Nalishebo	Research Fellow Public Finance	Zambia Institute for Policy Analysis & Research (ZIPAR), Ministry of Planning	Zambia	
47.	Mr. Mbewe Kalikeka	Associate Researcher – Public Finance	Zambia Institute for Policy Analysis &	Zambia	

No.	Name	Position	Organisation	Country	FGD
			Research (ZIPAR), Ministry of Planning		
48.	Ms. Abidemi Coker	Technical Officer	World Bank	Zambia	
49.	Mr. Hilary Chilala Hazele	Manager, Economics and Policy, Economics and Policy Department	Zambia Federation of Employers (ZFE)	Zambia	
50.	Mr. Boniface Phiri	Social Protection (Focal Point)	Zambia Congress of Trade Unions (ZCTU)	Zambia	X
51.	Mr. Luke Makinishi	Director, Education and Training	Zambia Congress of Trade Unions (ZCTU)	Zambia	X
52.	Mr. Mason Mwinga	Director Contributions and Benefits	National National Pension Scheme Authority (NAPSA)	Zambia	
53.	Mr. Daniel Kumitz	Social Policy Specialist (Social Protection)	UNICEF	Zambia	
54.	Mr. Michelo Silungwe	Director Compliance and Benefits	Workers Compensation Fund Control Board (WCFCB)	Zambia	
55.	Ms. Manard Sibumba	Manager, Branch Operations North	Workers Compensation Fund Control Board (WCFCB)	Zambia	
56.	Mr. Andre´ Bongestabs,	Technical Officer	ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme, ILO office in Lilongwe	Malawi	
57.	Mr. Reagan Kaluluma	National Project Coordinator	ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme, ILO Country Office	Malawi (<i>question naire only</i>)	
58.	Mr. Dalitso Kalimba	Economist	Ministry of Finance	Malawi	
59.	Ms. Bessie Msusa	Chief Economist	Ministry of Finance	Malawi	
60.	Mr. Arthur Takondwa B. Ntandika	Workers Compensation Commissioner	WCB, Ministry of Labour	Malawi	
61.	Shakira Phillis Fulano	Workers Compensation Assistant Officer	WCB, Ministry of Labour	Malawi	
62.	Mr. Diarmuid McClellan	Head, Development Cooperation	Embassy of Ireland	Malawi	
63.	Ms. Diane King	Policy Officer, Head Social Protection Programme	World Food Programme	Malawi	
64.	Mr. Brian Kiwsii	Social Policy	UNICEF	Malawi	

No.	Name	Position	Organisation	Country	FGD
65.	Mr. Nkandu Chilombo	Chief of Social Policy (OIC)	UNICEF	Malawi	
66.	Ms. Selvi Vikan	Head, Social Protection Programme	GIZ		
67.	Mr. Wellington Chibebe	Director	ILO Office, Dar es Salaam	Tanzania Mainland	
68.	Mr. Dampu N. Ndenzako	National Project Coordinator (NPC) (EIIP)	ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme, ILO Country Office	Tanzania Mainland	X
69.	Ms. Pendo Victor Lema	Finance and Administration Officer	ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme, ILO Country Office	Tanzania Mainland	
70.	Mr. Victor H. Seff	CEng. MIET, Chief Executive Officer	Tanzania Rural and Urban Roads Agency (TARURA) (Dodoma)	Tanzania Mainland	
71.	Ms. Veronica Mirambo	Environmental Officer	Tanzania Rural and Urban Roads Agency (TARURA) (Dodoma)	Tanzania Mainland	
72.	Ms. Domera Mgoma,	Environmental Officer	Tanzania Rural and Urban Roads Agency (TARURA) (Dodoma)	Tanzania Mainland	
73.	Mr. Simon Fugara Mwanjali	Director, Social Protection	Ministry of Labour, Youth, Employment and Persons with Disability	Tanzania Mainland	
74.	Dr Frederick Mwakibinga	Commissioner	Directorate of public procurement and development, Ministry of Finance and Planning	Tanzania Mainland	
75.	Ms. Beatrice Assenga	Supplies Officer, Public Procurement	Ministry of Finance	Tanzania Mainland	
76.	Dr. Aggrey K. Mlimuka	Chief Executive Director	Association of Tanzania Employers (ATE)	Tanzania Mainland	
77.	Mr. Jones Majura	Deputy Secretary General	Trade Union Congress of Tanzania (TUCTA)	Tanzania Mainland	
78.	Mr. Barnabas Jachi	Engineer (<i>recently retired from TASAF</i>)	Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF)	Tanzania Mainland	
79.	Mr. Paul Kijari	Act. Public Works Manager	Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF)	Tanzania Mainland	

No.	Name	Position	Organisation	Country	FGD
80.	Mr. Asfaw Kidanu	Senior Specialist, Employment Intensive Investment, DWCT	DWCT/Country Office in Pretoria	South Africa	X
81.	Mr. Eric Massinda	Programme Manager Rural Livelihoods	Embassy of Ireland	Tanzania Mainland	
82.	Mr. Mussa Omar Tafurwa	General Secretary at Teachers Union	Zanzibar Teachers' Union (ZATU)	Zanzibar	
83.	Mr. Japhet Malambi	Maintenance Engineer	Ministry of Works	Zanzibar	X
84.	Ms. Safia Juma Ameir	Civil Engineer	Ministry of Works	Zanzibar	X
85.	Mr. Salahi S. Salahi	Executive Director	Employers. Association of Zanzibar (ZANEMA)	Zanzibar	
86.	Mr. Ruben Vicente Andrés	Project Manager, Social Protection	ILO-Maputo (CO-Lusaka)	Mozambique	

ANNEX VII. EVALUATION TOOLS

7.8 SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ILO FIELD STAFF

Midterm Evaluation ILO-Irish Partnership Programme 2016-2021 “Inclusive growth, social protection and jobs”

In the process of gathering information for this evaluation, I would greatly appreciate if you could kindly participate in responding to a few questions. This questionnaire is given to all program in the 5 countries. Please be brief in your answers. I will use your response with discretion.

1. Program design

At midway of program implementation, it is relevant to look at the design of the project.

a) To what extent have you taken part in the design of the program?

Very much	A little	Not at all

Comment, if any:.....

b) According to you - to what extent does the ILO-Irish program, as it is designed, fit with the national framework and development priorities?

.....

c) To what extent has the program’s Logical Framework Analysis (LFA), or Theory of Change, been helpful for your understanding, of how it is intended that the program will contribute to change?

Very much	A little	Not helpful

If it has *not* been helpful – is there anything in the LFA that needs to be changed at this stage - at the level of planned Outcomes, Outputs, Activities, Assumptions/Risks, or Indicators?

Yes	No

If your answer is “yes” – what do you think needs to be changed?

.....

2. Implementation of activities

To what extent has the program been able to reach the goals/outputs that were to be expected at midterm (as per work plan)?

Reached	Almost reached	Not reached

Please explain if some of the goals/outcomes/outputs were *not* reached as expected and the *main reason* for not being attained:

.....

3. Stakeholder cooperation and involvement

Is there is any aspect of your partnership with the ILO tripartite constituents and other stakeholders that has *not* worked as well as you would have wished?

Please explain.....

Is there anything in particular that could *improve* the partnership - or could partnership be extended to *other* stakeholders?

Please explain:

.....

4. Monitoring progress of the program

If part of your duties involve monitoring, (of program activities, progress, results), please explain the system or the tools you use:

.....

According to you, should the monitoring system be improved, and if so how?

.....

5. Cross-cutting issues

To what extent has the program *been concerned with, or integrated* issues such as gender, non-discrimination and inclusion and persons with disabilities?

A lot	Quite a lot	Not much	Not at all

If not adequately integrated – what are the reasons?

.....

How could this be improved?

.....

6. Support

To what extent have you received **technical** support from ILO in performing your tasks?

Adequate	Not adequate	Not applicable

If not sufficient, please explain.....

To what extent have you received **administrative** support, and support in terms budgets/expenditures from the ILO in performing your tasks?

Adequate	Not adequate	Not applicable

--	--	--

If not sufficient, please explain.....

7. Comments

Do you have any additional comments or suggestions?

.....

Many thanks for your cooperation!

Lotta Nycander,

Independent consultant

7.9 QUESTION MATRIX

Some of the below-mentioned questions will be part of the brief questionnaire to be sent per e-mail to Programme ILO staff.

Questions to pose to stakeholders	Stakeholder category
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is the programme relevant to Irish Aid? 	Irish Aid
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent were the approaches and goals of Irish Aid incorporated/integrated in the final Programme Design? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How timely has the reporting about the Programme's progress been? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent would you say that ILO has been responsive to Irish Aid's comments/concerns, if any? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does Irish Aid have direct contact with the individual projects in the field? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What can you say, at mid-level, about the performance of the Project? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent (if at all) have you been involved in the programme design? 	ILO staff
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which were the main hurdles and challenges at the start up (including the inception period) of the programme? How were they addressed/solved? 	

Questions to pose to stakeholders	Stakeholder category
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which have been the main hurdles and challenges after the start up? How were they addressed/solved? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to you - to what extent have the overall Programme objectives and expected outputs, qualitatively and quantitatively been achieved? Is the project likely to achieve its medium and long-term outcomes by the end of the programme period? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to you - how is the Programme implementation coordinated with other ILO, UN and governments initiatives in social protection and public works, as required? Please give specifics. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are you aware of any unplanned effects (negative or positive)? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How has the Programme been able to involve the government in the <i>design</i>? The Employers Federations? Workers Unions/Chambers of Commerce? NGOs/CSOs? Programme participants/Beneficiaries? How have the constituents and other partners been involved in the <i>implementation</i>? If not involved, or not much involved, please explain. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are you aware of how the programme has managed to involve stakeholders (including beneficiaries) who have disabilities (differently abled) and how their needs and concerns are being addressed/met? How has the programme been able to address gender equality (and involve women as beneficiaries and staff) and non-discrimination issues? Do you know how these issues have been addressed? If not being adequately addressed – what would be the reason/s? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what level have you received adequate political, technical and administrative support from the national partners? From ILO? From the donor? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What changes, according to you, is the result of the Programme’s activities? 	

Questions to pose to stakeholders	Stakeholder category
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could anything have been done differently to make the programme more relevant, effective, efficient, sustainable? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From your point of view – could you mention any lesson learnt from the programme? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has been your involvement in the Programme? If not much involved, what would be the reason – and should you have been more involved? • According to you, how has the programme managed to undertake the activities (and produce results?) at this mid-way stage of implementation? • Are you aware of any drawback, or obstacles faced that have slowed down implementation, or seriously impeded the progress? Please explain. • Do you know how the programme has managed to involve stakeholders (including beneficiaries) who have disabilities (differently abled) and how their needs and concerns are being addressed/met? How has the programme been able to address gender equality (and involve women as beneficiaries and staff) and non-discrimination issues? Do you know how these issues have been addressed? If not being adequately addressed – what would be the reason/s? • From your point of view – could you mention any lesson learnt from the programme? 	<p>Government agencies including ministries</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has been your involvement in the Programme? If not much involved, what would be the reason – and should you have been more involved? • According to you, how has the programme managed to undertake the activities (and produce results?) at this mid-way stage of implementation? • Are you aware of any drawback, or obstacles faced that have slowed down implementation, or seriously impeded the progress? Please explain. • Do you know how the programme has managed to involve stakeholders (including beneficiaries) who have disabilities (differently abled) and how their needs and concerns are being addressed/met? How has the programme been 	<p>Employers Federations</p>

Questions to pose to stakeholders	Stakeholder category
<p>able to address gender equality (and involve women as beneficiaries and staff) and non-discrimination issues? Do you know how these issues have been addressed? If not being adequately addressed – what would be the reason/s?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From your point of view – could you mention any lesson learnt from the programme? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has been your involvement in the Programme? If not much involved, what would be the reason – and should you have been more involved? • According to you, how has the programme managed to undertake the activities (and produce results?) at this mid-way stage of implementation? • Are you aware of any drawback, or obstacles faced that have slowed down implementation, or seriously impeded the progress? Please explain. • Do you know how the programme has managed to involve stakeholders (including beneficiaries) who have disabilities (differently abled) and how their needs and concerns are being addressed/met? How has the programme been able to address gender equality (and involve women as beneficiaries and staff) and non-discrimination issues? Do you know how these issues have been addressed? If not being adequately addressed – what would be the reason/s? • From your point of view – could you mention any lesson learnt from the programme? 	<p>Workers Unions/Chambers of Commerce</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has been your involvement in the Programme? If not much involved, what would be the reason – and should you have been more involved? • According to you, how has the programme managed to undertake the activities (and produce results?) at this mid-way stage of implementation? • Are you aware of any drawback, or obstacles faced that have slowed down implementation, or seriously impeded the progress? Please explain. • Do you know how the programme has managed to involve stakeholders (including beneficiaries) who have disabilities (differently abled) and how 	<p>Private sector, NGOs/CSOs</p>

Questions to pose to stakeholders	Stakeholder category
<p>their needs and concerns are being addressed/met? How has the programme been able to address gender equality (and involve women as beneficiaries and staff) and non-discrimination issues? Do you know how these issues have been addressed? If not being adequately addressed – what would be the reason/s?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From your point of view – could you mention any lesson learnt from the programme? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has been your involvement in the Programme? • Has anything in your work situation or financial situation changed (or your family members: women, men, elders) as a result of being involved with the Programme? If yes, what? • Could the programme have done anything better in your opinion? What? • If not much involved, what would be the reason – and should you have been more involved? • Has anything in your work situation changed as a result of being involved, or benefitting from, any other programme/organisation? Please explain. 	<p>Programme participants/Beneficiaries (women, men, youth, elderly, disabled)</p>

